

2017

Funding South Carolina's Monuments: The Growth of the Corporate Person in Monument Financing

Justin Curry Davis
University of South Carolina

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Public History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Davis, J. C. (2017). *Funding South Carolina's Monuments: The Growth of the Corporate Person in Monument Financing*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/4141>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you by Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu.

**Funding South Carolina's Monuments:
The Growth of the Corporate Person in Monument
Financing**

by

Justin Curry Davis

Bachelor of Arts
Wofford College, 2010

Master of Library and Information Science
University of South Carolina, 2014

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts in

Public History

College of Arts and Sciences

University of South Carolina

2017

Accepted by:

Thomas Brown, Director of Thesis

Allison Marsh, Reader

Cheryl L. Addy, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

© Copyright by Justin Curry Davis, 2017
All Rights Reserved.

Dedication

For Mother

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge those who have assisted the writing of this paper. A special thank you is for Dr. Thomas Brown, the advisor of the this thesis, whose guidance was invaluable for establishing its final form. I also greatly appreciate the efforts of Dr. Allison Marsh for acting as reader, and for providing intellectual support and encouragement as I formulated my interest in the subject. I greatly appreciate the time of Representative Gilda Cobb-Hunter and Bud Ferillo, who both graciously agreed to an interview. Many thanks to Dr. Mark Smith and fellow student Ryan Antonouci for reading and providing comments on the section about the African American History Monument, which began as a standalone paper. I would like to give special gratitude to John Lustrea for reading and commenting on the paper, and especially for all the encouragement during the completion of the final draft. I could not have written this without his support. Finally, but not least, I would like to gratefully acknowledge the advice and assistance of Dr. Tom Thomson, whose skills as a proofreader, sounding board, and friend have been of paramount importance.

Abstract

The post-Reconstruction monuments in South Carolina have attracted scholarly interest for their role in promoting an alternative “Lost Cause” interpretation of the Civil War and its aftermath. Once established, this monument tradition continued to flourish throughout the twentieth century. The emphasis on a grassroots monument financing campaign has existed from the beginning of the monument building movement in South Carolina, as elsewhere in the American South, since the turn of the twentieth century. What has shifted is the role of the corporation in providing private funding for monuments. As the twentieth century progressed, the state came to play a much reduced role in galvanizing interest in monument campaigns by providing matching funds for private donations. This paper begins with a discussion of the Tillman statue (1940) at the South Carolina State House, one of the last projects within the old public-private matching strategy in South Carolina. Moving past mid-century, new projects firmly established the role of the private sector in arbitrating the public monument landscape. When public funds were allocated, as was the case with Columbia’s Vietnam Statue (1986), they were given with the understanding that they benefitted urban business development. In preparing the James F. Byrnes Monument (1972), corporate and professional donations were sought directly. However, this monument project demonstrates that the corporate citizenship concept had yet to develop as fully as it would at the end of the twentieth century. In the case of the Byrnes effort, almost all donations, including most of the largest donors, gave as individuals, even though most were prominent corporate leaders or professionals. The Vietnam Memorial opted to use the voluntary services of a professional fundraiser,

John Stringer Rainey, a trend that would continue to develop in future monument projects. The last two monument projects examined, the African American History Monument (2001) and the Strom Thurmond monument (1998) lacked the reservations of the earlier projects in relation to corporate funding. While grassroots support was still encouraged, as was the tradition, corporations in their respective corporate names controlled the funding processes of these expensive monument projects. Especially revealing is the case of the Strom Thurmond monument, where the corporate donors are etched into the stone of the monument itself.

Table of Contents

Dedication	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Abstract	v
List of Abbreviations	ix
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Benjamin Ryan Tillman Monument	4
Chapter 2: James F. Byrnes Monument	11
Chapter 3: Vietnam Memorial Park	16
Chapter 4: African American History & Strom Thurmond Monuments	27
Conclusion	40
Selected Bibliography	42
Appendix A: Summary of Donations	45
Appendix B: Byrnes Foundation Financial Records	47
Appendix C: Contributors to the SC Vietnam Memorial	49
Appendix D: Contributors to the African American History Monument	51

Appendix E: Contributors to the Strom Thurmond Monument 54

List of Abbreviations

AAHM African American History Monument

AAHMC African American History Monument Commission

SCMA South Carolina Monument Association

Introduction

Prior to the Civil War South Carolina's capitol had few monuments. Following Reconstruction, as the state began to create a new political order, the South Carolina state house became home to several monuments promoting the "Lost Cause" mythology of the Civil War. The first of these, the South Carolina Monument to the Confederate Dead, sought to epitomize grassroots memorial fundraising. The women of the South Carolina Monument Association (SCMA) asked for as many South Carolinians as possible to give according to their means, no matter how little. This approach preferred direct donations, money given intently for the purpose, thus discouraging other marketing strategies like bazaars or raffles.¹ The SCMA's appeal for money helped establish in South Carolina the notion that memorialization was a component of citizenship.

The state paid for large shares of later Lost Cause monuments in Columbia, such as the Wade Hampton equestrian statue and the Monument to South Carolina Women of the Confederacy, but private donations remained an expression of citizenship. Mid-century, the leaders of new monument projects continued to emphasize the importance of a grassroots campaign for private donations in funding public monument projects. In South Carolina, after the Tillman statue was finally erected in 1940, the role of public money was greatly reduced or eliminated in monument projects, and when provided, it was intended to further a business interest. In the latter half of the twentieth century, corporations gradually asserted themselves as the main contributors to monument projects as a part of their evolving role as corporate citizens. By the turn

¹Thomas Brown, *Civil War Canon: Sites of Confederate Memory in South Carolina* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 95.

of the twenty-first century, corporations had firmly established within their growing portfolio of prerogatives the role of shaping the public monument landscape.

In order to understand the growing influence of corporate citizenship in South Carolina's monument culture in the mid-to-late twentieth century, I select five monuments that demonstrate the shift of monument fundraising practices over the course of the century. All of these examples are in Columbia and four of them are at the South Carolina state house. I argue that the Tillman monument represents the last example of the established tradition among monument efforts where a state appropriation matched privately raised donations. The Tillman monument had a similar grassroots approach in its funding appeal as the Monument to the Confederate Dead, although women's leadership would play little to no role in its campaign.²

The second monument examined is another state house memorial honoring an individual. By the time the Byrnes monument was unveiled in 1972, few members of the public had even been asked to participate in the campaign to honor one of South Carolina's most nationally prominent citizens, breaking with the tradition the Tillman Memorial Commission had carried on. Wealthy individuals, often corporate leaders, contributed the bulk of the financial resources to the Byrnes project, although they did so in their capacity as private citizens. Toward the end of the twentieth century, this model would change further.

The third monument, South Carolina's Vietnam Memorial in Columbia, offers a contrast to the Byrnes model. It was a monument project that matured within Columbia's urban redevelopment strategies of the 1980s. The notion of corporate citizenship became much stronger in tandem with the rise of the professional fundraiser. In Columbia, the city's efforts to create a Vietnam Memorial within a "Memorial Park" full of other war memorials serves as an example of the rising corporate profile

²See Brown for a discussion of later nineteenth century and early twentieth century monument fundraising examples in Columbia and South Carolina, including the Women of the Confederacy monument and the Monument to the Confederate Dead.

in the funding and building of public monuments. This section includes a discussion about a particular professional fundraiser, John Rainey, a South Carolina attorney and businessman who donated a lot of his time to the financial development of public monuments in South Carolina.

The final two monuments, considered together, are the African American History Monument (henceforth AAHM) and the Strom Thurmond monument. By the end of the century, this corporate fundraising model matured amid an anxious memorialization culture. Confederate memorials no longer enjoyed the unifying theme they once had, one that came at the expense of the state's African American population. Countering the monuments to what came to be called Confederate "heritage," the AAHM brought together various tropes from the era in both theme and finance. It required a conversation about racial politics; all the while, behind the scenes the monument commission, aided by John Rainey, used a corporatist funding model to secure its construction. Although differing from the AAHM in theme, the Strom Thurmond monument provides a further, concurrent example of the connection between memorialization and corporate citizenship, having its major corporate donors etched in stone on its base.

Chapter 1: Benjamin Ryan Tillman Monument

The Tillman monument bears a plaque invoking those who had created it: “BENJAMIN RYAN TILLMAN / THIS MONUMENT ERECTED / BY THE LEGISLATURE, / THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY / AND / PRIVATE CITIZENS OF / SOUTH CAROLINA.” The original efforts to support the monument in the 1920s had less to do with the Democratic Party as a unit. Instead, Governor John Richards invoked continuity with recent memorialization projects, such as the preservation of Woodrow Wilson’s boyhood home in Columbia, for which the state had appropriated for \$17,500; the state’s donation of a marble Wade Hampton statue to National Statuary Hall; the “handsome” Marion Sims memorial at the state house; and a marker of Andrew Jackson’s (supposed) birthplace in Lancaster county.³ Richards’s idea of erecting a statue at the state house followed the example set by other monument projects in Columbia, like the Women of the Confederacy monument and the Wade Hampton monument, which relied on a contribution from the state to be matched by private donations from citizens. With his emphasis on grassroots financing, Richards intended to encourage patriotic sentiment throughout every county of South Carolina, each of which would have an opportunity to make a collective contribution to the memory of the man that Richards deemed especially worthy of memorializing. The state’s initial appropriation helped to give the appeal momentum.

Richards’s strategy for financing the Tillman monument followed the precedent set by editor William E. Gonzales of *The State* in raising funds for the monument

³“Wants Monument to Ben Tillman: Governor Richards Favors Erection of Monument,” *The State* (Columbia, SC), June 9, 1929; “In Final Annual Message Richards Reiterates the Stand for Consolidation and for Economy,” *The State* (Columbia, SC), January 15, 1931, (Copy of Final Address to the General Assembly), 1.

to Confederate women. The effort to build Tillman's statue was similarly to be a partnership between the state and the citizenry, with the legislature donating an amount to be matched by private contributions from individual citizens. The governor fully asked the General Assembly for an appropriation of \$10,000, which occurred in 1930.⁴ Richards also followed Gonzales in arranging for newspaper publication of the names of contributors with the amount of their contribution.⁵ Originally, Richards seemed to think that \$25,000 would be a sufficient amount to raise.⁶ The amount was reduced to \$20,000 by the time the General Assembly approved the project, with the final product costing only \$16,000. Richards led the way in fundraising for the monument, publishing a list of the initial thirty-five subscribers and the amounts they contributed in *The State* newspaper, including his \$25.00 subscription, the largest single donation.⁷ As the modest sum indicates, the convention remained to seek a wide pool of individual supporters from across the state, and even outside of it.

The onset of the Great Depression complicated Richards's task. Although the Tillman Memorial Commission began in earnest to collect funds in 1929, the campaign would not be renewed with vigor until 1937, still led by then former governor Richards. In the end, after a span of eleven years, the Tillman Memorial Commission only raised about \$6,000. The Tillman statue was thus primarily funded by the state. Nevertheless, the original intent held that it should be an equal effort. This conception of fundraising would not continue for later monument projects in Columbia.

The strategy that saw the monument to its completion required the establishment of a statewide bureaucracy to stimulate grassroots fundraising. Richards presided over

⁴See Act No. 1188 (1930) of the South Carolina General Assembly, in which \$10,000 was appropriated for the Tillman monument, \$10,000 was approved to be raised by "Public Subscription," and the Tillman Monument Commission was established, to be appointed by the Governor.

⁵See Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 116-117.

⁶"Seek Monument for Tillman: Governor Richards Makes Contribution to Fund," *The State* (Columbia, SC), September 26, 1929.

⁷"Seek Monument for Tillman," *The State* (Columbia, SC), September 26, 1929; "Announces Contributions in Richland Toward Monument to Senator Tillman," *The State* (Columbia, SC), November 6, 1929, 13. Of the other thirty-four donors, the next highest donation was \$10.00.

the monument commission and oversaw the appointment of regional county chairs, one for each county.⁸ Richards began the campaign before the 1930 resolution of the General Assembly authorized the monument commission and financial subscription drive. He initiated the effort “after assembling a few of the friends of the late Senator Tillman” and concluded that each county in the state should be involved in the financial drive, to be led by “a prominent citizen” in each vicinity.⁹ Richards would continue to lead the campaign as a former governor until its conclusion. In the traditional fashion, the funding committee used the newspaper to publicize the campaign. Although the newspapers did not print individual donors once the campaign resumed in 1937, they did carry seemingly exhaustive lists of the members of all the various county fundraising officials, well over one hundred people. In this way, the bureaucracy contributed to the fashion of giving credit to individual donations, including from members of the Tillman Memorial Commission. Much of the strategy focused on fostering local pride. Each county had a quota, and as each quota was met, the newspaper would update the list. Encouraging a grassroots approach, each county was given the same, relatively modest quota of about \$200.¹⁰ As the realities of the depression set in, the overwhelming majority of the county quotas went unmet.¹¹

Within the grassroots model, Richards also sought to pinpoint particular support, especially from Clemson and Winthrop Colleges. In addition to his work in promoting South Carolina’s segregationist constitution, Tillman’s education achievements as governor were aspects of his legacy emphasized by Richards during the funding drive. Tillman’s significance in founding Clemson and Winthrop was not completely without

⁸Correspondence on file in the Papers of Governor Richards.

⁹Memo of Governor Richards (to the Tillman Memorial Commission), October 10, 1929, files of the Governor Richards, Tillman Memorial Commission.

¹⁰Governor Richards’s Memo “To All County Chairmen,” October 26, 1928; files of the Governor Richards, Tillman Memorial Commission (Representative) to David A. Gaston, November 21, 1930, files of Governor Richards, Tillman Memorial Commission.

¹¹Memo of Governor Richards (to County Chairmen), January 2, 1930, files of the Governor Richards, Tillman Memorial Commission.

controversy.¹² Nevertheless, his influence in founding the two schools was widely reported and accepted. As a lasting memorial, both campuses continue to have a Tillman Hall. The fundraising committee for the Tillman statue did not seem to set a quota for Clemson and Winthrop in the same way as it did for the state's counties. It did, however, encourage a similar grassroots fundraising strategy from the members of the college communities whom Richards's considered to be direct beneficiaries of Tillman's legacy.¹³

Reminders of Tillman's political legacy were central to the dedication ceremony, just as they had been in the capital campaign. During his comments at the dedication, Chairman Richards was reported to have praised Tillman's populism, for a legacy that "championed the rights of the common man," going further to say that Tillman had made "South Carolina 'the most Democratic state in the nation.'"¹⁴ A man who had championed education was also famous for his racial politics, particularly for his actions in excluding African Americans from South Carolina's politics. Just as the United Daughters of the Confederacy had used monuments to advance the Lost Cause mythology of the Civil War, Richards used the Tillman capital campaign to advance the legitimacy of the new order he credited Tillman with initiating.¹⁵

Central to the revitalized monument funding campaign of 1937 was a reminder of what made Tillman a "great man." The leaders of the capital campaign for the Tillman statue fashioned a mythology of Tillman that credited him as a hero of white supremacy in South Carolina while also making him an example for the larger South and the nation. Richards and the commission had a pamphlet printed for the purpose of inspiring donors. Also appearing in the newspapers, it contained unambiguous

¹²See "Weak in His History," *The News and Courier* (Charleston, SC), August 3, 1928; Letter from Henry Tillman to John Richards, August 10, 1928, Files of the Tillman Memorial Commission.

¹³See June 1930 letters to the presidents of Winthrop and Clemson in Tillman Memorial Commission's files. The details of the fundraising efforts at the college campus are unclear beyond the promise of the presidents to forward the appeal to their students.

¹⁴"Byrnes Terms Ben Tillman 'The First New Dealer,'" *The State* (Columbia, SC), May 2, 1940.

¹⁵See Karen Cox, *Dixie's Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 2003).

reminders of Tillman’s racial message: “He was thoroughly patriotic, cherishing fervently conventional South Carolina belief concerning the war, the Yankees and the Negroes,” and “He participated in the Hamburg and Ellenton Riots of 1876, and aided in the Democratic triumph of that year by frightening prospective Negro voters away from the polls.”¹⁶ Tillman, after all, had been dead for some time by the later 1930s.¹⁷ The commission’s stated goal in reviving his monument campaign was to remind the citizenry of South Carolina that Benjamin Tillman had believed “in the inevitable triumph of white democracy.” His monument was a message that his belief would not waver, even though the Depression made it an inconvenient project. By donating money for its construction, South Carolinians could show their support for this vision of Tillman’s life and actions, one carefully crafted by Richards and the Tillman Memorial Commission, giving the impression that Tillman represented the vindication of the South over the Reconstruction order, and thus created a logical extension to Lost Cause memorialization. This history of Tillman’s monument also has the effect of unequivocally creating the state house as a landscape to white supremacy, bringing together themes from Civil War mythology and the post-Reconstruction racial order.¹⁸

Surprisingly, although Tillman’s statue was intended to memorialize Tillman’s racial politics, the final product was in some ways a monument to President Franklin Roosevelt. By the time the monument was prepared for dedication, James F. Byrnes,

¹⁶“Tillman Commission Now Raising the Funds for the Erection of Memorial: Sketch of the Senator’s Life Now Being Distributed in Pamphlet Form by Group,” *The State* (Columbia, SC) October 20, 1937, 5. At this point in time, the commission sought a 1938 unveiling date.

¹⁷See Dell Upton, *What Can and Can’t Be Said: Race, Uplift, and Monument Building in the Contemporary South* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015) for a discussion about the usual proximity of monument efforts to their subjects, as was the case for James F. Byrnes and Strom Thurmond, examined later.

¹⁸See “In Final Annual Message Richards Reiterates Stand for Consolidation and for Economy,” *The State* (Columbia, SC) January 15, 1931. It should be mentioned that the Tillman monument originated amidst a fiscal crisis of sorts. In Richards’s final address to the General Assembly, he blamed the body for the State’s unconstitutional deficit of \$3,848,000, which perhaps partly explains the interest in Tillman’s legacy because Tillman’s constitution had outlawed such a deficit. However, Richards also lists lynching as a lingering problem in the state. Richards had attempted to curtail lynching, a practice with which Ben Tillman is notoriously associated.

in particular, was keen to see it play a role in the debates about the future of the Democratic party, then beginning to fracture, and the controversy surrounding FDR's candidacy for a third term in office.¹⁹ Southern Democrats were beginning to break ranks, with many ending up giving their support to Wendell Willkie in the election of 1940, although FDR continued to have overall support in the South. W.W. Ball, who was the editor of the Charleston *News and Courier* and the former editor of Columbia's *State*, was a leading opponent of FDR in the late 1930s.²⁰ The Tillman monument's prominent declaration that it was largely funded by the Democratic Party serves a purpose beyond invoking South Carolina's single-party rule of the early twentieth century. For Byrnes, it was essential that Tillman's politics serve the interest of the FDR administration. In his keynote address at the dedication ceremony, which was a well-attended piece of political engineering, Byrnes targeted the political objections of Ball and other anti-New Dealer Democrats by proclaiming Tillman to be "The First New Dealer," thus establishing Tillman's legacy as one consistent with the wing of the Democratic party sympathetic to FDR (and Byrnes).²¹

Financially, the Tillman monument campaign had relied on the precedent set by the South Carolina Monument to the Confederate Dead, one focusing on a broad, grassroots campaign. The Tillman statue was effectively the last project in the same

¹⁹Associated Press, "Byrnes to Confer with Party Leaders of State When He Comes for Unveiling of Tillman Statue: Exercises on State House Grounds May 1," *The State* (Columbia, SC), April 21, 1940. With the Democratic Party undergoing the beginnings of its sectional crisis, the article specifically mentions that Byrnes was coming to South Carolina to "to confer with the political bigwigs on plans for the state Democratic convention" in addition to speaking at the Tillman dedication; See also James F. Byrnes, *All in One Lifetime* (New York: Harper, 1958), 117-132. Although Byrnes does not mention the Tillman monument dedication, he speaks about his involvement in the campaign of 1940.

²⁰See John D. Stark, *Damned Upcountryman: William Watts Ball: A Study in American Conservatism* (Duke University Press, 1968).

²¹Associated Press, "Byrnes to Confer with Party Leaders," *The State* (Columbia, SC) April 21, 1940; "Byrnes Speaks Tuesday at Tillman Unveiling," *The State* (Columbia, SC) April 28, 1940. 560 people had been invited and special bleachers were constructed for them to sit, creating a sort of stage upon which the monument was unveiled and the speakers performed; "Byrnes Terms Ben Tillman 'The First New Dealer,'" *The State*, May 2, 1940. The newspaper claimed that 3,000 people were present to "see" the unveiling, who presumably were standing around the seating constructed for the invited guests. It should be noted that *The State* carried a cartoon critical of FDR on the first page with the Tillman monument announcement, May 2, 1940.

grassroots approach of other early twentieth century models. Broad support would continue to be emphasized, but as was the case for the next major monument project at the state house, a statue honoring James F. Byrnes, the campaign could hardly be called grassroots. The politics of the Byrnes statue were less contentious in the end than those of the Tillman statue. Public justifications for the project would be fewer than they had been during the Tillman effort, and there would be much less public oversight.

Chapter 2: James F. Byrnes Monument

If the philosophy of mid-century monuments was to commemorate great men, James F. Byrnes certainly fit the requirements. He was by even the standards of the present day an extraordinary politician, having served in all three branches of the federal government before returning to South Carolina where he served as governor. Commemorated on his state house monument as the “Assistant President,” among his other accolades, Byrnes’s monument seems to have originated from a similar impulse as Tillman’s. When Solomon Blatt, then Speaker of the South Carolina House, announced his intention to ask for an appropriation for a statue honoring Byrnes, he justified the public expenditure as being an honor for “the ‘greatest American’ living today.”²² Although elderly, he was still alive when the efforts to build his statue were started, which would have significant fundraising implications. The James F. Byrnes monument, while maintaining continuity with its predecessors, differed in important respects in its realization, particularly in the fundraising efforts.

Initially, the Byrnes monument was to be funded from public money. Solomon Blatt announced in early 1969 that he planned to ask the SC House Ways and Means Committee for an appropriation of \$70,000 to \$80,000 for the monument effort.²³ Not surprisingly, Byrnes himself objected to his monument being funded by public money. The sentiment that public monuments should be privately financed would only continue to grow throughout the remainder of the century.²⁴ Breaking the tradition that the Tillman Memorial Commission had inherited from earlier projects, the task of

²²“Byrnes Statue,” *The State* (Columbia, SC), January 9, 1969.

²³“Byrnes Statue,” *The State* (Columbia, SC), January 9, 1969.

²⁴“Statue to Byrnes Authorized,” *The State* (Columbia, SC), June 26, 1969. The General Assembly authorized the monument’s construction on June 25, 1969, to be financed by private subscription.

actually financing and building the Byrnes monument passed to a private organization rather than relying on a public commission or leaders in the press.

The mechanics of funding and constructing the Byrnes monument provides a contrast to the Tillman campaign. The grassroots approach of the Tillman Memorial Commission was not adopted by those leading the Byrnes capital campaign, which was essentially a private subscription drive. Byrnes had been present for the Tillman unveiling ceremony in 1940, and had intended to be present for his own statue's debut, made impossible by his death. The Byrnes monument was the first monument built at the state house in almost thirty years.²⁵ Byrnes's monument probably cost roughly the same as Tillman's. The initial figure of \$60-70,000 ended up being lowered to only \$30,000.²⁶ Total amount aside, the Byrnes statue represents a clean break from the early-century funding models. The capital campaign included no state funds and did not utilize the statewide bureaucracy of the turn-of-the century memorials and the Tillman monument. The newspapers carried few updates of the Byrnes Monument Commission's activities and did not print itemized lists of donations or local fundraising officials.

Although a private undertaking, the monument commission that collected funds and directed monument's construction was, like the Tillman commission, made up of both legislators and non-legislators. In Byrnes's case, the concept of a statewide campaign was not utilized. Instead the small group of committee members used a separate, tax-exempt corporation to conduct the business of the monument cam-

²⁵See "Notice that the Byrnes Statue will be erected in May," *The State* (Columbia, SC), March 22, 1972; and "Unveiling of Byrnes Statue Tuesday," *The State* (Columbia, SC), May 1, 1972, which erroneously report that Byrnes's monument was the first built since Tillman's. The Cuban War Memorial had actually been dedicated in 1941 in a symmetrical position to Tillman's.

²⁶An invoice from Charles C. Parks (Sculptor), dated February 27, 1970, indicates that the monument casting cost \$10,000, of which the commission immediately paid \$3,333.00. Of the forecasted \$30,000, the Byrnes Foundation already had a significant amount of money in the bank from before it was reorganized into a 501(c)(3); Minutes of the Byrnes Foundation, November 11, 1969 indicate the Foundation had an outstanding balance of \$8,000 in money owed to Parks. The \$30,000 sum for the entire monument and installation was reiterated in these minutes, with a decision to remove, at least temporarily, plans for a screen.

paign. The Byrnes Foundation, with an altered constitution, served as the monument commission. The Byrnes Foundation already existed in 1968, having been founded in 1947 as an eleemosynary institution, granting scholarships to students, which it continues to do as of 2017. However, from 1968-1977, it was re-incorporated, with the stated purpose to serve as “an eleemosynary corporation to engage exclusively in education, including the preservation of a record of the services of James F. Byrnes to his State, his Nation and the peoples of the world; to erect a suitable monument in recognition of such services; and to raise and receive moneys and/or invest some in furtherance of these objectives.”²⁷

Just as the Byrnes Foundation had turned to a corporate structure for its own organization, it had a similar approach in its fundraising strategy. Gone were the subscription appeals and microscopic coverage of the monument effort in the newspapers. Instead, the Byrnes Foundation made personal appeals to roughly a thousand people.²⁸ Despite the direct appeals model, certain aspects of the Byrnes campaign are reminiscent of earlier monuments at the state house, including the Tillman statue. The Byrnes Foundation asked for “subscribers,” printing the official list in the dedication program, where the names are organized alphabetically: corporate and large donors were not separated into a separate, more prominent category.²⁹ Of the approximately 160 names, almost all of them were individual people. Hardly any corporate donors were part of the list, making Belk’s Department Store a noticeable outlier.

The Byrnes monument campaign is indicative of an era where a strong corporate

²⁷ *Constitution of The Byrnes Foundation*, “Purpose,” 1969, 1; “Notice of Dissolution,” November 26, 1977. The 501(c)(3) was dissolved in 1977, “the purposes for which the Byrnes Foundation was organized having been accomplished.”

²⁸ Form Letter of the Byrnes Foundation to Potential Donors, 1968, files of the Byrnes Foundation. The fundraising goal was set at \$75,000 in the appeal, although it was later lowered in the committee’s proceedings. The letter stated that any surplus money would go to the foundation’s scholarship fund for orphaned children; Minutes of the Byrnes Foundation September 13, 1971. Attached was a “to-do” list that claimed 945 letters had been sent in 1969.

²⁹ “James F. Byrnes Day” (Monument Dedication Program,) May 2, 1972. Working copies of the list are included in the Files of the Byrnes Foundation, 1968-1977; they are also organized alphabetically (E.g., see List of Subscribers as of February 17, 1969).

personhood identity had yet to take hold. Among some of the usual political donors, including Strom Thurmond, corporate leaders were certainly included on the list. In fact, there were many prominent citizens who contributed to the effort, Spartanburg businessman Roger Milliken among them. The Byrnes Foundation targeted business leaders and professionals directly, both in South Carolina and across the nation. Instead of giving to the effort through the corporations they controlled, almost all the corporate donors contributed as individual citizens, or, crucially, chose to be listed as individual citizens.³⁰ In Milliken's case, his donation of \$5,000, probably the largest single contribution, was taken from the accounts of the Deering Milliken Foundation, a fact mentioned in the letter accompanying his check but not on the list of contributors, where he appears as "Roger Milliken."³¹ The final list of subscribers is actually quite small compared with many of the other monument projects both before and after Byrnes. Within the list, even though it was arranged alphabetically, without monetary level indicated – as would become the standard within the next twenty years – the papers of the Byrnes Foundation make clear that about two-thirds of the approximately \$30,000 came for a handful of donations, mostly from business leaders and attorneys.

As was the case for the Tillman monument, the Byrnes monument effort encountered little political resistance. Its funds were raised privately, and those who opposed Byrnes's legacy had little political power. South Carolina mid-century, even as the Civil Rights era was unfolding, had not yet become an environment of competing or, as Dell Upton has described them, "dual" heritages. The African-American History Monument and the Strom Thurmond monument in the 1990s would both be contro-

³⁰"James F. Byrnes Day" (Monument Dedication Program,) May 2, 1972.

³¹Letter from Roger Milliken to J. Bratton Davis, December 26, 1969, files of the Byrnes Foundation. Milliken indicated that he was willing to send more money if needed, but that he felt the effort was destined to easily succeed and would probably become "over-subscribed." The Byrnes foundation sent a second appeal in April of 1969; Letter from the Byrnes Commission to Eugene M. Baker, April 2, 1969, files of the Byrnes Foundation, says that \$5,000 was the largest donation then, one taken "from an industrial group" (although the check itself was cut from Roger Milliken's foundation and not the accounts of Deering, Milliken and Co.).

versial, even though they were funded privately. Thematically, monuments on public property represent a public interest regardless of who has paid for them. In the case of Byrnes, his monument was “accepted . . . on behalf of the state” by John C. West, the sitting governor.³² “Accepted” is a crucial word in the coverage of the Byrnes ceremony because it acknowledges the limited government interest in preparing the actual monument in both its shape, theme, and cost. Even as the Byrnes monument process mirrored the later-century efforts in its more limited press coverage (excepting controversy), its managerial process and limited overt corporate donorship base in some ways was reminiscent of the Tillman effort and other monument efforts of the early twentieth century. Yet behind the scenes, the Byrnes endeavor represented a growing corporate influence in the politics of monument building, both the way its commission was structured, and the unbalanced proportion of donations coming from what were essentially corporate sources. Before examining the later state house examples of monument building, a broader discussion of public monuments in Columbia’s municipal property will give a greater historical context to those at the state house.

³²“Unveiling of Byrnes Statue Tuesday,” *The State* (Columbia, SC), May 1, 1972; Minutes of the Byrnes Foundation, November 11, 1969, 1, files of the Byrnes Foundation. The language in the minutes notes “that upon completion of the statue, The Foundation [will] present it to the State of South Carolina.”

Chapter 3: Vietnam Memorial Park

Memorial Park, originally called Vietnam Memorial Park, is a formal monument garden, not unlike the state house complex, that is a municipal park within the city of Columbia. The memorials and monuments there contrast to some of Columbia's modern public art closer to the traditional downtown area. Memorial Park is in a fairly quiet area near downtown, between the neighborhood of Arsenal Hill, where the Governor's Mansion is located, and Columbia's "Vista." Once an industrial area of town, the Vista was converted during the 1980s into a dining and boutique shopping district. The development of Memorial Park was accomplished by the partnership of municipal leadership and private citizens. Beyond its significance to war remembrance, the park played a significant role in Columbia's urban re-development campaign. Although the park was paid for by the city, the monument was funded by private donations. Corporations had a high profile in the fundraising process, as did the emerging role of the professional fundraiser.

The 1986 Vietnam Memorial dominates the high ground of Memorial Park, and was for a time the park's only monument and the first of its kind in a state capital. Following the example of the National Vietnam Memorial in Washington, it lists the names of South Carolina's casualties. A small creek cuts the park in half, spanned by a brick pedestrian bridge, which is in itself a monument. The pedestrian bridge is positioned near a weeping willow tree, invoking images of an English estate garden. Although the water-crossing is unique among Columbia's public gardens, the layout of formal pathways leading to monuments within a park-garden atmosphere is similar to the approach at the state house. While the area has the feel of an an attempt

to make another monument complex to complement the state house, one under the control of the city of Columbia rather than the state, the comparison ends with the focus of the memorials. Memorial Park is a decidedly modern complex. Omitting the Civil War and other nineteenth century conflicts, the earliest war commemorated is the First World War. The World War I monument contains a reproduction doughboy statue, complete with a built-up trench circling behind the doughboy. There are other, more conventional monuments to the Second World War, the Holocaust, and the Korean War.

The development of Memorial Park brought to prominence two individuals who would be important for later monument projects, representing the rise of the corporate citizen in South Carolina monument building. John Rainey and Bud Ferillo were involved heavily in the development of Memorial Park.³³ Beginning in 1985, Rainey headed the statewide fundraising campaign for the Vietnam Memorial, and collaborated on other monuments in the park and its overall layout.³⁴ Rainey and Ferillo, both Vietnam veterans, were invited to join the Vietnam Memorial and Park project by Patton Adams, the mayor of Columbia. Meeting for the first time during the Vietnam Memorial campaign, Rainey and Ferillo became close friends and would remain so until Rainey's death in 2015. Their friendship went on to include many collaborations beyond Memorial Park, including the AAHM and Ferillo's education advocacy work.³⁵

Beyond the monuments themselves, Memorial Park, as a municipal project, had an important role in economic development. It was intended to serve as one plot within a "greenway" from downtown Columbia to the Riverfront park by the canal,

³³"Rainey left a very tangible mark on Columbia" *The State* (Columbia, SC), March 30, 2015.

³⁴Shelley Hill, "Doughboy Statue to be Unveiled in Columbia," *The State* (Columbia, SC), November 11, 2002, A1; Charles "Bud" Ferillo, interview by author, October 25, 2016; "South Carolina Vietnam Monument and Memorial Park Dedication & Ceremony: Sunday, November 8, 1986 at 10:30 A.M." (Monument Dedication Program). Ferillo remains chair of the Memorial Park Commission as of January 2017.

³⁵Ferillo, interview by author, October 25, 2016. Ferillo wrote Rainey's obituary: obituary of John Rainey, *The State* (Columbia, SC), March 15, 2015.

placed strategically close to the Vista area of Columbia, then in the process of re-development.³⁶ Its economic potential was important to the city's justification for purchasing the land. The park's overall success within the larger project to revitalize the Vista is mixed. As the Vista's evolution continued, concerns were even raised by Rainey and Patton Adams. The pair went so far as to launch a campaign to protest urban encroachment onto the park.³⁷ Their concerns demonstrate the sometimes conflicting goals of economic redevelopment and memorialization; as the desirability of the area increased, the park's ostensibly primary function as a war memorial garden was threatened.³⁸

Rainey's involvement in the Vietnam Memorial project became more prominent over time. Even so, even as chief fundraiser, his name was not especially conspicuous throughout of the coverage of the Vietnam monument capital campaign.³⁹ Patton Adams had secured the monument for Columbia's municipal control, stopping a potential alternative option that would have seen the monument constructed at the state house.⁴⁰ By asking Rainey and Ferillo to join the effort, he turned to a new style of civic monument fundraising in Columbia by essentially appointing a professional fundraiser.⁴¹ The relationship between government and the private individual

³⁶"Monument to Honor Vietnam Vets," *The State* (Columbia, SC) April 7, 1985, 2D; Jeff Wilkinson, "Former Mayor Asks for Park Protections," *The State* (Columbia, SC), January 23, 2001, B1; "South Carolina Vietnam Monument and Memorial Park Dedication & Ceremony." The original plans had intended for Memorial Park to be a part of a "greenway" from downtown to the then newly developed Canal park at the State Museum. This plan was never exactly realized.

³⁷Jeff Wilkinson, "Former Mayor Asks for Park Protections."

³⁸Currently, the area is not within the restaurant and main walking district of the Vista. It may be that Rainey and Adams disapproved of the kind of urban encroachment into park of structures that would not serve the "greenway" idea. In any case, they wanted to preserve the conveniently located parking area and easy handicap access.

³⁹By contrast, Rainey's name appears much more frequently in the press coverage of the AAHMC's fundraising appeals.

⁴⁰"Vietnam War Memorial" *The State* (Columbia, SC), January 11, 1984, 6A; Rep. Palmer Freeman (York) had suggested that a SC Vietnam Memorial be built at the state house (although the suggestion had come a year earlier).

⁴¹Ferillo, interview by author, October 25, 2016; the original records of Memorial Park do not seem to have been preserved; obituary of John S. Rainey, *The State* (Columbia, SC), March 15, 2015.

“volunteer” was not unlike the later process to build the AAHM at the state house.⁴² Adams was responsible for the civilian “volunteers,” Rainey and Ferillo chief among them, who had by 1986 raised \$185,000, with \$25,000 still needing to be acquired.⁴³

Because of the multi-dimensional nature of the project, especially given the urban renewal component, the City of Columbia footed the bill for the four-acre parcel of land that became the park, at a sum of more than a half-million dollars.⁴⁴ The city also agreed to directly fund the monument’s maintenance fund, which required a further \$10,000 initial investment.⁴⁵ The decision of city officials to fund the land purchase was defined in terms of the city’s economic development. The project thus had dual goals. The desire for war memorialization had sparked the initial interest in the effort. Adams, originally as a city councilman, is credited with the vision that went on to become Memorial Park.⁴⁶ Adams was himself a Vietnam veteran interested in memorializing the war. However, he was also a city councilman and later a mayor who wanted to advance urban development in Columbia. Had the monument been placed at the state house, it would not have served the City’s goals of encouraging development in a blighted area of town, thus giving the monument and park a corporatist identity not shared by the earlier monuments built at the state house.⁴⁷

⁴²From 1990-2000, Rainey served as Chairman of the Board of Santee Cooper Electric Cooperative, a state owned cooperative, making his a political appointment. During his period as fundraising chair for the Vietnam memorial, Rainey worked as an attorney. Ferillo also worked for Santee Cooper in 1988.

⁴³“Dedication Events Set: Plans take shape for Vietnam Memorial Ceremonies,” *The State* (Columbia, SC), August 23, 1986, 1B, 9B; Three months later, the “South Carolina Vietnam Monument and Memorial Park Dedication & Ceremony” program mentions a reduced sum of \$20,000.

⁴⁴“Dedication Events Set,” *The State* (Columbia, SC), August 23, 1986.

⁴⁵“South Carolina Vietnam Monument and Memorial Park Dedication & Ceremony.

⁴⁶“South Carolina Vietnam Monument and Memorial Park Dedication & Ceremony.” The history in the dedication program asserts that then Councilman Patton’s initiated a writing campaign to garner interest in the project in 1981, to little interest. The proposition didn’t gain support until after the dedication of the National Vietnam Memorial in 1982.

⁴⁷“South Carolina Vietnam Monument and Memorial Park Dedication & Ceremony.” Officially, the state house did not have a tract of land large enough to support the monument. Adams is also noted for his “insistence” on the City of Columbia taking the project, advancing Adams’s plan for the “greenway” or “greenbelt;” See also Fred Monk “Squares Filling up in Congaree Vista,” *The State* (Columbia, SC), March 9, 1986, G1.

The fundraising campaign for the \$350,000 South Carolina Vietnam Memorial demonstrated the growing corporate role in South Carolina as a “citizen.” The monument commission needed \$195,000 from private donors in addition to state and military money. Although the monument received significant money from both state and private funding sources, its campaign was otherwise not similar to the Tillman effort or other early-century monuments. Unlike in the Byrnes campaign, corporations are highly represented among the donors. Although there are a number of prominent citizens who contributed in their own names, in addition to local government associations, many donations were given in the name of the corporations themselves as opposed to being listed as contributions of their CEOs and other leaders. In the final list of donations received, the hundreds of small donations (those less than \$100) make up much less of the total cost than those in excess of \$500, which included a handful at \$5,000-\$10,000.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, the Vietnam Memorial is an interesting example of financial cooperation between the state and municipal governments and the private sector. Being a military monument, it also received support from Vietnam and other military veterans associations. In addition to the city’s contribution of property, the National Guard and State of South Carolina gave large sums of money to the project. The Vietnam Memorial brought together an amalgamation of revenue sources of public and state money. The final list of donors gave corporations a high profile, even while the capital campaign had nodded to the traditional grassroots model of monument building that encouraged and praised a wide donor base of largely small donations, as was the case in the effort to build the Tillman monument. Certainly, the Vietnam Memorial had a large number of small donors, and its corporate donations would seem small in comparison to projects a decade later.

⁴⁸Donations are listed in the dedication program in increments, some as wide as \$5,000. Without exact financial records, it is difficult to pinpoint the precise figure of donation proportions. In addition to the \$105,000 dollars contributed by the state, the city of Columbia, and the SC National Guard, corporate donations of \$500 or more make up at least \$63,000 (or about 34% of the \$195,000 needed from private funds). The actual sum is likely higher, potentially in excess of \$130,000.

Giving the project more of a grassroots feel, much of the corporate fundraising happened behind the scenes, perhaps partly the reason for Rainey's absence from the press coverage. Nevertheless, a corporate funding model dominated the campaign, replacing the earlier, more democratic style that emphasized a large bureaucracy of local fundraising chairs who were organized by a monument commission in Columbia. Instead, Rainey emerged from the project as a professional fundraiser for public monuments, gaining him political capital that would secure him future projects, namely as financial chair of the AAHMC and chairman of the board of trustees of Brookgreen Gardens. The notion that monuments should have a wide donor base would later be important to the image of the AAHM campaign.

Along with South Carolina's Vietnam-era Medal of Honor recipients, General William Westmoreland, a South Carolina native, and Strom Thurmond feature more prominently in the press coverage of the fundraising campaign than Rainey or other members of the fundraising campaign team.⁴⁹ Multiple funding drives were organized, most importantly a general campaign by John Rainey and another by the South Carolina Army National Guard. Corporate underwriting was a significant part of Rainey's strategy. Various organizations (including South Carolina National Bank and the Columbia Metropolitan Airport) were involved in facilitating donations, which included underwriting a concert whose proceeds went to the monument fund.⁵⁰ Separate from these endeavors, corporate fundraising dinners were held that featured Westmoreland, Thurmond and others (who also appeared at the main fundraising concert in 1985 in the Carolina Coliseum).⁵¹ The newspapers, instead of being a voice organizing the fundraising initiatives, as they had earlier in the century, were

⁴⁹ "Monument to honor Vietnam Vets," *The State* (Columbia, SC), April 7, 1985, 2D.

⁵⁰ "South Carolina Vietnam Monument and Memorial Park Dedication & Ceremony." The first corporate donation came from FN Manufacturing (Fabrique Nationale). The \$5,000 gift was announced at the 1985 fundraising dinner with Westmoreland and Thurmond.

⁵¹ "Westmoreland, Thurmond at Milsap Concert Tonight." *The Sate* and *The Columbia Record* (Columbia, SC), October, 4, 1985, 12B. Country music stars Ronnie Milsap and Janie Fricke performed. The radio channel WCOS-FM "supported" the concert tickets.

used for the purpose of accurately collecting names of South Carolina’s Vietnam casualties to be etched onto the monument’s surface.

Corporate funding would be significant to many of the other monument projects in the Memorial Park, although some were funded by the individuals who donated the monuments to the park. The World War I Memorial, Rainey’s pet project, lists the corporate donors (mainly banks and energy companies) prominently on one of its plaques, in a way not unlike the Strom Thurmond monument at the state house.⁵² As would be the case for his efforts in the AAHMC, corporations with which Rainey had a connection appear on the donation lists, including Santee Cooper, which has a split public-private identity. For the projects in which Rainey did not play a role, especially the case for the Korean War Veterans Memorial, the funding strategy seemed to follow a similar model, relying on veterans groups and corporate donations.⁵³

Beyond encouraging a funding model that supported the active role of the corporate person for the purpose of municipal development, Rainey and Ferillo also represent a political continuity with earlier monuments – in their case it was the cause of reconciliation, in both war and race. The friendship forged between John Rainey and Bud Ferillo during their work on the original Vietnam Memorial began a partnership that lasted until the end of Rainey’s life. Their work on war memorials in Memorial Park morphed into a larger project on racial reconciliation; the two became a bipartisan tag team of sorts. Rainey was a prominent citizen in South Carolina,

⁵²Some of Thurmond’s donors are the same companies who are mentioned on the World War I monument. The complete list on the plaque: Santee Cooper, SCANA, NBSC, Wachovia, Bank of America, City of Columbia, John and Anne Rainey, Allen Marshall, Julia and Charles T. Ferillo, Jr. and BlueCross and BlueShield of SC. The City of Columbia’s support is a reminder of the Park’s origins; See also “A Holocaust Remembrance: 6 June 2001, Memorial Park Columbia, South Carolina,” which produces a murkier financial record. Seemingly funded through individual contributions, a separate “Special Thank You” section includes another set of Columbia municipal, corporate, and individual names not otherwise included in the donations section. SCANA, for example, is listed here, as it is for most of the monument projects I discuss.

⁵³“South Carolina Korean Veterans War Memorial: Dedication Ceremony,” July 25, 2000. The presentation model of the Korean list of donors separates corporate/organizational donors from individuals. The list of corporate donors includes names that appear on other monuments, like Bank of America. Others, like SCANA are absent.

both in his private and public sector work, which included a stint as head of South Carolina's state owned energy cooperative, Santee Cooper. Although not a politician, he was nevertheless a prominent Republican within the South Carolina political establishment, at times heavily involved party power-brokering in South Carolina. In particular, he is credited with recruiting Mark Sanford to run for his successful bid for governor.⁵⁴ He also became involved in partisan fights over his position at Santee Cooper with Democratic governor Jim Hodges, and filed an ethics dispute in court against Republican governor Nikki Hailey, of whose candidacy he had not approved.

Bud Ferillo was the son of an Italian immigrant father and a Charlestonian mother. He grew up in Charleston and became involved in civil rights activism as an adolescent and young man.⁵⁵ His entry into civil rights activism began with his work in aiding activists sitting in on Charleston's racially segregated movie theaters, work complicated by his father's profession as one of Charleston's movie theatre proprietors.⁵⁶ Ferillo has spent much of his career in political campaign advertising. One of his notable achievements was his management of Jim Clyburn's first campaign for the US House of Representatives in 1992, which was successful.⁵⁷ Much of Ferillo's later civil rights work concerned continuing unequal education in the South Carolina. Notable is the documentary *Corridor of Shame: The Neglect of South Carolina's Rural Schools* (2006), the main title of which has entered into common use when discussing the educational system in South Carolina.⁵⁸ Rainey personally funded much

⁵⁴Corey Hutchins, "Citizen Rainey: A Conservative's Crusade for Integrity in Governor's Mansion, State Politics," *Free Times* (Columbia, SC), November 16, 2011.

⁵⁵Ferillo, interview by author, October 25, 2016; Papers of Charles "Bud" Ferillo.

⁵⁶Ferillo, interview by author, October 25, 2016; See also; Clay N. Middleton "This year's Harvey Gantt award honors Bud Ferillo: A Lasting Legacy?" *Charleston City Paper*, January 13, 2010. Ferillo worked on teams that provided meals (usually held in Mother Emanuel AME Church on Calhoun Street.) and other assistance, including the arrangement of legal services for protesters who had been arrested.

⁵⁷Clyburn was the first African American Representative to be elected in South Carolina since Reconstruction.

⁵⁸South Carolina's schools are funded from local county property taxes, as opposed to the statewide tax intake. Thus, money is allocated from each county tax-base, the revenue of which varies significantly.

of Ferillo’s education activism, especially the film.⁵⁹ Ferillo, in turn, at times acted in Rainey’s name in some of his civil service activities, including the AAHMC. Giving an accolade to their approximately thirty-five year partnership and summarizing its results, former governor Nikki Haley gave the pair a Governor’s Award for the Humanities for their work on *Corridor of Shame* and other causes that advanced better education, race relations, and the preservation of the environment.⁶⁰

John Rainey’s relationship to race and Confederate memory is complicated, as it was for many of his contemporaries. He and Ferillo had bonded over their common experience of war. Rainey went on to create his own reputation as a man who valued racial reconciliation, certainly partly due to the influence of Ferillo. Rainey and Ferillo were involved in the 1994 campaign to remove the Confederate flag from the state house, along with the NAACP and Joe Riley, then the mayor of Charleston. He gave as a qualification for his anti-flag opinion that he was the descendant of Confederate soldiers who had surrendered at Appomattox. Referring to the soldiers’ version of the surrender where the “vanquished Southern soldiers’ folded their flag and saluted Grant’s troops,” Rainey said “If those men, who bore the battle, could conduct themselves that way, . . . why can’t we?”⁶¹ Rainey would continue to use references to Lee and the Confederacy throughout his life, as a reminder of a life steeped in Southern history and mythology that he sought to leverage for the purpose of reconciliation.

⁵⁹Ferillo, interview by author, October 25, 2016. Ferillo recounts Rainey’s flexibility during his work on the film, whose budget increased over term.

⁶⁰2016 Governor’s Award for the Humanities (Proclamation); the award was given to Rainey posthumously. Betsy Newman, who produced *A Seat at the Table: Pathways to Reconciliation* (2015) was also honored. Ferillo co-produced this film about the controversy over the Confederate flag and Racial Reconciliation in South Carolina. Rainey, as was his usual role, provided financial assistance and served as Executive Producer, although he died before the release. It should be noted that Haley’s praise for Rainey, calling him a “modern-day patriot of South Carolina,” came in after his legal challenge to her legitimacy as governor in light of his alleged ethics complaint.

⁶¹Lisa Anderson, “Flying of Confederate Battle Flag Above State House Raises Arguments that Many Hoped Were Long Buried” *Chicago Tribune*, September 25, 1994; Ferillo, interview by author, October 25, 2016: Ferillo recalled that Rainey, early in their friendship, once flew the Confederate flag from his beach home in Charleston before he changed his mind on its meaning.

Considering the sizable capital campaign involved, the experience Rainey gained during his work on the Vietnam Memorial gave him appropriate credentials as a professional monument fundraiser by the time he offered his services to Glen McConnell, the recently appointed chair of the AAHMC, who in turn appointed Rainey as the AAHMC's Finance Chair in 1996.⁶² Memorial Park is an interesting item on his résumé, showing not only his corporate fundraising credentials, but also his deep concern for the importance of history and public monuments. Throughout his tenure on the AAHMC, Rainey supported the continued development of Memorial Park. Although Rainey did not participate in all the monument projects housed there, his vision, together with Ferillo's, was of principal importance in making the decisions regarding the park's overall design and the realization of the Vietnam Memorial, its centerpiece.

For Rainey, monument building clearly reflected his conception of citizenship, lending his skills as a professional fundraiser to projects he felt contributed to the public good and to his personal reputation. Contrasting with his strategy of softening Confederate mythology, even as he flatly rejected the flag's presence on state property, Rainey's joint statement with Joseph A. Darby reflects his philosophy of reconciliation as he saw it near the end of his life, one that mirrors his own personal evolution and his friendship with Ferillo. Invoking the memorial landscape, Rainey and Darby write, "A sober reading of our history reveals that African American gains achieved during Reconstruction were taken away by the populist movement of Governor 'Pitchfork' Ben Tillman and its violently insidious efforts to roll back African-American political, legal and civil rights."⁶³ The response to Tillman, quite literally his statue, and all the earlier Civil War monuments that surround him, was another monument to be

⁶²Letter from Glenn McConnell to John Rainey, September 13, 1996. Rainey's appointment to this commission was by unanimous vote on account of his "ability," which certainly included his work Memorial Park work.

⁶³Joseph A. Darby and John Rainey, "The Journey to Reconciliation," *Carolina Panorama* (Columbia, SC), February 13, 2014.

dedicated to African American history. As Rainey reflected, “Until its dedication, not a single monument recognizing the legacy of African American progress stood among the countless monuments to the state’s white political and military leadership.”⁶⁴ Building the African American History Monument would prove to involve as much political skill as it did visual art, and would require all of Rainey’s skills as a fundraiser. The same period also saw corporations firmly establish their role and prerogative as contributors to public monuments as an important identity in their role as “citizens.”

⁶⁴Darby and Rainey, “The Journey to Reconciliation.”

Chapter 4: African American History & Strom Thurmond Monuments

Of all the monuments at the South Carolina state house, the AAHM's historical scope is perhaps the largest. Its eventual focus departed from the "great man" approach taken by many of the other state house monuments. The final product is more like a war memorial. It serves the role as a collective memorial to the suffering and achievements of South Carolina's African Americans. Its design creates a panorama of the African American story, beginning with slavery and continuing through emancipation and reconstruction. It then shifts to the struggles of Jim Crow and the eventual coming of the civil rights movement. The process to create the monument was long and tortuous. It involved numerous political compromises between the monument's supporters and those holding neo-Confederate views. The Confederate flag's presence at the state house was always a point of greatest contention.

By the time the monument was unveiled in 2001, the AAHM had cost \$1.2 million, and had brought together a diverse group of legislators and civilian artists, historians, and business leaders. The monument was a tightly controlled legislative creation, chaired by the powerful Republican Senate President Pro Tempore, Glenn McConnell, and vice-chaired by Gilda Cobb-Hunter, who went on to become one of the most prominent Democrats in the South Carolina House. Yet as public of a creation as it was, the AAHM follows the trend of other state house monuments in being privately funded, which is a point of pride for Rep. Cobb-Hunter to this day. Funding the AAHM was a challenge that extended beyond the tricky politics of race and Confederate memory, a challenge for which John Rainey volunteered and eventually proved successful, largely utilizing broad corporate support from throughout

the state.

The AAHM had its political origin in the General Assembly, originally contained within legislation called the “Heritage Act.” The Heritage Act, first drafted in 1994, would have moved the Confederate flag from the state house’s dome to the lawn by the Monument to the Confederate Dead, and created a “Civil Rights Monument Commission” charged “to design and establish an appropriate monument to be placed on the grounds of the Capitol Complex to honor and recognize the efforts made to afford and guarantee equal rights and opportunities for all South Carolinians irrespective of race or ethnic origin.”⁶⁵ The Heritage Act was highly controversial, causing the original act to fail. Upon the impasse, Governor David Beasley convened a special legislative session of the general assembly in which a stand-alone bill was passed, separated from any language mentioning the Confederate flag. Act 457 was actually broader in its scope than the monument itself. Beyond establishing the African American History Monument and Commission, to be under the control of Glenn McConnell, it included additional sections calling for a determination of the “feasibility” of a museum to African American history in Charleston and potentially a similar museum in Columbia, not unlike the Confederate Relic Room.⁶⁶

Glenn McConnell was an unlikely legislative champion of the AAHM. McConnell was well known for his Confederate sympathies, being an enthusiastic Confederate reenactor and having once owned a shop trading in Confederate memorabilia. He was a major supporter of flying the Confederate flag at the state house, using the now infamous “symbol of heritage – not hate” language in his 1997 position statement on the Confederate flag, whose suggested removal he termed “cultural genocide.”⁶⁷ His

⁶⁵Heritage Act of 1996.

⁶⁶Act 457 of the South Carolina General Assembly, 111th Session, 1995-1996. The museums were never constructed, although the AAHMC gave serious consideration to the Charleston possibility early on its work. The International African American Museum, a museum under construction in Charleston as of 2017, was not connected with the AAHMC.

⁶⁷Glenn McConnell, “Senator McConnell’s Response to Race Relations Commission’s Report on the Confederate Flag.” December 11, 1997. Governor Beasley had initiated the Commission on Race Relations.

presence as a supporter of the AAHM was intended to placate the neo-Confederate wing of the Republican party, which did eventually succeed. Nevertheless, the majority of the monument's business was conducted by vice-chair Cobb-Hunter, a prominent African American representative from Orangeburg. Cobb-Hunter continues to credit McConnell for his influence and work in securing the monument project and seeing it succeed. Certainly, McConnell subscribed to the "dual heritage" idea of history Upton describes, seeing the point of the AAHM as filling in a hole in the memorialization record at the state house. For McConnell, but certainly not for all in the neo-Confederate camp, monuments to the civil war and segregationist figures like Tillman need only be supplemented with more monuments that commemorate the civil rights story, as opposed to being redacted from the monument landscape. Naturally, much of the controversy over the monument and its history continues to dwell on this point.⁶⁸ The second person to whom Rep. Cobb-Hunter continues to give special credit is John Rainey, without whose financial influence the monument very well may have faltered.⁶⁹ While the state had not forbidden the use of public money, the AAHMC strove to fund the monument privately. Certainly, a request for a state appropriation would have been just as controversial as the original legislation establishing the commission.

John Rainey was the most prominent non-legislator to serve on the AAHMC. After Rainey wrote to offer his support for the monument, McConnell quickly replied, offering him the position of finance chair of the AAHMC.⁷⁰ Rainey's presence was a constant throughout the AAHMC's activities, often supplemented by Ferillo, who acted as his second. Rainey's interest in statuary was one of his major interests in life. He served as a trustee of Brookgreen Gardens, a statue garden in Murrells Inlet, South

⁶⁸See Upton, "What Can and Can't Be Said: Beyond Civil Rights" in *What Can and Can't be Said*, 172-199.

⁶⁹Cobb-Hunter, interview by author, March 15, 2016.

⁷⁰Letter on file; Glenn McConnell to Gilda Cobb-Hunter, January 15, 1999, AAHMC files. Cobb-Hunter, presumably holding the majority opinion, preferred to see the funds raised privately.

Carolina. Concurrent with his financial chairmanship of the AAHMC, beginning in 1997, Rainey became chairman of the board of trustees at Brookgreen Gardens. Thus, in his role as citizen, Rainey conducted two monument-related projects at the same time, both of which required his financial and networking acumen. Brookgreen's financial well-being became one of Rainey's pet projects, giving him a connection to monuments that went beyond his activities in raising funds for memorials and statues on public land. Before he died, he also commissioned multiple statues dedicated to racial reconciliation. These included a Larry Dobby and Bernard Baruch statue in Camden, SC and a Freddie Stowers statue in Anderson. Stowers, a World War I veteran, was the first African American Medal of Honor recipient from South Carolina. Rainey died shortly before being able to personally dedicate the Stowers monument, which was scheduled for Veterans Day, 2015. He had also planned to dedicate the Vietnam War Dog Memorial in Columbia's Memorial Park on the same Veterans Day.⁷¹

John Rainey was a consummate financier throughout his life. He had his hand in a variety of projects, both as citizen volunteer and as a paid professional, serving on the board of many corporations across the state. Rainey's work was characterized by scrupulous, conservative fiscal practices, and a rigid standard of ethics concerning the management of money, which eventually put him at odds with Governor Nikki Haley.⁷² At Brookgreen Gardens, Rainey was not a caretaker chairman of the board of trustees. He used his position to push for fiscal conservatism that saw the organization through the Great Recession while also presiding over the construction of a new "Sculpture Learning and Research Center." Memorialized by Brookgreen after his sudden death as "our Renaissance trustee," his association with Brookgreen was by all appearances a labor of love.⁷³ Applying a similar fundraising strategy as he

⁷¹Bud Ferillo, interview by author, October 25, 2016.

⁷²See Hutchins, "Citizen Rainey."

⁷³"Brookgreen Journal," 2015.

used during the AAHM financial campaign, he courted wealthy South Carolinians and corporations to underwrite new exhibitions and building projects at Brookgreen, particularly the sculpture center.⁷⁴

Rainey's period of leadership at Brookgreen, some of which overlapped with his financial chairmanship of the AAHMC, saw many attempts to include African American history, efforts concurrent with Rainey's support of Ferillo's education activism.⁷⁵ Rainey, as a "perpetual member" of Brookgreen Gardens left a memorial garden that includes, among other statues, a representation of a member of the 54th Massachusetts, an African American regiment from the Civil War. Rainey was a man who cared deeply for monuments. As Ferillo recounts, "Rainey truly believed in the power of monuments." During the Tillman campaign, some regional chairs had accepted their positions even while casting some doubts about the value of monuments.⁷⁶ Rainey on the other hand, as a fundraiser, was personally highly motivated by the what he perceived to be valuable work. In his role as professional fundraiser, he was effective at convincing corporate leaders in the state of the same.

During the campaign to build the AAHM, as is a familiar trope, the decision was made that the monument should have a broad range of public support; thus the financial drive was to be grassroots in feel. Just as the monument effort existed uncomfortably among the Confederate flag debate, the Strom Thurmond monument was also a cause of anxiety. Strom Thurmond's monument was another example of the "great man" genre, a great man who had a highly controversial history with race relations. The Thurmond monument was approved after the AAHM, yet was built

⁷⁴See the "Brookgreen Journal," Nov 2007 about the funding of The Elliot & Rosemary Offner Sculpture Learning & Research Center at Brookgreen Gardens and BMW's underwriting of the exhibit "American Masters: Sculpture from Brookgreen Gardens."

⁷⁵See "Brookgreen Journal," Vol. 35, No. 1, June 2005.

⁷⁶E.g., Philip H. Arrowsmith to Governor John Richards, October 16, 1929. Arrowsmith, asked by Richards to be the Florence county chair within the Tillman Monument Commission, expressed doubts that a monument could fully do justice to the memory of someone like Tillman. Arrowsmith would rather have seen funding efforts extended to new higher education projects in Tillman's name as a more appropriate way of advancing his legacy.

before it. The quick turnaround was aided by the swift funding of the effort and the fact that its commission found it unnecessary to advertise for bids, which were received voluntarily after the press coverage announced the plans.

When considering the relationship of public monuments to the development of the corporate citizenship, the Strom Thurmond monument stands out among all the rest at the state house. Similar to the World War I monument that Rainey oversaw in Memorial Park, which was unveiled in 2002, the Thurmond monument carries the names of its main corporate contributors around the base of the monument, carved in stone, forever to be memorialized in their own right as having financed the monument. Such an arrangement was a departure from the examples of monuments, like the Tillman Statue, that have plaques carrying inscriptions to “the People of the State.” Strom Thurmond’s monument was an unapologetic corporate affair, as had become the life of the politician by the 1990s.

Financially, the Strom Thurmond monument and the AAHM contrasted a bit in their approach to finances. The AAHM maintained a more direct financial appeal, one that praised small donations, despite the fact that, proportionally, a relatively small group of mainly corporations provided the bulk of the funding, as had been the case with the Byrnes Foundation’s financial drive. The Strom Thurmond monument made no such pretenses. Its final figure of about \$850,000 was to be largely raised from corporate and Republican Party political sources. Even so, it had a total donor pool of 2,700.⁷⁷ The large number of small donations received, nevertheless, were overshadowed by the corporations who ended up being memorialized themselves on the statue’s base. The Thurmond monument appeal was a high-profile affair. Governor Beasley himself held a fundraiser for the Thurmond monument at the Governor’s Mansion.⁷⁸ The Strom Thurmond Monument Commission accepted donations of up

⁷⁷Michael Sponhour, “Thurmond Statue to be Built on Corporate, GOP Donations,” *The State* (Columbia, SC), July 17, 1997; Sid Gaulden, “Thurmond Monument Discussed,” *Post and Courier* (Charleston, SC), December 31, 1998, B3.

⁷⁸Lee Bandy, “Capitol Monument Finds its Face: 1950s Strom to Greet Millennium,” *The State*

to \$75,000. Given the combination of political support and such a high maximum donation, it is not difficult to understand how the money for the monument was raised fairly quickly, even though there was only a small group of corporate donors giving the maximum amount. The Thurmond Monument's "Patrons," the seven corporations chiseled onto its base, contributed the maximum \$75,000, and are listed in addition to the "People of South Carolina," an inscription reminiscent of the Tillman statue. Their combined \$525,000, or about 62 percent of the total cost of the project, left the individual people of the state, even as a collective body, a distinct minority within the total pool of contributions. Other large corporate donors found themselves lumped into the "people of the state," meaning that the \$25,000 given by Milliken Co. and NationsBank did not rise to "Patron" level.⁷⁹

The AAHM under Rainey's leadership, in contrast, placed a donor cap of \$25,000 "to encourage diversity," Rainey said. Even though the AAHM cap was considerably lower, \$25,000 was certainly out of reach of average citizens.⁸⁰ Corporations did step in and donate such large amounts, including several that had also given to the Thurmond effort. Cobb-Hunter maintained that "much of the money came from individuals in small donations. That included passing the bucket at the ground breaking a year ago. One white man from Columbia sent a few dollars every two weeks."⁸¹ Certainly the AAHM persisted in giving the impression of a grassroots campaign, but much of Rainey's work was in finding larger corporate donor sources, whose contributions funded well more than half of the of the AAHMC's financial drive, not including law firm and foundation contributions. By contrast, excluding

(Columbia, SC), January 14, 1998, A1.

⁷⁹Michael Sponhour, "In Building Thurmond Statue, are Companies Buying Favors?" *The State* (Columbia, SC), December 5, 1997. "Thurmond Inspects Model of Monument," *Augusta Chronicle* December 13, 1998 The seven corporations listed on the monument are Alcoa Mt. Holly, Bank of America, Bellsouth, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of South Carolina, SCANA Corporation, Springs Industries, and Wachovia Bank; "The People of South Carolina" are listed last.

⁸⁰Jim Davenport "New African-American Monument Sits Among Confederate Reminders" Associated Press, March 25, 2001.

⁸¹Davenport "New African-American Monument."

anonymous cash, small donations from individuals (usually of \$100 or less) accounted for about \$9,000 when the list was assembled in 1999. At this point, the drive had stagnated, and most of the potential corporate donor sources had already committed with a pledge, most of which were paid by this point.⁸²

Rainey's task was immense. The original Request for Proposal outlined a budget of between \$350,000-\$500,000.⁸³ Rainey immediately began searching for corporate and private donations, including those who could afford the \$25,000 cap.⁸⁴ Over the years, the actual costs for the project would inflate to well over \$1 million, leaving the fundraising behind schedule and the monument's artist, Ed Dwight constantly angry because of the slow rate of payments. Dwight's time as artist ended up as a saga of debt and exasperation. By the time the project was finished, he claimed to have absorbed over \$100,000 in debt beyond what was legally owed to him. In the meanwhile, he had defaulted on early loans during the period between award of the bid and the ratification of his contract.⁸⁵ By December of 1998, eight months after winning the bid, Dwight had decided that the original budget cap of \$500,000 was impossible given the demands of the Citizens Advisory Council chair Mac Arthur Goodwin and the legislators of the AAHMC. In a letter to Ferillo, Rainey's associate,

⁸²"African American History Monument: Pledges and Cash Received," May 21, 2001, AAHMC files.

⁸³Request for Proposal, 3, AAHMC files. The RFP also carried the caveat, "The actual budget is dependent upon the success of the fundraising campaign."

⁸⁴A full list of donors is included in the files of the AAHMC. Nineteen companies and organizations, including Santee Cooper (Rainey's company) and the SC Black Caucus gave \$25,000. The May 19, 2000 Donor list has 605 itemized donations. J. Verne Smith, chair of the state house committee that approved the final monument design, gave \$5,000, as did Rainey, personally. BMW and Michelin both gave large donations. They are discussed in contemporary op-eds as the new sort of companies to come to the South Carolina that did not have an interest in the Confederate past, including the flag. Both of South Carolina's federal senators E. Fritz Hollings and Strom Thurmond personally donated \$500 to the project.

⁸⁵Ed Dwight to Kenny Davis, fax, January 20, 1998, AAHMC files. Dwight told Davis "I am in default on two very important notes that I promised well before Christmas. I have dumped an inordinate amount of my reserve funds and lines of credit into this project and it has come back to bite me in the 'fanny.' Of all the projects I have done, this is the first of this scale that has taken this long to get on line;" the final agreement between Ed Dwight Studios and the AAHMC was not signed until March 24, 1999. Much of his work in the intermediary period was made without assured financial payout.

he doubled his prospective for the project, saying “What we have here is a \$1 Million project.”⁸⁶ McConnell sent a stern letter to Dwight asking for the reason for the Eighty percent increase in costs.⁸⁷ McConnell later clarified that he was interested to have an explanation to make the case for the increase in budget to those who would criticize the project’s expanding costs.⁸⁸

Cost-wise, Rainey had his task more than doubled. He would also end up balancing the relationship of the committee to an increasingly irate Dwight. He was successful, but not without periods of uncertainty. As Cobb-Hunter said, “if it were not for John Rainey, we would have been in trouble.”⁸⁹ The project had reached a financial crisis point in 1999. In response, Rainey hired Tom Sawyer Productions to develop an advertising campaign to boost the stagnant donations.⁹⁰ The new marketing campaign expressed concerns that “the project has failed to appeal to broader segments of the population” and further that “any efforts at this time [to raise funds] face a potential ‘backlash’ due to the ongoing Confederate Flag debate.”⁹¹ The AAHMC required Tom Sawyer Productions to be sensitive to the political situation, and specifically “avoid the perception that this project is a compromise effort in the midst of the current Confederate flag dispute.”⁹² Unlike much of Rainey’s earlier work with corporate fundraising, his decision to retain the services of a marketing firm was to appeal for donations from interested individuals.

⁸⁶Ed Dwight to Bud Ferillo, December 8, 1998, AAHMC files. The actual figure was then given as \$985,000.

⁸⁷Glenn McConnell, “Letter from Glenn McConnell to Ed Dwight, January 29, 1999,” AAHMC files.

⁸⁸Glenn McConnell, “Letter from Glenn McConnell to Gilda-Cobb Hunter, January 29, 1999,” AAHMC files.

⁸⁹Gilda Cobb-Hunter, interview by author, Columbia, March 15, 2016.

⁹⁰Mac Arthur Goodwin, “Letter from Mac Arthur Goodwin to Carolyn Sawyer (of Tom Sawyer Productions, Inc.), November 4, 1999, AAHMC files. The project was then listed as having raised \$800,000 toward the \$1.1 million goal.

⁹¹“Marketing Campaign for African American History Monument,” November 12, 1999, AAHMC files. The document outlines a new marketing plan to run from November 29, 1999 through March 1, 2000 in response to the \$300,000 shortfall.

⁹²“Marketing Campaign for African American History Monument,” November 12, 1999, AAHMC files.

While individual donations would help the stated grassroots goals of the AAHMC funding campaign, certainly, part of the need for Tom Sawyer Co. was the reality that the available money from corporate funding sources and other foundations had been accounted for, with the project still falling short. This strategy ultimately paid off, resulting in many small donations, both from individuals and organizations, including small business and churches. Nevertheless, the proportion of the monument financed by corporations compared to small donors is stark. Small individual donations (not including organizations) had only been about \$9,000 in August 1999, but stood at more than \$34,500 in May 2001, with an additional \$2,500 in anonymous cash.⁹³ Overall, the roughly \$35,000 of small individual donations was about five percent of the total revenue needed to finish the monument. In contrast, donations exceeding \$5,000 accounted for just under \$884,500, about 74 percent of the total amount needed. Much unlike the James F. Byrnes campaign, almost all of these donations were from corporations given under their respective corporate names, making Spartanburg businessman Walter S. Montgomery, Jr.'s \$10,000 donation in his own name buck the trend.⁹⁴

The difficulties in finishing the funding drive also caused work delays for the artist. Dwight thought that the AAHMC misunderstood the financing of artistic work. Rainey himself stepped in as a diplomat in an attempt to help the often strained relationship between Dwight and the AAHMC, sometimes traveling to Denver to check in on progress and relay messages from the commission.⁹⁵ Dwight indicated

⁹³“African American History Monument: Pledges and Cash Received,” May, 21, 2001.

⁹⁴The Milliken Foundation donated \$25,000; thus Roger Milliken, still alive in 2001, did not donate in his own name as he had nearly thirty years before to the Byrnes appeal. Other individual donors at or above \$5,000 were Allard and Lynette Allston, Gayle O. Averyt, Jaunita W. Brown, Harriott H. Faucette, Governor Jim Hodges, Perry E. Palmer, John Rainey, Dick Rosen, Robert V. Royall, J. Verne Smith, Joel A Smith, III, and Inez and Samuel Tenenbaum (Inez was then State Superintendent of Education). All of these donations were \$5,000, totaling \$60,000. Thus the percentage of corporate of total donations above \$5,000, individuals removed, was about 69%. There were many additional donations in the \$500-\$3,000 range, the majority of them corporate.

⁹⁵Dwight spoke highly of Rainey, saying that he and Gilda Cobb-Hunter were the most helpful to him during the “communication difficulties” with the AAHMC and Citizen’s Advisory Committee.

that the project schedule could not advance without payment from the committee. Further, he owed money to his architect and subcontractors who wanted to be paid.⁹⁶ Dwight's anger was fully displayed on March 7, 1999 when he wrote to inform the AAHMC that he would quit if he was not paid and given a contract in short order. In any case, he planned to hold the AAHMC liable for the work he had already done.⁹⁷

Dwight was temporarily placated when his contract was finally assembled in March of 1999. The project cap was put at \$985,000 for Dwight's activities, not including extra fees incurred by the AAHMC. The project was still on a faster schedule than could be realized. As late as January of 2000, McConnell was pushing for a spring unveiling, a year ahead of the eventual reality.⁹⁸ Dwight's response illustrated the level to which he felt underappreciated. Attributing the problems of the monument project to the "sheer politics of South Carolina," Dwight said that "John Rainey has been the singular person that has provided me the moral support and encouragement so needed here. I need the Committee's full support. It has been a bit spotty over the past year."⁹⁹ The constant financial shortfalls, delays in work, and the general communication problems between the AAHMC and Dwight at his Denver studio held the project back, and kept its progress tense.

Dwight was certainly not the only person involved with the AAHMC to suffer financial complications. Acknowledging low project funds, Rainey wrote Governor Hodges in May of 1999 to inform him that the AAHMC would be required to take out loans to keep pace with the disbursement schedule arranged between the AAHMC and Dwight. In order to gain permission to transact business and take out loans on behalf of the AAHMC, Rainey was forced by the State Budget and Control Board

⁹⁶Ed Dwight, "Letter from Ed Dwight to Kenny Davis and John Rainey, February 17, 1999," AAHMC files.

⁹⁷Ed Dwight to Sen McConnell and John Rainey; cc. Kenny Davis," fax, March 7, 1999, AAHMC files.

⁹⁸Glenn McConnell to Ed Dwight, fax, January 18, 2000, AAHMC files.

⁹⁹Ed Dwight to Kenny Davis (CC McConnell, Cobb-Hunter, Goodwin, Rainey and Ferillo), fax, January 31, 2000.

to offer his personal assets as collateral, releasing the state, AAHMC, and Dwight of financial responsibility.¹⁰⁰ Gilda Cobb-Hunter said that Rainey interpreted this as a slight. Neither the Strom Thurmond Monument Commission nor any other precedent they could find had been subjected to similar treatment. Rainey, according to Cobb-Hunter, wondered if the African American focus of the project had perhaps brought them extra bureaucratic obstacles.¹⁰¹

Rainey's hand was a constant shaping force in many details of the monument's progress. The contract with Dwight had required him to sell his copyright of the artwork and monument design to the AAHMC.¹⁰² A 501(C)(3), "Friends of the Monument" was established in 2001 for the preservation of the structure. Rainey had pushed through loans for the commission to get it through gaps in fundraising. Dwight similarly claimed a personal stake in the monument, which became one of "sacrifice." He said "I undertook this General Contractor role assuming that the Committee would be there to assist me, since we both had a common interest in the creation and instillation of [one of] the most important African American monuments to date. Thank God that I have deep enough pockets to hang with this."¹⁰³ The "deep pockets" presumably took a \$100,000 loss in the project. Dwight had decided to abide by the \$985,000 project cap before making some adjustments to the bronze reliefs that

¹⁰⁰"Agreement Between the African-American Monument Commission and John Rainey," March 24, 1999, AAHMC files. John Rainey was held liable to pay all amounts of money due to Ed Dwight Studios, Inc. The Agreement was terminated on May 24, 2001. The Termination Agreement summarized his previous responsibility: "Rainey provided a personal guarantee to pay all amounts due for the construction of the Monument in the event the Commission did not raise sufficient funds."

¹⁰¹Gilda Cobb-Hunter, interview by author, Columbia, March 15, 2016. I have not investigated the possibility of other precedents or the procedural differences between the AAHMC's non-profit corporation and similar organizations. Cobb-Hunter indicated that this phase of the project had angered Rainey such that it was the major sticking point he carried away from the project. Rainey's correspondence in the AAHMC's files is always polite and taciturn.

¹⁰²Dwight was not happy with this requirement; he was eager to maintain the copyright and not be a "work for hire." The initial draft of the agreement did not require him to relinquish his copyright. This point extended the contract negotiations, at which Dwight was quite desperate for a contract so that financial disbursements would begin.

¹⁰³Ed Dwight, "Letter from Ed Dwight to Mac Arthur Goodwin, November 11, 2000," AAHMC files.

raised the cost of the monument. Additionally, he had personally taken out \$125,000 in loans that he wanted to pay back, ideally with some help from the AAHMC.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁴Ed Dwight to Glenn McConnell, Fax, April 10, 2001, AAHMC files.

Conclusion

Considered together, the AAHM and the Strom Thurmond monument demonstrate the firm emplacement of the corporation in South Carolina's culture of memorialization and patriotism, even though individual fundraising efforts for these monuments were handled differently given their very different political realities. The person of John Rainey, a prominent citizen with broad ties to the state's business community, serves as a bridge between private and corporate personality. He was a private citizen who felt a personal responsibility to use his influence gained from his professional life for public projects, in this case, advancing the case of memorializing war and South Carolina's difficult history concerning race. Such a person would not have been possible or perhaps necessary for monuments produced prior to the development of the modern corporation's conception of citizenship. The concept of corporate personhood was hardly new, but its role as a broker of monuments and memorials on public land was. As the Byrnes Foundation's strategy had demonstrated, prominent corporate leaders, unsurprisingly, were asked to contribute their wealth. Even then, they largely conceived their role as donor as a private contribution, from their own account or a foundation separate from their company.

Monuments shift in theme in response to changing social circumstances and expectations, but also as a result to developments in the economic culture. In addition to the social history of South Carolina's monuments, is the history of their financial campaigns, which have implications for the state's understanding of citizenship and patriotism. Tillman's monument never actually fulfilled the original pact the state made with its citizens, where the state gave half and the people gave half – the state

actually ended up giving about two-thirds. Financially, the relationship of the state to the people continued to be tenuous throughout later monument appeals. Often, the notion of private and public responsibilities in providing for new monuments was that the public contribution of the state was the land, and the private contribution was the monument itself. What changed over time was not the expectation that if a monument was worthy to be built, it should be funded by the people. Instead, the matter of who should be included and excluded from the realm of the citizenry has been a dynamic concept.

In South Carolina, the history of Jim Crow is the obvious example of exclusionary practices. Subtler, was the inclusion of the corporation over time, which added to its personhood certain prerogatives of citizenship. Just as a prominent, private citizen like John Rainey felt a certain duty to involve himself in the life of the state, in his case, its memorial efforts, corporations more and more came to echo the same sentiment, which is felt nowhere on South Carolina's memorial landscape more strongly than on the Strom Thurmond monument. Quite reasonably, much of the dialogue about the Thurmond monument concerns his connection to race and the retroactive inclusion of his African American daughter among the inscriptions of his other children. Yet this focus overshadows the other conspicuously exposed trope of corporate citizenship, being visibly inscribed on the monument. Thurmond was not special or pioneering in garnering corporate interest in his memorialization project, or the underwriting of its cost. Most of the newer large monuments around the state house, Columbia, and elsewhere have a similar history, the AAHM among them. What is extraordinary about Thurmond's statue is the way it was proclaimed, written in stone. Just as individual donations were listed in the newspapers in public congratulations for their money much earlier in the twentieth century, the Strom Thurmond monument encourages a similar approach in providing accolades for its corporate citizens.

Selected Bibliography

Secondary Sources

- Brown, Thomas. *Civil War Canon: Sites of Confederate Memory in South Carolina*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina, 2015.
- Bryan, John M. *Creating the South Carolina State House*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999.
- Byrnes, James F. *All in One Lifetime*. New York: Harper, 1958.
- Cox, Karen. *Dixie's Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture*. Gainesville, University of Florida Press, 2003.
- Doss, Erika. *Memorial Mania: Public Feeling in America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- Hagopian, Patrick. *The Vietnam War in American Memory: Veterans, Memorials, and the Politics of Healing*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2009.
- Johnson, Kristina D. *No Holier Spot of Ground: Confederate Monuments & Cemeteries of South Carolina*. The History Press, 2009.
- Kantrowitz, Stephen. *Ben Tillman & the Reconstruction of White Supremacy*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000.
- Loewen, James W. *Lies Across America: What Our Historic Sites get Wrong*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000.
- Prince, Michael K. *Rally 'Round the Flag, Boys!': South Carolina and the Confederate Flag*. Columbia: University of SC Press, 2004.
- Sanford, Levinson. *Written in Stone: Public monuments in Changing Societies*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1998.

Sergiusz, Michalski. *Public Monuments: Art in Political Bondage*. London: Reaktion Books, 1998.

Simkins, Francis Butler. *Pitchfork Ben Tillman: South Carolinian*. Columbia, University of South Carolina Press, 1944.

Stark, John D. *Title Damned Upcountryman: William Watts Ball: A study in American Conservatism* Durham: Duke University Press, 1968.

Upton, Dell. *What Can and Can't Be Said: Race, Uplift, and Monument Building in the Contemporary South*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2015.

Watson, Inez. *Monuments on the State House grounds, Columbia, South Carolina*. Columbia: The State Commercial Printing Company, 1958.

Winter, Jay. *Remembering War: The Great War Between Memory and History in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2006.

Newspapers and Periodicals

Augusta Chronicle (Augusta, GA), 1998.

Brookgreen Journal (Publication of Brookgreen Gardens, Murrell's Inlet, SC, 1985-2015).

Carolina Panorama, 2014.

Chicago Tribune, 1994.

Columbia Record, The (Columbia, SC), 1985.

Free Times, The (Columbia, SC), 2011.

News and Courier, The (Charleston, SC), 1920-1940.

Post and Courier (Charleston, SC), 1985-2015.

State, The (Columbia, SC), 1920-2015.

Unpublished Primary Sources

Columbia Memorial Park, Monument Dedication Programs (1985-1995), South Caroliniana Library.

Papers of Charles T. "Bud" Ferillo (1950-2016), South Carolina Political Collections, University of South Carolina.

Records of the African American History Monument Commission (AAHMC files, 1996-2001), South Carolina Department of Archives and History, including:

- Commission Minutes
- Minutes of Public Hearings
- Selection Recommendation Committee files
- Financial Records
- Sculptor Files
- Correspondence
- Administrative File

Records of the Byrnes Foundation (1968-1977), South Caroliniana Library, including:

- Commission Minutes
- Correspondence

Records of the Commission on Civil Rights (1996-1998), South Carolina Department of Archives and History.

Records of Governor John Richards and the Tillman Memorial Commission (1927-1940), South Carolina Department of Archives and History, including:

- Commission Minutes
- Correspondence

Appendix A: Summary of Donations

Table A.1 Beginning and End of Monument Funding Campaigns

Monument	Beginning of Campaign	Dedication Date	Initial Budget	Total Cost
Tillman statue	1929	1940	\$20,000	\$16,000
Byrnes statue	1969	1972	\$30,000	\$30,000
SC Vietnam Memorial	1983	1986	\$150,000	\$350,000
AAHM	1996	2001	\$300-500,000	\$1.2 M
Thurmond monument	1997	1999	\$700,000	\$850,000

Table A.2 Public and Private Funding

Monument	State Appropriation	Other Government Funding	Private Contributions Sought	Actual Private Donations
Tillman statue	\$10,000	\$0	\$10,000	\$6,000
Byrnes statue	\$0	\$0	\$30,000	\$30,000
SC Vietnam M.	\$50,000	\$55,000	\$195,000	\$195,000
AAHM	\$0	\$0	\$1.2 M	\$1.2 M
Thurmond	\$0	\$0	\$850,000	\$850,000

Table A.3 Corporate Funding Levels*

Monument	Percentage of Corporate Donorship	Percentage given by top 20 Donors	Approximate Percentage of Donors <\$100
Tillman statue	0%	<10%†	100%
Byrnes statue	<10%	73%	50%
SC Vietnam Memorial	34-65%‡	27-50%†	6-12%
AAHM	88%	43%	5%
Thurmond monument	>77%	>75%	5-15%‡

* Corporate donors are those who donated under their corporate names. Most percentages are approximations based on available records. Percentages are of the total private money sought, excluding any public contributions (see Table A.2).

† Not including state and other government appropriations.

‡ These numbers are difficult to reconstruct without the final financial records. Besides the nine largest contributions to the Thurmond monument, \$270,000 remained to be collected.

Appendix B: Byrnes Foundation Financial Records

Partial List of Donations to the Byrnes Foundation:*

Donor Name	Amount
Roger Milliken	\$5,000
Robert Steven, (Steven Building, NYC), April 16, 1969	\$2,500
Charles C. Parks n.d.†	\$2,500
E. A. Ramseur (Greenville News-Piedmont Co.), Jan. 8, 1968	\$1,200
Lester Bates (Columbia)	\$1,000
Leigh Batson (Beverly Hills, CA), Dec. 27, 1968	\$1,000
Charlie T. Cooper and wife, Dec. 30, 1968	\$1,000
James F. Daniel, III (Daniel Foundation), Dec. 12, 1969‡	\$1,000
Alester G. Furman/Bygeen Foundation (Spelling?), n.d.	\$1,000
Raymond F. Grenfell, M.D. (Jackson Miss.), Jan 10, 1969	\$1,000
Ambrose Hampton and wife (President, State-Record Publishing Co., Columbia), Jan 13, 1969	\$1,000
Harold R. Jewett of the W.B. Camp Foundation (Bakersfield CA), Feb. 13, 1969	\$1,000
Gladys C. Swint (of Augusta, private citizen), Jan 14, 1969	\$1,000
50 Shares of Manhattan Life Insurance common stock from Mrs. Renee B. Samstag, April 22, 1969	\$565.63
Sol Blatt (Columbia Attorney and SC Speaker of the House), Feb 8, 1969	\$500
Owen Robertson Cheatham and wife (Chairman of the board, Georgia-Pacific Corporation), Jan. 3. 1969	\$500
Dorothy Guilder (and John Guilder, of NH), April 8, 1969	\$500
Joseph Walker (not to be confused with Jr.) Cotton Merchants, Columbia, SC, Jan 1, 1969	\$500
Mrs. Alfred Dupont (Wilmington Delaware)	\$300
Calhoun Lemon (Barnwell SC), Jan 21, 1969	\$300
Robert Coker, Jan 3, 1968	\$250
Charles E. Fraser (Sea Pines Plantation Co., Hilton Head), Dec. 27, 1968	\$250
Francis Townsend (Graniteville Co, Graniteville, SC), Jan. 29, 1969	\$250
Levi and Wittenberg Law Office (Sumter) (Signature unreadable), April 14th, 1969	\$250
Ed. T. Tatum, of SC Employment Security Commission, Feb. 22, 1969	\$150

Donor Name	Amount
J. Boone Aiken (Guaranty Bank and Trust Co., Florence, SC), April 8, 1969	\$100
H.M. Arthur (Arthur State Bank, Union), Dec. 21, 1968	\$100
Paul Barnett, March 17, 1969	\$100
Laurence S. Barringer (Barringer Foundation), April 15, 1969	\$100
John B. Hartnett, April 7, 1969	\$100
James Harrell (JP Stevens and Co, Greenville), April 14, 1969	\$100
William K. Kimbel (Mid-Coast Investment Co.)	\$100
George Levy (Sumter attorney)	\$100
W. J. Murray, Jr. (Murhartom Company, Columbia), April 9, 1969	\$100
Strom Thurmond, Feb. 17, 1969	\$100
George T. Townes (attorney in Greenville, SC), Dec. 28, 1968	\$100
Charles S. Way, Jr. (attorney), April 14, 1969	\$100
William Weston Jr. M.D., Jan 21, 1969	\$100
A.F. Burgess (Greenville attorney), April 7, 1969	\$50
Heyward Clarkson, Jr. (Columbia attorney)	\$50
Bradley Dewey (NH)	\$50
Elizabeth Moore, Feb 1, 1969	\$50
Robert Small (Dan River Mills, Inc.), Dec. 31, 1968	\$50
Joseph Walker, Jr. (Cotton Merchant, Columbia), Jan. 21, 1969	\$50
Ben Scott Whaley (Charleston attorney), April 11, 1969	\$50
Ervin Dargan, Dec. 17, 1969	\$25
Chris Eventis (Dixie-Central Produce Co., Columbia), Dec. 30, 1968	\$25
Robert L. Stoddard (Spartanburg, SC Mayor)	\$25

* This list is constructed from those letters preserved in the files of the Byrnes Foundation that included the amount of the enclosed donation.

† This is the only donation listed in this way, and thus should be considered unverified.

‡ \$1,000 promised by Buck Mickel (President, Daniel Construction Co.) to be taken from the Daniel Foundation, April 17, 1969.

Appendix C: Contributors to the SC Vietnam Memorial

List of Largest Contributors to the SC Vietnam Memorial:*

Donor Name	Donation Range
City of Columbia	\$10,000
SC National Guard	>\$10,000
SC Parks and Recreation	\$35,000
SC Counties (collected contributions)	\$10,000
State of South Carolina	\$50,000
Citizens & Southern National Bank	\$5,000-\$9,999
F.N. Manufacturing Inc.	\$5,000-\$9,999
NCNB	\$5,000-\$9,999
S.C. National	\$5,000-\$9,999
State Record Foundation	\$5,000-\$9,999
Stringer Foundation	\$5,000-\$9,999
Vietnam Veterans of S.C.	\$5,000-\$9,999
GMK Associates	\$2,500-\$4,999
Richland County	\$2,500-\$4,999
Stevens & Wilkinson, Inc.	\$2,500-\$4,999
Mr. & Mrs. T. Patton Adams	\$1,000-\$2,499
Mr. & Mrs. H.M. Alexander	\$1,000-\$2,499
Norman J. Arnold	\$1,000-\$2,499
Ben Arnold Company Inc.	\$1,000-\$2,499
Beaufort County Council	\$1,000-\$2,499
Mr. & Mrs. Clinch H. Belser, Jr.	\$1,000-\$2,499
Carolina Capital Corporation	\$1,000-\$2,499
Columbia Action Council	\$1,000-\$2,499
Community Cash Stores	\$1,000-\$2,499
Daniel International Corp.	\$1,000-\$2,499
Daniel Foundation	\$1,000-\$2,499
duPont E.I. de Nemours & Company	\$1,000-\$2,499
Dritz Corporation	\$1,000-\$2,499
Edens & Avant	\$1,000-\$2,499
First South Savings Bank	\$1,000-\$2,499
First Union National Bank of S.C.	\$1,000-\$2,499
Florence County	\$1,000-\$2,499
Fort Jackson Federal Credit Union	\$1,000-\$2,499
John C. Judy, Jr.	\$1,000-\$2,499

Donor Name	Donation Range
Keenan Company	\$1,000-\$2,499
Lexington County Council	\$1,000-\$2,499
John S. Rainey	\$1,000-\$2,499
Dr. & Mrs. John F. Rainey	\$1,000-\$2,499
RPR & Associates, Inc.	\$1,000-\$2,499
S.C. State Fair	\$1,000-\$2,499
SCANA Corp.	\$1,000-\$2,499
Southern Bell	\$1,000-\$2,499
Southwind Corp.	\$1,000-\$2,499
Special Forces Assn. Chapter No. 34	\$1,000-\$2,499
Lt. Col. & Mrs. David L. Starkey	\$1,000-\$2,499
John Strickland	\$1,000-\$2,499
Mrs. Nancy F. Stringer	\$1,000-\$2,499
Sunbelt Beer Distributors, Inc.	\$1,000-\$2,499
TexFi Industries Inc.	\$1,000-\$2,499
Vietnam Veterans of Edgefield County	\$1,000-\$2,499
Edwin Craig Wall, Jr.	\$1,000-\$2,499

* This list of donors is taken from the "Dedication of the South Carolina Vietnam Monument and Memorial Park," November 8, 1986. Donations are listed in the ranges printed here.

Appendix D: Contributors to the African American History Monument

List of Largest Contributors to the AAHM, May 2001

Donor Name	Source	Amount
Advance America	Spartanburg	\$25,000
BMW	Spartanburg	\$25,000
Bank of America	Columbia	\$25,000
BellSouth	Columbia	\$25,000
Blue Cross/Blue Shield	Columbia	\$25,000
Carolina Power and Light	Florence	\$25,000
Duke Energy Foundation	Greenville	\$25,000
Extended Stay America	Spartanburg	\$25,000
Georgia-Pacific Corp.	Columbia	\$25,000
Greater Greenville Chamber	Greenville	\$25,000
Liberty Life and WIS	Greenville/Columbia	\$25,000
Milliken Foundation	Spartanburg	\$25,000
Nelson, Mullins Riley & Scarborough	Columbia	\$25,000
Norfolk Southern	Norfolk, VA	\$25,000
Roche Carolina, Inc.	Florence	\$25,000
SCANA	Columbia	\$25,000
Santee Cooper	Moncks Corner	\$25,000
SC Legislative Black Caucus	Columbia	\$25,000
State-Record Company	Columbia	\$25,000
Wachovia Bank	Columbia	\$25,000
CSX Corp.	Jacksonville, FL	\$20,000
Piggly Wiggly/Greenbax Enterprises	Charleston	\$15,500
BI-LO, Inc.	Greenville	\$15,000
Michelin	Greenville	\$15,000
South Carolina Bar Foundation	Columbia	\$15,000
SCETV	Columbia	\$11,863.88
AVX/Kyocera Foundation	Myrtle Beach	\$10,000
Barnet Foundation Trust	Arcadia	\$10,000
Burroughs & Chapin Company, Inc.	Myrtle Beach	\$10,000
Carolina First	Greenville	\$10,000
State Chamber of Commerce	Columbia	\$10,000
Colonial Life Insurance Company	Columbia	\$10,000
First Citizens Bank	Columbia	\$10,000

Donor Name	Source	Amount
Inman-Riverdale Foundation	Inman	\$10,000
McNair Law Firm	Columbia	\$10,000
NBSC	Columbia	\$10,000
Walter S. Montgomery, Jr.	Spartanburg	\$10,000
South Carolina Baptist Education and Missionary Convention	Columbia	\$10,000
Springs Industries	Lancaster	\$10,000
Baulknight, Pietras & Stormer, CPAs	Columbia	\$7,000
Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.	Greenwood	\$5,275
ALCOA	Goose Creek	\$5,000
Advantica Restaurant Group, Inc.	Spartanburg	\$5,000
Allston, Allard and Lynette	Columbia	\$5,000
Averyt, Gale O.	Columbia	\$5,000
Brown, Juanita W.	Fund-Raising Co-Chair	\$5,000
Close Foundation, Inc.	Lancaster	\$5,000
Daniel-Mickel Foundation	Greenville	\$5,000
The Electric Co-Ops of SC	Cayce	\$5,000
Faucette, Harriott H.	Columbia	\$5,000
Flour Daniel	Greenville	\$5,000
Founders Federal Credit Union	Lancaster	\$5,000
General Electric	Charlotte	\$5,000
Hodges, James	SC Governor	\$5,000
Jon and Kathleen Rivers Foundation	Charleston	\$5,000
Mayfair Mills, Inc.	Arcadia	\$5,000
McColl, Hugh and Jane	Charlotte	\$5,000
Metromont Prestress	Greenville	\$5,000
Norman J. Arnold Foundation	Columbia	\$5,000
Palmer, E. Perry	Fund-Raising Co-Chair	\$5,000
Philip Morris Management Corp.	Richmond, VA	\$5,000
Rainey, John S.	Fund-Raising Chair	\$5,000
Rosen, Dick	Myrtle Beach	\$5,000
Royall, Robert V.	Columbia	\$5,000
Sonoco Foundation	Hartsville	\$5,000
SC Alpha Kappa Alpha Chapters	South Carolina	\$5,000
Smith, J. Verne	State Senator	\$5,000
Smith, Joel A., III	Columbia	\$5,000
Springs Company	Lancaster	\$5,000
Tenenbaum, Samuel & Inez	Superintendent of Education	\$5,000
United Black Fund of the Midlands	Columbia	\$5,000
Westinghouse Savannah River Co.	Aiken	\$5,000
Amheuser-Busch Company	Atlanta	\$3,000
Haynsworth, Marion, McKay & Guerard	Charleston	\$2,600
Belton Industries, Inc.	Belton	\$2,500

Donor Name	Source	Amount
Ben Arnold - Sunbelt Beverage Co.	Columbia	\$2,500
Collins & Aikman Foundation	Charlotte	\$2,500
Finlay, Mrs. Mary Fleming	Columbia	\$2,500
Hallenbeck, Joyce A.	Columbia	\$2,500
Ness, Motley, Loadholt, Richardson & Poole	Barnwell	\$2,500
New Prospect Baptist Church	Williamston	\$2,500
Palmetto Health Alliance	Columbia	\$2,500
Paradigm Asset Mgmt.	New York	\$2,500
Pfizer, Inc.	Atlanta	\$2,500
Prym-Dritz Corporation	Spartanburg	\$2,500
SMI Steele SC	Cayce	\$2,500
Safety-Kleen Corporation	Columbia	\$2,500
SC Trial Lawyers Association	Columbia	\$2,500
Siemens Westinghouse Power		\$2,500
Costal Carolina University Phi Kappa Phi	Conway	\$2,122.35
Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority	Tampa	\$2,000
Fleet Mortgage Group	Columbia	\$2,000
SC State Fair	Columbia	\$2,000
W. Frazier Construction, Inc.	Ravenel	\$2,000
Young, Dr. and Mrs. James H.	Anderson	\$2,000
54th Massachussetts Vol. Infantry	Charleston	\$1,500
Columbia Postal Employees	Columbia	\$1,500
Greenville Hospital System	Greenville	\$1,500
Most Worshipful Palmetto Grand Lodge	West Columbia	\$1,500
Clyburn, Bill	Black Caucus Member	\$1,200

Appendix E: Contributors to the Strom Thurmond Monument

List of Top Contributors to the Strom Thurmond Monument

Donor Name	Amount
Alcoa Mt. Holly	\$75,000
Bank of America	\$75,000
Bellsouth	\$75,000
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of South Carolina	\$75,000
SCANA Corporation	\$75,000
Springs Industries	\$75,000
Wachovia Bank	\$75,000
Milliken Co.	\$25,000
Nations Bank	\$25,000