

Spring 2021

**“We are Going to be Reckoned With”: The South Carolina UDC and the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, 1986-2000**

Caitlin Cutrona

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



Part of the [Public History Commons](#)

---

**Recommended Citation**

Cutrona, C.(2021). *“We are Going to be Reckoned With”: The South Carolina UDC and the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, 1986-2000*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/6242>

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](mailto:dillarda@mailbox.sc.edu).

“We are Going to be Reckoned With”: The South Carolina UDC and the South Carolina  
Confederate Relic Room and Museum, 1986-2000

by

Caitlin Cutrona

Bachelor of Science  
Taylor University, 2017

---

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

2021

Accepted by:

Thomas Brown, Director of Thesis

Allison Marsh, Reader

Tracey L. Weldon, Interim Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

© Copyright by Caitlin Cutrona, 2021  
All Rights Reserved

## DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my parents who have supported and encouraged me in all my endeavors. Left side...

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis would not have been possible without the Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau collection at the South Caroliniana Library or the internal archives at the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum (SCCRRMM). Special thanks go to Edward Blessing at the South Caroliniana Library who responded promptly to my many requests and helped make sure that I could conduct research safely in the middle of a pandemic. Likewise, I would like to recognize Allen Roberson and Fritz Hamer at the SCCRRMM, both of whom offered important insights into the museum's history and provided me with sources that were invaluable to my thesis. Thank you to the staff at the South Carolina Department of Archives and History and the South Caroliniana Library who located indispensable sources. I also want to extend my sincere appreciation to my thesis director Dr. Thomas Brown who gave thoughtful comments on each thesis section and provided clear direction throughout this process. Additionally, my gratitude goes to Dr. Allison Marsh who served as my second reader as well as the initial inspiration for my decision to study the SCCRRMM. To my mother-in-law, thank you for providing a second set of eyes and offering editing suggestions that made my thesis stronger.

Additional thanks go to my parents whose love and gifts of chocolate helped push me to the finish line, and to Hannah and Holly who provided a constant supply of friendship and encouragement. Last but not least, to the love of my life goes my upmost love and gratitude for his constant cheerleading, love, and support, without which this project would not have been completed.

## ABSTRACT

From 1986 to 2000, the South Carolina Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy actively negotiated influence for its organization at the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum (SCCRRM) as an important museum stakeholder. While 1986 marked a low point for UDC authority over the museum, from 1986 to 2000, the South Carolina UDC sought to salvage and protect its influence at the SCCRRM and ultimately reclaim its authority over the museum. The South Carolina Daughters did this through a variety of means and methods, including employing Dotsy Boineau, a UDC member and SCCRRM employee, as an instrument of UDC influence, following the lead of pro-flag legislators Glenn McConnell and John Courson during the South Carolina Confederate flag debate (up to 2000), crafting museum enabling legislation, and working to have one of their own appointed to the SCCRRM director position. While its efforts to reassert UDC authority over the SCCRRM failed, the South Carolina UDC's ongoing association with the SCCRRM from 1986 to 2000 provides important insight into the relationship between museums and their stakeholders. Ultimately, this thesis examines the relationship between a museum, the SCCRRM, and a museum stakeholder, the South Carolina UDC, from the perspective of the stakeholder, demonstrating how institutional stakeholders can use their influence at a museum to their benefit.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION .....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	iv
ABSTRACT .....	v
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS .....	vii
INTRODUCTION .....	1
CHAPTER 1: THE SOUTH CAROLINA UDC AND THE SCCRRM, 1986-1996.....	11
CHAPTER 2: THE SCCRRM, THE SOUTH CAROLINA UDC, AND THE CONFEDERATE FLAG DEBATE, 1994-2000.....	51
CHAPTER 3: THE SCCRRM AND THE SOUTH CAROLINA UDC, 1996-2000.....	85
CONCLUSION .....	128
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	137

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

BCB.....	Budget and Control Board
SCCRRM.....	South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum
SCCRRMM.....	South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum
SCV.....	Sons of Confederate Veterans
UDC.....	United Daughters of the Confederacy



## INTRODUCTION

In August 2000, Allen Roberson, the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum's (SCCRRM)<sup>1</sup> current director, published a report on the SCCRRM's ongoing revitalization. This one-page report provided information about the reasons behind the museum's relocation from the War Memorial Building on the University of South Carolina's campus to the Columbia Mills Building along Gervais Street in Columbia's Vista area. It also discussed the money that the South Carolina General Assembly allocated for the renovations, the architects and exhibit design firm that the museum employed to create the exhibit plan at its new location, and the museum's anticipated opening date, which was spring of 2001. At first glance, one might assume that Roberson was providing information about the museum's future to a museum governing board or administrative authority who were anxious to hear updates about the SCCRRM's progress moving forward. In reality though, Roberson's report was published in the pages of the *United Daughters of the Confederacy South Carolina Division* newsletter.<sup>2</sup> To

---

1. Throughout its history, the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum (SCCRRM) has gone by many names. Today, the SCCRRM is officially known as the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum. Beyond its official title, the general public has frequently referred to the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum as the "Confederate Relic Room" and the "Relic Room," including from 1986 to 2000. However, for consistency, the thesis will use the name "South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum" and the related acronym SCCRRM, since this was the museum's official name during the period under study.

2. Allen Roberson, "The South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum," *United Daughters of the Confederacy South Carolina Division Newsletter*, August 2000, 3, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Unprocessed Box, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

understand why the SCCRRM's museum director was providing particulars about the museum's future plans to the South Carolina Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC), we have to turn back time more than one hundred years to the SCCRRM's founding.

On December 20, 1895, exactly thirty-five years after the state of South Carolina seceded from the United States of America, Sally Elmore Taylor motioned and Malvina Black Gist Waring seconded a resolution establishing the Wade Hampton Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy.<sup>3</sup> The Confederate Relic Room was the organization's first project.<sup>4</sup> This effort began in March 1896 when Sally Taylor recommended establishing the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room in order to "preserve with care the treasured dust of our sacred dead."<sup>5</sup> In an 1896 letter to General Wade Hampton, the Wade Hampton Daughters explained that the SCCRRM "will be valuable in nurturing proper sentiments and maintaining the truth among our own people."<sup>6</sup> As their letter indicates, the members of the Wade Hampton Chapter originally established the museum as a Confederate museum that commemorated and vindicated

---

3. Wade Hampton Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy, "The Beginning or Organization of Wade Hampton Chapter, U.D.C.," Scrapbook, 1960-1967 (bulk, 1965-1966), South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

4. Mrs. Claude Girardeau and Mrs. Thornley Walker, *South Carolina Confederate Relic Room of Wade Hampton Chapter U.D.C.* (Columbia, SC: State House, 1924), 3.

5. Thomas J. Brown, *Civil War Canon: Sites of Confederate Memory in South Carolina*, Civil War America (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015), 107-110; "Collecting the Relics," *State* (Columbia, SC), May 14, 1896, 2, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

6. "Collecting the Relics," 2.

Confederate men and women, though, as this thesis demonstrates, the Daughters eventually expanded the museum's mission to include South Carolina history in general.<sup>7</sup>

While the Wade Hampton Chapter was the museum's original founder, by 1901 the South Carolina state division of the UDC joined members of this chapter in petitioning the South Carolina legislature to provide "the room at the head of the stairway, on the north side of the State House" as a home for the Confederate relics in their collection.<sup>8</sup> In February 1901, the General Assembly granted the Daughters' request.<sup>9</sup> This moment marks the start of a long relationship between the South Carolina UDC and the SCCRRM with the South Carolina UDC becoming the museum's primary stakeholder.

Much of the museum's early history has already been covered by two existing theses. Focusing on the SCCRRM's founding years, Rachel Wynne Overton argues that the museum was the most consequential action undertaken by the Wade Hampton Chapter to promote the Lost Cause narrative, offering a way for the Wade Hampton Daughters to influence Southern public memory.<sup>10</sup> Building on Overton's work, Kristie

---

7. Rachel Wynne Overton, "Girls of the Sixties: The Wade Hampton Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy, and the Founding of the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum" (master's thesis, University of South Carolina, 2003), 13-20.

8. John Martin, Jr., "Brief History of the Confederate Relic Room & Museum," [ca. 1986], Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; "Leaders in South Carolina: Women of Character and Intellect," *State*, April 17, 1904, 10, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; Girardeau and Thornley, *South Carolina Confederate Relic Room*, 3.

9. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the Senate of the State of South Carolina*, Regular sess., February 15, 1901, 518, LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), *Journal of the Senate of South Carolina*.

10. Overton, "Girls of the Sixties," 9-14, 20-25.

DaFoe examines the SCCRRM from 1960 to 1986. DaFoe depicts 1960 to 1986 as a time of growth for the museum, though she also contends that this is when the UDC lost control of the SCCRRM to the South Carolina Budget and Control Board (BCB).<sup>11</sup>

This moment of defeat for the South Carolina UDC in 1986 where DaFoe ends her story is where this thesis's story begins. Though the South Carolina UDC lost its direct authority to appoint the SCCRRM's museum director in 1986, during the next fourteen years the organization actively negotiated influence for itself at the SCCRRM as an important museum stakeholder. While DaFoe provides a declension narrative of the South Carolina UDC's power over the museum from 1960 to 1986, this paper explores how the South Carolina UDC claimed and protected positions of influence for the organization at the SCCRRM after 1986. For reference, 2000 marks the end of the time period under study, as several developments, including Dotsy Boineau's retirement from the museum and the Confederate flag's removal from the State House dome, took place during 2000 that signify the end of the era explored by this thesis.<sup>12</sup>

The thesis is divided into three sections that outline the South Carolina UDC's relationship with the SCCRRM from 1986 to 2000 and examine the organization's efforts to advance and protect its influence at the museum. The first section largely focuses on

---

11. Kristie L. DaFoe, "Shifting Authority at the Confederate Relic Room, 1960-1986" (master's thesis, University of South Carolina, 2015), 2-5, 15-16, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global (Order No. 1589287).

12. Dotsy L. Boineau, "South Carolina Relic Room and Museum," Minutes of the One Hundred and Fourth Annual Convention, United Daughters of the Confederacy, South Carolina Division, 2000, 84, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 8, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; Shirley D. Schoonover, "Possible Ways to Improve the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum," January 15, 2004, 3, South Carolina State Documents Depository, South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC, <http://hdl.handle.net/10827>.

the 1986 to 1996 time period. During John Martin's tenure as museum director (1986-1996), Dotsy Boineau, who was both a UDC member and an SCCRRM employee, served as an instrument of UDC influence at the museum, helping the South Carolina UDC to maintain its sway at the museum during the first years without a member in the director position. Furthermore, in the midst of government restructuring efforts in 1993, the South Carolina Daughters successfully used their legislative clout to maintain the SCCRRM's independent status from the South Carolina State Museum, thereby protecting their position as a central institutional stakeholder. The second section examines the South Carolina UDC and the SCCRRM's involvement in the South Carolina Confederate flag debate from 1994 to 2000. While relocating the Confederate flag from the State House dome to the SCCRRM became a point of contention between pro and anti-flag forces, the South Carolina UDC did not add to this discussion in any way. The organization's failure to offer a counternarrative to pro-flag assertions that museums, like the SCCRRM, were places where objects went to be forgotten, likely stems from the Daughters' reluctance to antagonize pro-flag legislators over an issue (the Confederate flag debate) that the South Carolina UDC was not heavily invested in. The final section, which extends from 1997 to 2000, marks the climax of the South Carolina UDC's efforts to negotiate power and influence for its organization over the museum. In 1997, the South Carolina UDC actively sought to reclaim its authority over the museum by crafting legislation that institutionalized positions of power for the organization at the museum and by attempting to have a UDC member appointed to the SCCRRM director role.

The arguments presented in this thesis are based on the perspective that the South Carolina UDC operated as a primary SCCRRM stakeholder from 1986 to 2000. This

viewpoint raises questions about why the South Carolina UDC can be demarcated as an institutional stakeholder. For one, the museum itself defines the organization as an important constituency. In its 2018-2019 museum accountability report, the institution described the South Carolina UDC using the terms “core supporters” and “core constituency.”<sup>13</sup> While recognizing that the SCCRRM identifies the South Carolina UDC as a primary stakeholder, it is still helpful to think about how the South Carolina UDC fits into the definitional framework for museum stakeholders. Edward Freeman, who provided one of the earliest and most cited stakeholder definitions, defines stakeholders as “any group or individual who can affect or is affected by the achievement of the organization’s objectives.”<sup>14</sup> Freeman’s stakeholder definition aligns with other descriptions provided by museum-related literature on stakeholders. For instance, museum planner Jeanne Vergeront defines stakeholders as “the people, groups, constituencies, and institutions who are likely to affect or be affected by a museum, its plans, or projects.”<sup>15</sup> Similarly, museum professional Jane Legget identifies museum stakeholders as “individuals or organizations who have an interest in, or influence on, a

---

13. South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum, “Fiscal Year 2018-19 Accountability Report,” 2019, 11-12, South Carolina State Documents Depository, South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC, <https://dc.statelibrary.sc.gov/handle/10827/32394>.

14. Ronald K. Mitchell, Bradley R. Agle, and Donna J. Wood, “Toward a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the Principle of Who and What Really Counts,” *The Academy of Management Review* 22, no. 4 (October 1997): 853-854, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/259247>; Jane Legget, “Measuring What We Treasure or Treasuring What We Measure? Investigating Where Community Stakeholders Located the Value in Their Museums,” *Museum Management and Curatorship* 24, no. 3 (July 2009): 214, doi:10.1080/09647770903073052.

15. Jeanne Vergeront, “Stakeholders + Engagement,” *Museum Notes* (blog), March 25, 2012, <https://museumnotes.blogspot.com/2012/03/stakeholder-engagement.html>.

museum's ability to achieve its objectives.”<sup>16</sup> Based on the definitions provided, a stakeholder can be generalized as any individual or group who either has an influence on or who can be influenced by an organization's ability to achieve its objectives. From using the museum to promote its Lost Cause ideology to playing an instrumental role in maintaining the SCCRRM's independence, the South Carolina UDC from 1986 to 2000 fits into the definitional framework of a museum stakeholder.

At its heart, this paper is a case study that examines the relationship between the SCCRRM and one of its main supporters—the South Carolina UDC. However, the story told in the following pages also speaks to a larger field of scholarship centered on museum stakeholders. Much of the existing literature on museum stakeholders is prescriptive in nature with a focus on how museums can cultivate and sustain these relationships to the museums' benefit. Alexandra Zbucnea and Monica Bira discuss how museums can employ stakeholder management strategies to promote institutional sustainability. They argue that effective stakeholder management will result in multiple benefits for a museum, including greater resources, enhanced public loyalty, and more innovation.<sup>17</sup> David Ebitz explains that museum educators should utilize stakeholder analysis, which, as its name implies, is a tool that enables museum professionals to identify their museum constituents. He contends that museum educators' use of stakeholder analysis will enable them to garner support for their programs and reduce any

---

16. Legget, “Measuring What We Treasure,” 214.

17. Alexandra Zbucnea and Monica Bira, “Does Stakeholder Management Contribute to a Museum's Sustainable Development?” *Management Dynamic in the Knowledge Economy* 8, no. 1 (March 2020): 95-107, doi:10.2478/mdke-2020-0007.

potential opposition.<sup>18</sup> Even literature that studies museums from a stakeholder's perspective identifies ways that these institutions can use the information gleaned from stakeholders to improve their relationship with their patrons, thereby aiding museums by increasing their public support and community value.<sup>19</sup> For example, though Legget examines the factors that museum stakeholders from New Zealand's Canterbury Museum recognize as important values when evaluating the museum's performance, her article addresses how museums can utilize this information to craft assessment criteria that more accurately reflect their value to their local communities.<sup>20</sup> While the identified scholarship emphasizes how museums can leverage or improve their relationship with museum stakeholders, this paper presents a case study on the museum-stakeholder relationship from the stakeholder's perspective. Contrary to the existing scholarship, this thesis does not explore how the SCCRRM profited from its relationship with the South Carolina UDC, but it instead focuses on how the South Carolina UDC sought to advance and protect its influence at the museum to its organization's advantage.

As noted earlier, the South Carolina Confederate flag controversy up to 2000 intersects with the thesis's narrative, as both the South Carolina UDC and the SCCRRM were drawn into the Confederate flag firestorm. Fortunately, there is a rich literature on the 2000 South Carolina Confederate flag debate to build upon. In his thesis, Grant Lefever

---

18. David Ebitz, "Stakeholder Analysis for Educators: Obtaining Support and Reducing Obstacles," *The Journal of Museum Education* 35, no. 2 (Summer 2010): 187-191, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25801348>.

19. Laura D. Carsten Connor, Angela M. Larson, and Carol E. Diebel, "What Matters to Stakeholders? Measuring Values at a University Museum," *Visitor Studies* 17, no. 1 (2014): 45-65, doi:10.1080/10645578.2014.885358; Legget, "Measuring What We Treasure," 213-232.

20. Legget, "Measuring What We Treasure," 213-232.



argues that it was political pragmatism, not lawmakers' commitment to racial equality or cultural change, that caused the Confederate flag to be removed from the State House dome in 2000 and the State House grounds in 2015.<sup>21</sup> K. Michael Prince provides a detailed study of the South Carolina Confederate flag controversy up to 2000 in *Rally 'Round the Flag, Boys!* Historians John Coski and Thomas Brown both devote a chapter to the Confederate flag dispute in their larger works on the battle flag and Confederate memorial sites in South Carolina respectively.<sup>22</sup> Taken together, the current scholarship on the South Carolina Confederate flag dispute offers extensive detail on pro and anti-flag supporters' arguments given during the debate, proposed solutions to the controversy, and the reasons behind the flag's relocation in 2000.<sup>23</sup> Brown's argument that the South Carolina UDC was not a significant factor in the Confederate flag controversy proved particularly illuminating.<sup>24</sup> Though the secondary literature reviewed here provides a foundation for the arguments given in this thesis, the paper itself concentrates specifically on pro and anti-flag groups' perspective on relocating the State House Confederate flag to the SCCRRM, and the South Carolina UDC's involvement, or rather lack of involvement, in this debate.

---

21. Grant Burnette Lefever, "Furling the South Carolina Confederate Flag: Political Expediency or Cultural Change?" (master's thesis, University of Mississippi, 2016), 18, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global (Order No. 10160615).

22. K. Michael Prince, *Rally 'Round the Flag, Boys! South Carolina and the Confederate Flag* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2004); John M. Coski, *The Confederate Battle Flag: America's Most Embattled Emblem* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005); Thomas J. Brown, *Civil War Canon: Sites of Confederate Memory in South Carolina*, Civil War America (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015).

23. For clarification, "pro-flag," "flag supporters" and "flag defenders" are terms used in this thesis to describe people who supported keeping the Confederate flag on the State House dome. Likewise, "anti-flag," "flag opponents" and "flag detractors" are terms used in reference to people who wanted the Confederate flag to be removed from atop the State House.

24. Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 219.

While built upon a bedrock of secondary sources, the thesis's analysis also rests upon a careful interpretation of primary sources. A significant portion of its argumentation draws from the Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau collection at the South Caroliniana Library. The paper's analysis also uses the records of the now-defunct South Carolina Budget and Control Board, and material on the Confederate flag debate from South Carolina newspapers, including *The State*, *The Columbia Record*, and *The Greenville News*. Collectively, these sources illuminate the South Carolina UDC's continued relationship with the SCCRRM from 1986 to 2000, and it is to that story that this thesis now turns.

## CHAPTER 1: THE SOUTH CAROLINA UDC AND THE SCCRRM, 1986-1996

### THE 1986 SCCRRM DIRECTOR SEARCH

On June 3, 1986, the South Carolina General Assembly passed a concurrent resolution commending LaVerne Watson for the “splendid work she has rendered” as the director of the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum.<sup>25</sup> The General Assembly’s concurrent resolution honored Watson prior to her imminent retirement. In the wake of Watson’s impending retirement, the SCCRRM needed to find a new director, and for the first time in the museum’s history, the South Carolina Budget and Control Board (BCB) led the SCCRRM director search.

Before delving into the details of the 1986 director search, it is useful to take a moment to consider the question, why did the BCB, a state agency, take charge of finding the director for an institution not officially under its control?<sup>26</sup> The answer to this question highlights the long relationship between the SCCRRM and South Carolina’s state government. The South Carolina UDC sought to integrate the museum with state power as early as 1901. In that year, Sally Elmore Taylor, president of the South Carolina UDC, along with members of the Wade Hampton Chapter, asked the General Assembly

---

25. S. 1360, 106th sess. (1985-1986), South Carolina Legislature, [https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=%22Relic%20Room%22&category=LEGISLATION&session=106&conid=36641600&result\\_pos=0&keyval=1061360&numrows=10](https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=%22Relic%20Room%22&category=LEGISLATION&session=106&conid=36641600&result_pos=0&keyval=1061360&numrows=10).

26. Schoonover, “Possible Ways to Improve,”3.

to provide space in the State House for the Confederate relics in their collection.<sup>27</sup> The General Assembly granted the Daughters' request, and for the next sixty years the Confederate Relic Room inhabited a location in the seat of state power. Then, in 1909, the South Carolina legislature began providing an annual appropriation for the museum. In doing so, the state assumed the museum's financial burden, which was becoming too much for the South Carolina UDC.<sup>28</sup> Though the state funding in 1909 only consisted of \$150 to pay the Confederate Relic Room custodian's salary, the SCCRRM's state budget has increased significantly since its first appropriation.<sup>29</sup> By 1985, the museum's state appropriation totaled \$144,000, and the SCCRRM's operations were entirely funded through government money.<sup>30</sup> The SCCRRM's rising state appropriation prompted a parallel increase in government interest in the museum. Beginning in the 1960s, the state, particularly the BCB, became more involved in the museum's affairs. Increased government intervention in the museum's operations culminated in 1986 with the BCB's decision to assume responsibility for selecting the next director.<sup>31</sup>

---

27. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the Senate of the State of South Carolina*, Regular sess., January 11, 1901, 28, LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), *Journal of the Senate of South Carolina*; "Leaders in South Carolina: Women of Character and Intellect," *State*, April 17, 1904, 10, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

28. Overton, "Girls of the Sixties," 11, 25; Schoonover, "Possible Ways to Improve," 2.

29. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the Senate of the State of South Carolina*, Regular sess., February 26, 1909, 801, LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), *Journal of the Senate of South Carolina*.

30. Edward P. Alexander, "South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, Columbia, South Carolina 29201 Reaccreditation Visit October 1, 1985," October 8, 1985, 2, 4, Reaccreditation: Pre-1998 folder, Internal Archives, South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum, Columbia, SC.

31. DaFoe, "Shifting Authority," 14, 32-35.

In 1986, the members of the Budget and Control Board who were responsible for choosing the new SCCRRM director were Governor Riley, Grady Patterson, Jr. (State Treasurer), Earle Morris, Jr. (Comptroller General), Rembert Dennis (Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee), and Tom Mangum (Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee).<sup>32</sup> As a part of the hiring process, the BCB considered several candidates, including John A. Martin, Jr. and Dotsy Boineau.

John Martin was a former SCCRRM curator from 1978 to 1983. Upon leaving the museum in 1983, he served as a marketing representative for the Better Business Bureau of the Midlands. While not much is known about Martin's background, he was the son of the powerful South Carolina Senator John Martin, who served as a member of the senate from 1953 to 1960 and 1965 to 1993. Notice that Martin was a member of the senate during the year that his son John Martin, Jr. applied for the SCCRRM director position.<sup>33</sup>

---

32. South Carolina Budget and Control Board, Minutes of State Budget and Control Board Meeting, Regular Session, April 8, 1986, 7, Minutes and Attachments of the Budget and Control Board, 1940-1998, South Carolina Electronic Records Archive, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, SC, <http://e-archives.sc.gov/file/sdb%3AdigitalFile%7C58e34a2c-22cb-4701-a236-5c21615e3c06/>.

33. South Carolina Budget and Control Board, Minutes of State Budget and Control Board Meeting, Executive Session, March 25, 1986, 22, Minutes of Budget and Control Board Meeting, April 8, 1986, Minutes and Attachments of the Budget and Control Board, 1940-1998, South Carolina Electronic Records Archive, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, SC, <http://e-archives.sc.gov/archive/sdb%3Acollection%7Cbd93e5a5-a192-4be8-9a4a-0f5e3bf2c72e/>; DaFoe, "Shifting Authority," 35; South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, "Annual Report Confederate Relic Room 1977-78," 1978, 4, South Carolina State Documents Depository, South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC, <http://hdl.handle.net/10827/17690>; South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, "Annual Report Confederate Relic Room 1982-1983," 1983, 6, South Carolina State Documents Depository, South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC, <http://hdl.handle.net/10827/17695>; "Executive Items," *State*, April 22, 1984, 86, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; John A. Martin, Jr. to Elizabeth Hunter, May 6, 1986, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South

Dotsy Boineau was both a SCCRRM curator and a South Carolina UDC member.<sup>34</sup> Boineau began working at the SCCRRM as a curator in February 1984 while LaVerne Watson was still the museum's director.<sup>35</sup> Watson and Boineau, both prominent South Carolina UDC members, had a close relationship outside of the museum, as they worked together on several UDC projects. These projects included the Pioneers in Space medal, which was a medal designed to honor astronauts with Confederate ancestors.<sup>36</sup> Senator Glenn McConnell even once referred to Dotsy as "a natural successor to Mrs. LaVerne Watson's dedication in preserving" Confederate heritage.<sup>37</sup>

As demonstrated through her friendship with Watson, Boineau's UDC roots ran even deeper than her SCCRRM associations. Upon her mother's advice, Boineau joined Columbia Chapter #1711 of the South Carolina UDC shortly after her marriage in 1954.

---

Carolina, Columbia, SC; John A. Martin, Sr., "Interview with John A. Martin," interview by James Duffy, November 9, 1999, 2, Oral History Project, South Carolina Political Collections, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, <https://digital.tcl.sc.edu/digital/collection/scpcot/id/38/>.

34. John Courson, Glenn McConnell, and Joe Wilson to Governor Carroll Campbell, Jr., April 12, 1993, 2, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 13, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, "Annual Report Confederate Relic Room 1983-1984," 1984, 3, South Carolina State Documents Depository, South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC, <http://hdl.handle.net/10827/17696>.

35. Dot Broom to Chairman of the Budget and Control Board, June 12, 1997, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Unprocessed Additions Box, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

36. Dotsy Boineau, "South Carolina News," *United Daughters of the Confederacy Magazine*, June 1986, 12, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 7, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; Linda Caughman, "She Joins Just to Participate," *State*, December 26, 1972, 18, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers. The Pioneers in Space Medal was an idea originally conceived by LaVerne Watson and carried to fruition by Dotsy Boineau, the chairman of the Pioneers in Space Committee.

37. Glenn McConnell to Dotsy Boineau, May 30, 1988, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 3, UDC, MSS, Feb-Aug 1989, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

Boineau gained UDC membership through her great-grandfather, Pvt. Peter Ransome Davis Watkins, who fought for the Confederacy as a part of South Carolina's Kershaw's Brigade. Starting with making sandwiches for her mother's UDC meetings, Boineau steadily worked her way up the UDC leadership chain, serving as the Columbia Chapter president, the South Carolina UDC third vice president, and the South Carolina UDC president.<sup>38</sup> In 1980, Boineau ascended to the top of the UDC organization by becoming president general.<sup>39</sup>

As the BCB vetted its candidates for the director position, the South Carolina UDC conducted its own director search. Sometime prior to March 25, 1986, Watson contacted William Putnam, the BCB's executive director, to explain that the South Carolina UDC had already chosen Renee Watts as the SCCRRM's new leader. Watts had served as the museum's administrative assistant since at least 1976 and was a Wade Hampton Chapter member. The South Carolina UDC confirmed its selection of Renee Watts as the SCCRRM's next director through a letter sent to Governor Riley by the South Carolina Division President on March 5, 1986.<sup>40</sup> Watson's phone call and the

---

38. Bill East, "She Wants to Update the Daughters," *Sentinel* (Winston-Salem, NC), November 5, 1981, 16, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 3, Boineau, Dotsy Diane Lloyd, UDC, MPs, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; Pam White, "Patriotic Priorities Viewed by UDC Leader," *Richmond News Leader* (VA), November 13, 1980, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 3, Boineau, Dotsy Diane Lloyd, UDC, MPs, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; Ann Holiday, "UDC's Outgoing President General Proud of Growth," *Richmond News Leader*, November 9, 1982, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Unprocessed Additions Box, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; Dotsy Boineau, "Dotsy Lloyd Boineau Volunteer Activities," 1998, 2, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 13, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

39. Courson, McConnell, and Wilson to Campbell, April 12, 1993, 2.

40. South Carolina Budget and Control Board, Minutes of State Budget and Control Board Meeting, Executive Session, March 25, 1986, 22;"Deaths and Funerals," *State*,

South Carolina Division President's letter indicate that the South Carolina UDC had already selected Watson's predecessor without input from the BCB, and that the organization expected the BCB to rubber stamp its choice for SCCRRM directorship.

The South Carolina UDC's actions in this matter were not without precedent. By 1986, the SCCRRM had been led by several different directors including Elizabeth Brown, Caroline Girardeau, Luvie Land, and LaVerne Watson. All the museum's former directors were female, Wade Hampton Chapter members, and had been appointed by the UDC.<sup>41</sup> The South Carolina UDC's legal claim to authority in selection of the SCCRRM's director apparently stemmed from a temporary proviso in the 1924 appropriations act, which allowed the Wade Hampton Chapter to recommend an assistant custodian for the SCCRRM to the South Carolina governor. In describing his call with LaVerne Watson to the other members of the BCB, Putnam brought their attention to the temporary proviso, and the BCB subsequently agreed to add Renee Watts to their list of potential candidates.<sup>42</sup>

Despite agreeing to consider Watts as a director candidate, in April 1986, the BCB named Martin acting director of the SCCRRM, and in 1987 the BCB officially

---

October 29, 1990, 7, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, "Annual Report Confederate Relic Room 1976-1977," 1977, 3, South Carolina State Documents Depository, South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC, <http://hdl.handle.net/10827/17689>.

41. Girardeau and Thornley, *South Carolina Confederate Relic Room*, 4; "Mrs. Girardeau, Confederate Room Custodian, Dies," *State*, August 13, 1956, 1-2, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; DaFoe, "Shifting Authority," 10; "Mrs. LaVerne Watson, 74, Retired Director of Museum," *Columbia Record* (SC), March 8, 1988, 6, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

42. South Carolina Budget and Control Board, Minutes of State Budget and Control Board Meeting, Executive Session, March 25, 1986, 22.



elevated Martin to the SCCRRM's director position.<sup>43</sup> The BCB's accessible records provide little insight into why the state agency chose Martin over Boineau or Watts. However, considering Martin's familial connections to a sitting South Carolina senator, it is likely that the BCB's decision to select Martin as the SCCRRM's next director reflects his father's prominent status in the South Carolina legislature. This likelihood is reinforced by the fact that, during his time in the Senate, Martin had close contact with at least one of the BCB's legislative members, Rembert Dennis. Regardless of why he was appointed as the museum's next director, Martin's assumption of the SCCRRM directorship marked a watershed moment in the museum's history, as it was the first time that a male and a non-UDC member led the museum.<sup>44</sup> In 1986, an article on the SCCRRM, published in the *United Daughters of the Confederacy Magazine*, credited the museum's success to the Wade Hampton Chapter's ability to appoint UDC members to the director position.<sup>45</sup> That same year, the South Carolina Daughters lost their ability to do just that.

#### 1986 MUSEUM ACCESSION BOOKS CONTROVERSY

Martin's appointment as acting director in April 1986 likely also sparked another significant development in the museum's history. On June 30, 1986, LaVerne Watson

---

43. DaFoe, "Shifting Authority," 34-35; William A. McInnis to Dotsy L. Boineau, April 8, 1986, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 3, UDC, MSS, Jan-April 1986, South Caroliniana Library, Columbia, SC; "People on the Move," *State*, March 8, 1987, 15, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

44. Martin, interview, 11; DaFoe, "Shifting Authority," 35.

45. "The South Carolina Confederate Relic Room & Museum," *United Daughters of the Confederacy Magazine*, June 1986, 19, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 7, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

retired as the SCCRRM director.<sup>46</sup> Sometime between Martin's appointment as acting director and her retirement, Watson took from the museum all of the SCCRRM's early accession books, which listed the artifacts donated from 1895 until 1952. While Watson originally insisted that she removed the books to create a copy of the records for the Wade Hampton Chapter, she later wrote to Martin, who had assumed the museum's acting director title by this point, that it was not necessary for the SCCRRM to have the original accession books and that these records "are now, as they always have been" the Wade Hampton Chapter's property.<sup>47</sup> She further stipulated that the accession books were only kept at the museum while she was the SCCRRM director because she was the Wade Hampton Chapter's "official representative."<sup>48</sup> In contrast to Watson's stance, Elizabeth Hunter, the South Carolina UDC president, expressed her support for the museum as a repository for the accession books. She reassured Martin that the books were "an integral part of the museum collection and should remain at all times with the collection."<sup>49</sup> For his part, Martin fought for the accession books' return on the grounds that they provided vital documentation for the museum's collection, and that the museum would not receive

---

46. South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, "South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum Annual Report 1985-1986," 1986, 3, South Carolina State Documents Depository, South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC, <http://hdl.handle.net/10827/17698>.

47. John A. Martin, Jr. to LaVerne Watson, August 1, 1986, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; LaVerne Watson to John A. Martin, Jr., August 13, 1986, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

48. Watson to Martin, August 13, 1986.

49. Elizabeth S. Hunter to John A. Martin, Jr., September 3, 1986, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

reaccreditation from the American Association (Alliance) of Museums (AAM) if the institution did not retain its original records.<sup>50</sup>

At the heart of this controversy was a conflict over the accession books' status. Were they public records belonging to the SCCRRM, or were they the property of the Wade Hampton Chapter? Watson believed that the accession books belonged to the chapter, since they recorded artifacts donated to the Wade Hampton Chapter for display in the museum. From Watson's perspective, Martin was not a member of the Wade Hampton Chapter, and so the accession books, which were chapter property, could not remain in his care at the museum.<sup>51</sup> In contrast, J. Emory Smith, Jr., the lawyer assigned to help mediate the dispute, advanced the argument that the accession books could be considered public records due to their long tenure in the SCCRRM, even though the books were originally owned by the UDC. Following this logic, Smith proposed giving the original accession books back to the SCCRRM while providing the Wade Hampton Chapter with a certified copy of the records.<sup>52</sup> The accession books, however, were not returned to the museum. Instead, as a compromise measure, the original accession books ended up in the State Treasurer's Office, with the SCCRRM receiving a copy of the records. It is unclear whether the museum gave the Wade Hampton Chapter its own copy

---

50. John Richard Craft to John A. Martin, Jr., September 18, 1986, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; Jane McCue Johnson to LaVerne Watson, August 29, 1986, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; John Martin, Jr., "Brief History."

51. Watson to Martin, August 13, 1986.

52. J. Emory Smith, Jr. to Myrtis Carson, September 23, 1986, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

of the accession books, or whether the state provided the South Carolina Daughters with access to the original records stored under lock and key at the Treasurer's Office.<sup>53</sup>

While the accession books controversy was resolved, Watson's actions indicate existing tension between the SCCRRM staff and the South Carolina UDC, particularly the Wade Hampton Chapter, over who owned the museum's records.<sup>54</sup> This question of authority over the museum's early accession books parallels a larger question about the extent to which the South Carolina UDC could lay claim to the museum's collection itself, which is a question that will be explored more thoroughly in a later section of this thesis. Furthermore, one could argue that the accession books controversy's outcome marked a loss of authority for the Wade Hampton Chapter, and by extension the South Carolina UDC, over the museum, as the Wade Hampton Chapter ceded its claim to the accession books by allowing the records to be removed from its chapter files and placed in the Treasurer's Office.<sup>55</sup>

#### DOTSY BOINEAU: AN INSTRUMENT OF UDC INFLUENCE, 1986-1996

Kristie DaFoe has argued that the South Carolina UDC's failure to select one of its own as the SCCRRM director in 1986 signifies its "loss of direct authority" over the museum itself.<sup>56</sup> In 1986, moreover, the Wade Hampton Chapter, led by LaVerne

---

53. This retelling of the accession books controversy is based on information provided by Allen Roberson. He remembered that after becoming the SCCRRM's director, the State Treasurer's Office asked him if the museum would like to have its records back, leading him to realize that the SCCRRM only had a copy of the original accession books. W. Allen Roberson, interview by Caitlin Cutrona, February 4, 2021.

54. Smith to Carson, September 23, 1986.

55. Watson to Martin, August 13, 1986; Smith to Carson, September 23, 1986; Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

56. DaFoe, "Shifting Authority," 2, 35-36.

Watson, surrendered its chapter's exclusive ownership claims to the museum's early accession books.<sup>57</sup> Regardless of these clear setbacks to the UDC's authority over the museum, the South Carolina UDC continued to negotiate influence for its organization at the SCCRRM as an important stakeholder after 1986. As both a UDC member and a SCCRRM staff member, Dotsy Boineau acted as an instrument of UDC influence at the museum during John Martin's tenure as SCCRRM director (1986-1996).

Despite her failure to secure the director position in 1986, Boineau continued to work at the SCCRRM for another fourteen years. Before her retirement from the SCCRRM on June 6, 2000, Boineau served as both the museum's curator of history and archivist.<sup>58</sup> Boineau operated as the museum's curator of history from 1985 to around 1998.<sup>59</sup> As curator of history, she conducted museum tours, maintained the SCCRRM's research library, answered research requests, acquired gifts for the museum collection, maintained the Upper Gallery, and worked with the rest of the curatorial staff to preserve and display the museum's collection.<sup>60</sup>

---

57. Watson to Martin, August 13, 1986; Smith to Carson, September 23, 1986; Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

58. Boineau, "South Carolina Relic Room and Museum," Minutes of the One Hundred and Fourth Annual Convention, 2000, 84; Dotsy L. Boineau, "S.C. Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum-1991," Minutes of the Ninety-Fifth Annual Convention, United Daughters of the Confederacy, South Carolina Division, 1991, 60, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 7, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

59. Dotsy Lloyd Boineau, Resume, 1998, 2, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 13, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021. Prior to her role as Curator of History, the SCCRRM employed Boineau as an Associate Curator. Boineau, Resume, 2.

60. Courson, McConnell, and Wilson to Campbell, April 12, 1993, 1; Boineau, Resume, 2; Bonnie G. Moffat to Dotsy Boineau, memorandum, 1995, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Unprocessed Additions Box, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

As a museum staff member, Boineau often performed UDC responsibilities while working as a SCCRRM employee. For example, in 1992, Boineau sent a letter to Paul Greenberg in reference to a column that he wrote to commemorate Robert E. Lee's birthday. Boineau signed the letter as a former President General of the UDC, but she wrote the correspondence on stationery stamped with the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum's letterhead.<sup>61</sup> Likewise, in 1994, Boineau sent a letter to the Dick Anderson Chapter of the South Carolina UDC continuing a conversation she had held with members of the chapter about placing their organization's papers in a public facility. Though the letter's content involved UDC concerns and revolved around a discussion that Boineau had with UDC members at a UDC function, the missive itself was written on paper printed with the SCCRRM's letterhead, and Boineau ended her correspondence by telling the Dick Anderson Chapter members to visit the museum anytime.<sup>62</sup> Beyond Boineau's correspondence, her SCCRRM responsibilities involved maintaining the South Carolina UDC records stored at the museum. In many of her reports for the South Carolina UDC, Boineau carefully notes that "all application papers have been filed in the UDC cabinets and research for prospective members furnished upon request."<sup>63</sup>

In completing UDC work as a part of her SCCRRM responsibilities, Boineau demonstrated her belief that the South Carolina UDC and the museum were intertwined,

---

61. Dotsy Boineau to Paul Greenberg, January 27, 1992, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 19, Correspondence 1990-1992 folder, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

62. Dotsy Boineau to Retta Sanders, February 25, 1994, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 18, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

63. Boineau, "S.C. Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum Report-1991," Minutes of the Ninety-Fifth Annual Convention, 1991, 60.

meaning that responsibilities fulfilled for one organization also counted as responsibilities filled for the other. In fact, upon describing Boineau's role at the SCCRRM, Allen Roberson, the museum's current director, affirmed that Boineau saw herself less as a SCCRRM staff member and more as a UDC member working at the museum.<sup>64</sup> By acting as a UDC member employed by the SCCRRM, Boineau served as an instrument of UDC influence over the museum by advancing the South Carolina UDC's perspective that the SCCRRM was a part of the South Carolina UDC organization. This perspective was articulated multiple times by Mary Lund, president of the South Carolina Division. In reference to the South Carolina government restructuring process in 1993, Lund thanked the South Carolina Daughters for their work in sending letters to their legislators about "our Confederate Relic Room." She later informed the Daughters that their work helped to ensure the safety of "our Relic Room."<sup>65</sup> Both times Lund referred to the SCCRRM as *our* Confederate Relic Room, not *the* Confederate Relic Room. Echoing Lund's comments, every time that Boineau addressed a UDC concern as a SCCRRM staff member or provided information for a South Carolina UDC membership application, she blurred the boundaries between the South Carolina UDC and the SCCRRM. In doing so, she advanced the view that the SCCRRM and the South Carolina UDC were synonymous. After 1986, the South Carolina UDC no longer had a UDC

---

64. Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

65. Mary Lund, "From Your Division President," *United Daughters of the Confederacy South Carolina Division Newsletter*, June 15, 1993, 1, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.; Mary Lund, "From Your Division President," *United Daughters of the Confederacy South Carolina Division Newsletter*, August 1993, 1, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

member as the museum's director. However, the organization had a UDC member employed by the SCCRRM who buttressed its sway at the museum by strengthening the organization's ties to the museum itself.

Boineau's efforts to maintain the South Carolina UDC records at the museum not only signify her willingness to carry out UDC work as a SCCRRM staff member, but the records themselves stand as a symbol of continued UDC authority at the museum. In his brief overview of the museum's history, John Martin noted that the SCCRRM maintained the South Carolina UDC papers upon a "mutual agreement" between the two organizations that was "beneficial to both." The South Carolina UDC's ability to maintain its mutual agreement with the museum to store its records after 1986 reflects the organization's persistent influence at the museum. After all, the SCCRRM was willing to house another organization's records, despite the museum's own storage problems.<sup>66</sup> Moreover, as a part of maintaining the UDC records at the SCCRRM, Boineau provided the research and help needed for prospective South Carolina UDC and Children of the Confederacy members to complete their membership applications. In this way, Boineau's SCCRRM responsibilities helped to advance the South Carolina UDC's organizational growth, demonstrating the UDC's ability to use its pull at the museum to advance its own interests.<sup>67</sup>

---

66. Martin, "Brief History"; Alexander, "Confederate Relic Room and Museum," 6.

67. Dotsy Boineau, "South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum," Minutes of the Ninety-Second Annual Convention, United Daughters of the Confederacy, South Carolina Division, 1988, 66, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 8, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; Dotsy Boineau, "S.C. Confederate Relic Room and Museum," Minutes of the Centennial Convention, United Daughters of the Confederacy, South Carolina Division, 1996, 100, Dotsy Diane Lloyd



In addition to acting as an instrument of UDC clout at the museum through her amalgamation of SCCRRM and UDC work, Boineau also served as a liaison between the museum and the South Carolina UDC by writing a yearly museum report for the organization from 1987 to 1996. Through these reports, Boineau made sure that the South Carolina Daughters were up to date on museum donations and museum activities, and she reinforced the Daughters' special relationship with the SCCRRM. As representative examples, in her 1987 report, Boineau asserted that "We are always happy to have members of the UDC visit us—after all, if it weren't for the Daughters of South Carolina, we wouldn't be here for you and the public to enjoy!"<sup>68</sup> In her 1996 report, Boineau informed the Daughters that the War Memorial Building renovations were almost complete, and that the museum now had a new heating and cooling system due to the renovations.<sup>69</sup>

By keeping the South Carolina Daughters current on important museum news, from donations to renovations, Boineau articulated the perspective that members of the South Carolina UDC should be privy to museum developments because their organization held a prominent position in the SCCRRM. Likewise, by extending an open invitation to the Daughters to visit the museum because the SCCRRM would not exist without the Daughters' support, Boineau staked a claim for UDC influence over the

---

Boineau Papers, Box 7, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

68. Dotsy Boineau, "South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum," Minutes of the Ninety-First Annual Convention, United Daughters of the Confederacy, South Carolina Division, 1987, 65, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 8, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

69. Boineau, "S.C. Confederate Relic Room and Museum," Minutes of the Centennial Convention, 1996, 100.

SCCRRM due to the Daughters' position as founders and supporters of the museum. While Boineau was a UDC member, she signed her 1987 and 1996 reports to the South Carolina Daughters as the SCCRRM's curator of history.<sup>70</sup> As such, Boineau wrote the reports not as a UDC member, but as a SCCRRM ambassador to the UDC, imbuing her statements with legitimacy as an official museum representative to the UDC. In the years immediately after the South Carolina UDC lost its direct authority over the museum, Boineau, as a museum employee, signaled to the South Carolina Daughters that they still held an important position at the SCCRRM, and she made claims about why the South Carolina UDC should have pull at the museum.

In 1993, Senators John Courson, Glenn McConnell, and Joe Wilson wrote a letter to South Carolina Governor Carroll Campbell requesting the Order of the Palmetto, the state's highest civilian honor, for Dotsy Boineau. Part of their reasoning for why Boineau deserved this acclamation was her "life history of dedication and sacrifice" to the SCCRRM. In describing Dotsy Boineau's role as the SCCRRM's curator of history, Courson, McConnell, and Wilson explained that her "primary responsibility is to disseminate information and to educate visitors about South Carolina's cultural and military history from 1562 until today with emphasis on the Confederate Period."<sup>71</sup> Though the senators described Dotsy Boineau as educating SCCRRM visitors on hundreds of years of South Carolina history, Boineau's work at the SCCRRM

---

70. Boineau, "South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum," Minutes of the Ninety-First Annual Convention, 1987, 65; Boineau, "S.C. Confederate Relic Room and Museum," Minutes of the Centennial Convention, 1996, 100.

71. Courson, McConnell, and Wilson to Campbell, April 12, 1993, 1; John Hassell, "Carolina Day Honors Battle at Moultrie," *News and Courier* (Charleston, SC), June 25, 1989, 17, NewsLibrary.com.

demonstrates that she actively promoted the UDC-accepted version of Civil War history, also known as the Lost Cause narrative, through her museum position. In doing so, Boineau reinforced the UDC's influence over the museum as she worked to advance the organization's ideology through her museum work.

Boineau, who once told journalist Tony Horwitz that South Carolina still wasn't certain that it wanted to be "a part of the Union," was not shy in expressing her perspective on the Civil War.<sup>72</sup> In her capacity as President General of the UDC in 1982, Boineau encouraged other UDC members to send letters to the CBS Network detailing their disappointment in *The Blue and the Gray* television series, which, according to Boineau, gave a "fictional account of our history represented as fact." Boineau was concerned that the series depicted the South as a cruel slave society and indicated that the Civil War was fought over slavery.<sup>73</sup> Boineau expressed her Civil War beliefs more creatively in *They Dared to Secede*, a one-act play that she wrote. This play emphasizes Northern aggression against the South, portrays the South as defending the Constitution, and argues for secession's legality.<sup>74</sup> Boineau's Civil War beliefs reflect the UDC's embrace of Lost Cause ideology. This Civil War narrative argued that Confederate soldiers were not traitors, the war was not fought over slavery, Northerners and abolitionists were the aggressors, and the South lost the war due to a lack of manpower

---

72. Tony Horwitz, *Confederates in the Attic: Dispatches from the Unfinished Civil War* (New York: Vintage Books, 1999), chap. 4, 76-77, Kindle.

73. Dotsy Boineau and Mrs. John G. Williams to United Daughters of the Confederacy, November 8, 1982, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 3, UDC, MSS, Oct-Dec 1982, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

74. Dotsy Boineau, *They Dared to Secede*, Play, n.d., 4-5, 7, 10-12, 14, 18-19, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 3, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC. 8136

and resources.<sup>75</sup> This ideology also sought to memorialize Confederate soldiers, preserve Confederate values, promote pro-Confederate history, and redeem Confederate men by portraying them as constitutional heroes through their active defense of states' rights.<sup>76</sup>

The South Carolina UDC has a long history of promoting the Lost Cause at the museum. In her work on the SCCRRM, Rachel Overton argues that upon being founded in 1896 the SCCRRM became “the most significant activity undertaken” by the South Carolina Daughters to “perpetuate the Lost Cause.”<sup>77</sup> Boineau carried this tradition forward through her work at the SCCRRM. Roberson noted that the Lost Cause perspective on the Civil War was the interpretation that Boineau wanted to be presented through the museum.<sup>78</sup> Boineau’s promotion of the Lost Cause ideology through her museum position is evident in a response that she gave to a research request by James W. Roberson, Jr. In her reply, Boineau enclosed a portion of a UDC catechism to answer his “question as to the real cause of the War Between the States.”<sup>79</sup> Though Boineau does not indicate which UDC catechism she sent Roberson, the catechisms collectively articulate the Lost Cause narrative.<sup>80</sup> As an example, the *U.D.C. Catechism of South Carolina Confederate History*, revised by the History Committee of the South Carolina Division in

---

75. Amy L. Heyse, “Reconstituting the Next Generation: An Analysis of the United Daughters of the Confederacy’s Catechisms for Children,” *Southern Communication Journal* 76, no. 1 (January-March 2011): 60, doi:10.1080/10417940902825689.

76. Karen Cox, *Dixie’s Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture*, New Perspectives on the History of the South (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2003), 1-27, 163.

77. Overton, “Girls of the Sixties,” 9.

78. Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

79. Dotsy Boineau to James W. Roberson, Jr., June 14, 1995, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

80. Heyse, “Reconstituting the Next Generation,” 60-62.

1923, asserts that South Carolina and the other Confederate states had the right to secede, contends that Northern states abused Southern states before the Civil War, stipulates that the North and President Lincoln started the Civil War, argues that the Civil War was not fought over slavery, and depicts Reconstruction as an injustice to the South.<sup>81</sup> Boineau sent Robinson a portion of the UDC catechism as the SCCRRM's curator of history, and she wrote her response using the museum's letterhead.<sup>82</sup> Therefore, in her official museum capacity, Boineau actively promoted the UDC's version of Civil War history.

Another notable example of Boineau advancing the Lost Cause narrative through her museum position is her work editing the *Recollections and Reminiscences* series. The *Recollections and Reminiscences* series originated in 1896 when the South Carolina Daughters began acquiring and compiling information about Confederate history, including oral histories, newspaper articles, and letters from veterans. This information remained stored and unused in seventy "Blue Books" in the SCCRRM until 1988, when the South Carolina UDC formed the Preservation of the Relic Room Records Committee to transform the "Blue Books" into publishable material. Dotsy Boineau was a founding member of this committee, and she served as the series editor.<sup>83</sup> South Carolina UDC

---

81. The Historical Committee of the South Carolina Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, *U.D.C. Catechism of South Carolina Confederate History*, Rev. and enl. (Clemson College, SC: Chambers Printing Co., 1923); Amy Lynn Heyse, "The Rhetoric of Memory-Making: Lessons from the UDC's Catechisms for Children," *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 38, no. 4 (Fall 2008): 408-432, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40232600>.

82. Boineau to Robinson, June 14, 1995.

83. Frances Jeffcoat, "Recollections and Reminiscences, 1861-1865 through World War I," *United Daughters of the Confederacy Magazine*, June 1990, 20, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 7, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC. The reminiscences and records that the South Carolina Daughters collected were referred to as "Blue Books," because the compiled material was stored in blue loose-leaf binders. Jeffcoat, "Recollections and Reminiscences," 20.

President Donna Harris recognized Boineau's significant contributions to the *Recollections and Reminiscences* series when she proclaimed that "without Dotsy's guidance this project would not be completed," and she thanked Boineau for the "tedious hours of assembling, editing and proofing" that she did for the project.<sup>84</sup> While the South Carolina UDC created the Preservation of the Relic Room Records Committee, Boineau completed her editing work as a part of her museum responsibilities.<sup>85</sup> In fact, Boineau's resume placed her editing work under her SCCRRM duties, not her South Carolina UDC category.<sup>86</sup> By 1998, Boineau's SCCRRM job description listed editing the *Recollections and Reminiscences* series as a part of her official museum responsibilities.<sup>87</sup> Though it was the South Carolina UDC president thanking Boineau for her role in editing the volumes, it was the SCCRRM who provided Boineau with a position and a salary to complete the work.

The *Recollections and Reminiscences* series was clearly an attempt by the South Carolina Daughters to propagate their version of Civil War history. Boineau expressed the organization's motivation for compiling and publishing the *Recollections and Reminiscences* series when she wrote in the introduction to volume twelve that "South Carolina will always be proud of its men, women, and children who endured the horrors

---

84. Donna Peterson Harris, acknowledgement section of volume 12 of *Recollections and Reminiscences, 1861-1865 through World War I*, by South Carolina Division United Daughters of the Confederacy (South Carolina: South Carolina Division, UDC, 2002).

85. Dotsy L. Boineau, "May, 1998 Report," Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 19, Monthly Reports folder, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

86. Boineau, Resume, 2.

87. W. Allen Roberson, "State of South Carolina Position Description," September 22, 1998, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Unprocessed Additions Box, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

of the war for a cause they believed in—that of a state’s right to determine its own fate.”<sup>88</sup> The information given in this multi-volume work also points to the South Carolina UDC’s purpose in publishing the series. Volume ten of the series is a good case in point. In addition to biographies on the Confederacy’s political and military leaders, the volume contains articles on the humanity of slave owners, the devotion of the “Old Black Mammy,” the rise of South Carolina’s Red Shirts to combat “radical rule,” and Carpet Baggers and Scalawags.<sup>89</sup> While the volume provides insight into Civil War perspectives in South Carolina at the time, the recollections are presented uncritically, lending them the air of undisputed fact and reinforcing the UDC-approved interpretation of Civil War history. As Boineau herself writes in the introduction to volume ten, “Despite attempts from various groups and individuals to rewrite the history of our Southland, particularly the War Between the States period, the truth will prevail as long as we are able to present the firsthand recollections and reminiscences of those who lived during this critical period.”<sup>90</sup> The *Recollections and Reminiscences* series was designed to do just that—present the “truth” about the Civil War through firsthand accounts of the time period.

Boineau described the *Recollections and Reminiscences* series as the “most significant contribution to . . . the truth about the men and women of the Confederacy for

---

88. Dotsy L. Boineau, introduction to volume 12 of *Recollections and Reminiscences 1861-1865 through World War I*, by South Carolina Division United Daughters of the Confederacy (South Carolina: South Carolina Division, UDC, 2002).

89. South Carolina Division United Daughters of the Confederacy, *Recollections and Reminiscences 1861-1865 through World War I* (South Carolina: South Carolina UDC, 2000), 10:318-320, 412-416, 435-436.

90. Dotsy L. Boineau, introduction to volume 10 of the *Recollections and Reminiscences 1861-1865 through World War I*, by South Carolina Division United Daughters of the Confederacy (South Carolina: South Carolina Division, UDC, 2000).

many generations to come.”<sup>91</sup> Consequently, Boineau’s editing of the *Recollections and Reminiscences* volumes highlights her role as an instrument of UDC influence at the museum. Though the South Carolina UDC no longer had control of the SCCRRM director position, its views on the Civil War were still communicated at the museum through Boineau’s museum responsibilities, highlighting the fact that neither the UDC nor its ideology completely separated from the SCCRRM after 1986.

Moreover, the fact that Boineau edited the *Recollections and Reminiscences* series as a part of her museum responsibilities also underscores the UDC’s continued influence at the museum, as the SCCRRM supported, at least indirectly, the spread of UDC ideology through work accomplished by one of its museum staff. Beyond the SCCRRM’s indirect support for the *Recollections and Reminiscences* project, the museum also directly aided the South Carolina UDC’s efforts to distribute the series. The SCCRRM added the books to its library collection, and it invited the UDC’s *Recollections and Reminiscences* committee to display its volumes at a museum event designed to highlight South Carolina authors and publishers.<sup>92</sup> The SCCRRM’s direct and indirect support for the *Recollections and Reminiscences* series represents another blurring of the boundaries between the South Carolina UDC and the museum, which reinforced the South Carolina UDC’s perspective that the museum was a part of its organization and strengthened the UDC’s position at the museum as an important stakeholder.

---

91. Boineau, “S.C. Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum-1991,” *Minutes of the Ninety-Fifth Annual Convention*, 1991, 60.

92. Boineau, “S.C. Confederate Relic Room and Museum,” *Minutes of the Centennial Convention*, 1996, 100.



The UDC's authority over the SCCRRM reached a low point in 1986. During that year, the organization lost its ability to appoint the museum director, and the Wade Hampton Chapter relinquished its exclusive claim to the museum's early accession records. Yet, 1986 also marks the start of the South Carolina UDC's efforts to negotiate influence for its organization over the SCCRRM as a primary stakeholder. Through Dotsy Boineau, the South Carolina UDC advanced the perspective that the SCCRRM was synonymous with the South Carolina UDC; it promoted the view that the South Carolina UDC was a significant institutional stakeholder; and it propagated its Lost Cause ideology. In combining her UDC and SCCRRM work, in writing yearly museum reports for the South Carolina UDC, and in editing the *Recollections and Reminiscences* series as one of her museum responsibilities, Dotsy Boineau ensured that the South Carolina UDC would still have influence at the museum, despite no longer having a UDC member as the museum's director.

The relationship between the SCCRRM and the South Carolina UDC from 1986 to 1996 also presents a compelling example of how a museum stakeholder can use its position at a museum to benefit its own organization. In the case of the South Carolina UDC, the organization's position as an important institutional stakeholder provided both a safe space to store its records and a museum staff member (Dotsy Boineau) to maintain and conduct research related to those records, which promoted organizational growth. Likewise, the South Carolina UDC was able to advance its Lost Cause ideology with the museum's support through projects like the *Recollections and Reminiscences* series. While much of the existing museum literature focuses on how a museum can improve its relationship with its stakeholders to the museum's advantage, the South Carolina UDC-

SCCRRM relationship demonstrates how a stakeholder can leverage its influence at a museum to advance its own organizational goals.

In the end, the South Carolina Daughters' continued contributions to the SCCRRM reflect the South Carolina UDC's satisfaction with the organization's ability to use Dotsy Boineau's position as a SCCRRM employee to reinforce and advance the South Carolina UDC's presence at the museum. In 1991, the Stephen D. Lee Chapter from Clinton, South Carolina loaned the SCCRRM the Martin Guards' flag. Also in 1991, the Michael S. Talbert Chapter of Columbia gave money to the museum to be used to commemorate the chapter and the chapter's founder, Benzie T. Rice. In 1995, the Drayton Rutherford Chapter loaned five Confederate flags to the SCCRRM.<sup>93</sup> The South Carolina UDC's ongoing contributions to the SCCRRM demonstrate how the organization rose from the ashes of 1986 to claim continued UDC influence over the museum through Dotsy Boineau during John Martin's tenure as director. In 1993, the South Carolina UDC faced another crisis related to the SCCRRM that threatened to once again jeopardize the organization's sway at the museum and its position as a primary museum stakeholder.

#### THE SCCRRM AND THE GOVERNMENT RESTRUCTURING CRISIS OF 1993

In 1986, the SCCRRM endured conflict from an organization closely affiliated with the museum. In 1993, it faced a threat to the museum's existence from more external

---

93. Boineau, "S.C. Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum-1991," Minutes of the Ninety-Fifth Annual Convention, 1991, 59; Esther Cope, "Officers' Reports 1995," Minutes of the Ninety-Ninth Annual Convention, United Daughters of the Confederacy, South Carolina Division, 1995, 43, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 8, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

forces. Specifically, in 1993, state government restructuring efforts endangered the SCCRRM's independence by threatening to subsume the museum into the State Museum. While the South Carolina UDC no longer had direct authority over the SCCRRM through its ability to appoint a museum director, the organization used its legislative pull to thwart any merger between the SCCRRM and the State Museum, thereby demonstrating its efforts to protect its influence and stakeholder position at the SCCRRM. Before diving into the details of the government restructuring crisis, it is important to recognize that 1993 was not the first time that the South Carolina Daughters acted to stop a possible merger between the SCCRRM and the State Museum. In 1982, the Daughters worked to impede any potential plans to place the SCCRRM under the South Carolina Museum Commission, also known as the State Museum Commission, which was the governing authority for the yet-to-be-opened State Museum.<sup>94</sup>

In 1982, Governor Riley's veto of legislation related to the SCCRRM catalyzed the Daughters' efforts to oppose any merger between the museum and the State Museum. In June 1982, the General Assembly passed an appropriations bill with a section that amended the South Carolina Code of Laws by creating the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum Commission.<sup>95</sup> The proposed South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum Commission would have been composed of six members. Two of the members were to be from the Senate Finance Committee, two of the members were to be

---

94. John M. Bryan, *The South Carolina State Museum: A History and Highlights from the Collection* (Columbia, SC: South Carolina Museum Foundation, 2000), 6.

95. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina*, 104th General Assembly, 2nd sess., June 3, 1982: 1:3914, 3933, LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), *Journal of the House of Representatives*.

appointed from the House Ways and Means Committee, and two were to be selected by the governor. One of the governor's appointees had to be approved by the Wade Hampton Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. The commission's main responsibilities were to select a museum director, establish museum regulations, provide an annual museum report to the General Assembly, oversee the distribution of museum funds, and accept gifts on the SCCRRM's behalf.<sup>96</sup> Supporters of this permanent-law addition to the appropriations bill stated that it was intended to protect the museum's staff from dismissal. It is not clear why members of the General Assembly were interested in guarding the SCCRRM's employees from being fired. It is, however, possible that they passed legislation creating the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum Commission as a preemptive measure to prevent any merger between the SCCRRM and the State Museum, which might have led to staffing changes.<sup>97</sup> Despite legislators' backing, Governor Riley vetoed this section of the appropriations bill on the grounds that a Confederate Relic Room and Museum Commission would duplicate the State Museum Commission's functions and expand the SCCRRM's mission beyond the Confederate period, leading it into competition with other agencies like the State Museum. House members sustained Riley's veto by a vote of seventy-one to twenty-eight.<sup>98</sup>

---

96. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the Senate of the State of South Carolina*, 104th General Assembly, 2nd sess., June 3, 1982, 2:2727-2728, LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), Journal of the Senate of South Carolina.

97. Clark Surratt, "Riley Won't Back Down on Pay Raises," *State*, June 16, 1982, 6, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

98. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina*, 104th General Assembly, 2nd sess., June 16, 1982, 1:4078-4079, LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), Journal of the House of Representatives.

The South Carolina Daughters supported the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum Commission's establishment because they believed that such a commission would preserve the museum's independence. Consequently, in response to Governor Riley's veto, Hattie Belle Lester, president of the South Carolina UDC, wrote a letter to the South Carolina Daughters warning them that she believed "that Governor Riley and others are in favor of placing the Confederate Relic Room & Museum under the authority of the State Museum Commission." Her letter also contained a copy of the resolution that the South Carolina Daughters unanimously passed at their October 1982 division convention in Greenville. This resolution proclaimed the South Carolina UDC's opposition to any suggestion that the SCCRRM be placed under the State Museum Commission.<sup>99</sup> At the same convention, the Daughters also formed a Museum Committee to address the issue. Following the convention, the Daughters wrote letters to their representatives and senators in order to solicit their support for keeping the SCCRRM independent from the State Museum.<sup>100</sup> From writing letters to crafting a resolution, the

---

99. Hattie Belle Lester to the United Daughters of the Confederacy South Carolina Division, October 15, 1982, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC. While Dotsy Boineau told the UDC members at the division convention that the South Carolina legislature was tasked with placing the SCCRRM under the State Museum Commission, no records indicate that actual legislation was introduced to do so. Mrs. T.P. Crooks, "Minutes of the Business Session, October 9, 1982," Minutes of the Eighty-Sixth Annual Convention, United Daughters of the Confederacy, South Carolina Division, 1982, 27, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 8, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

100. Hattie Belle Lester, "Museum Committee Report," Minutes of the Eighty-Seventh Annual Convention, United Daughters of the Confederacy, South Carolina Division, 1983, 82, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 8, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; Jessie B. Patterson to C. Alex Harvin, III, 1982, C. Alex Harvin, III Papers, Box 3, Confederate Flag, South Carolina Political Collections, Ernest F. Hollings Special Collections Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

South Carolina Daughters actively worked to ensure that the SCCRRM retained its status as an independent agency.

In 1982, the Daughters expressed several reasons for why the SCCRRM should not be placed under the State Museum Commission. One of their primary concerns was the museums' different collections policies. The SCCRRM accepted gifts with the promise that the museum would indefinitely retain the donations as a part of its collection. In contrast, the State Museum Commission had the ability to "buy, swap, or sell any artifact within its jurisdiction," meaning that the State Museum Commission could theoretically "buy, swap, or sell" any SCCRRM artifact if the museum was placed under the commission's authority. Consequently, the Daughters argued that if the State Museum Commission was given control over the SCCRRM, then the SCCRRM would be forced to return thousands of dollars' worth of donations to their donors, since the museum could no longer keep its original promise.<sup>101</sup>

More importantly, the Daughters opposed placing the SCCRRM under the State Museum Commission because they believed that the museum losing its independence would jeopardize the Daughters' legacy at the SCCRRM and threaten the South Carolina UDC's ability to protect its relics and records stored at the museum.<sup>102</sup> Hattie Belle Lester expressed this sentiment when she explained in a letter to the South Carolina UDC, "The Daughters have labored for 87 years to collect and preserve the historical articles in the Confederate Relic Room & Museum. . . . If we do not take immediate

---

101. "South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum," [ca. 1982], Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

102. "South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum," [ca. 1982].

action, our work over the past 87 years may be lost.”<sup>103</sup> For the South Carolina UDC, protecting the SCCRRM’s collection and the UDC’s authority over the museum meant opposing any attempts to place the SCCRRM under the State Museum Commission. Though the South Carolina legislature did not grant the SCCRRM its own commission in 1982, Dotsy Boineau reported to the South Carolina Daughters in 1983 that most of the legislators they had contacted were in favor of maintaining the museum’s independent status, and the SCCRRM ultimately did not become a part of the State Museum Commission.<sup>104</sup>

As in 1982, the South Carolina Daughters acted again in 1993 to defend the SCCRRM’s independence. Fueled by the political scandal unearthed through Operation Lost Trust, during the 1993 legislative session, the South Carolina General Assembly took up the issue of government restructuring.<sup>105</sup> The goal behind restructuring was to streamline existing government agencies, give the South Carolina governor more direct control over these agencies, and boost government efficiency and accountability.<sup>106</sup> As a state-funded agency, the SCCRRM found itself enmeshed in the legislature’s restructuring efforts. While the Senate passed a restructuring bill that maintained the

---

103. Hattie Belle Lester to the United Daughters of the Confederacy South Carolina Division, October 15, 1982.

104. Dotsy Boineau, “Legislative Committee Report,” Minutes of the Eighty-Seventh Annual Convention, 1983, 76.

105. Operation Lost Trust was a federal investigation that led to the conviction of seventeen South Carolina legislators on various charges, including bribery, extortion, and drug use. Jon B. Pierce, “Operation Lost Trust,” South Carolina Encyclopedia, University of South Carolina, Institute for Southern Studies, last modified October 20, 2016, <https://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/operation-lost-trust/>.

106. Cindi Ross Scoppe, “‘It’s History:’ Campbell Signs Bill to Overhaul Government,” *State*, June 19, 1993, 14, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; Brad Warthen, “The Revolution got Watered Down—but it’s a Start,” *State*, June 20, 1993, 41, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

museum's independence, the House version of the restructuring bill created a State Museum Division, which was a part of the newly organized Department of Parks, Tourism & Cultural Affairs. The Division also had the "authority to run the Confederate Relic Room and Museum."<sup>107</sup> The House proposal called for the SCCRRM to become a division of the State Museum, but the bill did not specify whether this shift meant that the museum would remain unchanged, whether its artifacts would move to the State Museum, or whether the museum would cease to exist entirely. Though the final outcome of the House's proposal to place the SCCRRM under the State Museum was unclear, the plan faced swift criticism from multiple organizations, including the SCCRRM, the State Museum, the South Carolina Sons of Confederate Veterans (SCV), and the South Carolina UDC.<sup>108</sup>

The State Museum and the SCCRRM expressed similar reservations to the idea of placing the SCCRRM under the State Museum. John Martin and Overton Ganong, then director of the State Museum, both argued that the institutions served different purposes.<sup>109</sup> Martin described differences in the two museums' functions as early as 1986 when he noted that the SCCRRM was a small museum that provided visitors with "a good look at South Carolina history" in a short time, most likely an hour or less. In

---

107. "Government Restructuring Plans," *State*, May 26, 1993, 8, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; Ways and Means Committee and the Constitutional Laws Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, South Carolina House of Representatives, "Department of Parks, Tourism & Cultural Affairs Summary," Draft Proposals for State Agency Restructuring and Consolidation, February 22, 1993, 23, Box 2, Minutes and Public Hearings of the Judiciary Committee, 1993-1994, General Assembly, House of Representatives, Judiciary Committee. South Carolina Department of Archives and History.

108. Jeffrey Day, "Confederate Museum still Fighting Union," *State*, May 6, 1993, 18, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

109. Day, "Confederate Museum still Fighting," 12.



comparison to the SCCRRM's position as a small historical museum, the State Museum was a large, multidisciplinary institution that would take days to explore in depth. It was also a museum that offered its visitors a comprehensive picture of the state of South Carolina, from its history to its art to its scientific achievements.<sup>110</sup>

Jeffrey Day, *The State's* lead arts writer at the time, highlighted another difference in the museums' functions in a 1993 article that he wrote for the newspaper on the possible consolidation between the two institutions. Day explained that the State Museum is "largely educational and interprets material, the Relic Room provides display space for items donated by the public."<sup>111</sup> In addition to delineating a difference in mission between the two museums, Day's comments also suggest a variance in how the State Museum and the SCCRRM treated its exhibited objects. Specifically, his comments indicate that at the State Museum artifacts were exhibited for educational purposes, whereas at the SCCRRM relics were displayed for public viewing and remembrance. While the terms artifact and relic are often used interchangeably, the two are not synonymous. According to Joe Long, the current curator of education at the SCCRRM, the term relic reflects "a different frame of mind." Long argues that artifacts are primarily

---

110. Larry Cribb, "A Visit to the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum," *Living in South Carolina*, August 1986, 6-7, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; Alexander, "Confederate Relic Room and Museum," 8; Bryan, *The South Carolina State Museum*, 1; South Carolina Legislature, Senate, Senate Education Oversight Subcommittee, *Senate Education Oversight Subcommittee Summary Report on the South Carolina Museum Commission*, March 2016, 1, <https://www.scstatehouse.gov/CommitteeInfo/SenateEducationCommittee/OversightReports/SCSM%20Final%20Report%20and%20Summary%2032316.pdf>.

111. Day, "Confederate Museum still Fighting," 12.

educational objects whereas relics are designed to provoke emotion and remembrance.<sup>112</sup> From its inception, the State Museum and its artifacts were intended to educate visitors about the state of South Carolina. In fact, a report released by the legislative committee formed to study the feasibility of creating a state museum insisted that “if such a museum collects and displays a few artifacts and does not involve the museum visitor in anything more than a superficial story of the state, then no purpose will be served by such a museum.”<sup>113</sup> From its inception, the SCCRRM, in contrast to the State Museum, was a museum where the story behind an object and the emotions that story evoked were more important than academic interpretation. In other words, it was a relic room.<sup>114</sup>

The SCCRRM’s continued position as a relic room from 1986 to 2000 is illustrated through the museum’s exhibits. Unlike its early days in the South Carolina State House, the SCCRRM’s displays at the War Memorial Building included textual interpretation.<sup>115</sup> However, this interpretation largely explained the objects’ provenances, rather than contextualizing the artifacts within a broader narrative about South Carolina history. As a case in point, the museum’s *Confederate Prisoners of War* exhibit included a piece of jewelry, a metal collar, an autograph book, and a lock of hair. The objects’

---

112. South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum, “History at Home: Dr. B.H. Teague,” June 3, 2020, YouTube video, 12:38-14:11, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Zi5XsrI9W60>.

113. South Carolina Museum Commission, “First Annual Report of the South Carolina Museum Commission,” 1975, 25, South Carolina State Documents Depository, South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC, <http://hdl.handle.net/10827/8393>.

114. Overton, “Girls of the Sixties,” 12-15.

115. Overton, “Girls of the Sixties,” 12-13; Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 110; South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, “Annual Report Confederate Relic Room 1976-1977,” 1977, 5; “SC Confederate Relic Room & Museum, Confederate Prisoners of War Exhibit/1st Floor,” October 27, 1999, Photograph, Box 208, SCCRRMM Photos-WWI Memorial Building Folder 2, File #4029, Internal Archives, South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum, Columbia, SC.

textual descriptions focused on what the items were and who had owned/used the object. For instance, the metal collar was identified as being worn by a Confederate soldier while he was a prisoner at Point Lookout, Maryland, and the autograph book was associated with Major Charles Whitehead. At the same time, there was no effort to connect the individual objects to larger trends shared by Confederate prisoners of war. This interpretation reflected the view that the objects and their stories were important in and of themselves because they were Civil War relics. The exhibit's use of personal effects and interpretation that highlighted the objects' origins also demonstrated how the museum's displays invited personal connections between the objects and museum visitors, rather than providing visitors with an intellectual framework to interpret the relics.<sup>116</sup> As Allen Roberson noticed in his first visit to the museum upon applying for the director position, the SCCRRM's collection was impressive, but its objects were exhibited as relics with no broader context.<sup>117</sup>

The SCCRRM's relic room status was also reinforced through comments made by the museum's supporters during the restructuring crisis. Robert Brown, the commander of the South Carolina SCV, explained that the SCCRRM was a museum *and* a memorial. Mary Lund, the South Carolina UDC president, asserted that if the SCCRRM were to merge with the State Museum it would be a loss to all those who came to the museum to

---

116. "Confederate Prisoners of War Exhibit/1st Floor," October 27, 1999, Photograph; Felicity Bodenstern, "The Emotional Museum. Thoughts on the 'Secular Relics' of Nineteenth-Century History Museums in Paris and their Posterity," *Conserveries Mémoires* (2011), OpenEdition Journals, <http://journals.openedition.org/cm/834>; Jeff Wilkinson, "Relic Room Breaks Attendance Record," *State*, September 2, 2009, 6, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

117. Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

“feel the pride we have in our Soldiers of all wars and pause to honor them.”<sup>118</sup> Jeffrey Day, in his coverage of the 1993 restructuring efforts, acknowledged that, while he found it hard to believe that the SCCRRM’s dusty exhibits provoked such intense support, “you don’t mess with memories.”<sup>119</sup> Lund’s, Brown’s, and Day’s observations demonstrate that the SCCRRM’s objects were not displayed solely for educational purposes but also served as relics of South Carolina history—objects exhibited to provoke veneration and provide personal connections to the past.



Figure 1.1 The *Confederate Prisoners of War* exhibit at the War Memorial Building, October 27, 1999. Courtesy of the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum.

---

118. Mary Lund, “Dear Daughters,” *United Daughters of the Confederacy South Carolina Division Newsletter*, March 1993, 2, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

119. Day, “Confederate Museum Still Fighting,” 18.



Figure 1.2 Objects displayed like relics in *Hampton's Legion* exhibit at the War Memorial Building, October 27, 1999. Courtesy of the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum.

In addition to differences in mission, the State Museum and the SCCRRM also had varied collections practices. Contrary to standard museum practice, the SCCRRM's collections policy, by law, dictated that the museum could not sell or trade any items donated to the museum.<sup>120</sup> In fact, a proviso in the 1980 appropriations bill stipulated that “no artifacts in the collection and exhibits of the Confederate Relic Room shall be permanently removed or disposed of except by a Concurrent Resolution of the General Assembly.”<sup>121</sup> The provision itself reinforces the relic-like nature of the museum's objects, as it implies that the SCCRRM's artifacts were too sacred to remove from the collection through the usual deaccession practices. For his part, Ganong believed that the

120. Day, “Confederate Museum Still Fighting,” 12.

121. Act 517, 103rd sess. (1979-1980), South Carolina Legislature, [https://www.scstatehouse.gov/sess103\\_1979-1980/bills/3241b.htm](https://www.scstatehouse.gov/sess103_1979-1980/bills/3241b.htm).

variances in the museums' collections policies would create legal issues for the State Museum if they were to merge. Ganong also argued that the State Museum did not need the SCCRRM's artifacts, as it already had its own "Confederate period exhibits" and numerous other objects that it did not have the space to display. For the State Museum director, placing the SCCRRM under the museum's authority would be "disruptive" to the State Museum, bringing more headaches than benefits.<sup>122</sup>

Beyond the opposition expressed by the organizations directly involved in the restructuring proposal, the South Carolina SCV and the UDC both opposed placing the SCCRRM under the State Museum. As explained earlier, Robert Brown insisted that the SCCRRM had a unique mission as a "memorial to our veterans" that could not be found in other South Carolina museums like the State Museum. For Brown, the SCCRRM was "more than a museum."<sup>123</sup> Mary Lund contended that "I'm not against the State Museum; I'm just against the Relic Room being placed there."<sup>124</sup> Though Lund did not explicate her opposition to moving the SCCRRM to the State Museum at that particular moment, in a newsletter to the South Carolina Daughters in March 1993, she explained that any efforts to "close or move to the State Museum our Confederate Relic Room" would be a "great loss" to South Carolina's children and all the other visitors who come from around the state, the rest of the country, and the world to learn about South Carolina history and honor South Carolina's soldiers.<sup>125</sup> While Lund couched her opposition to the proposed merger between the SCCRRM and the State Museum in altruistic terms, similar to 1982,

---

122. Day, "Confederate Museum Still Fighting," 12.

123. Day, "Confederate Museum Still Fighting," 12

124. "Confederate Museum Fans Rise Up Against Merger," *Post and Courier* (Charleston, SC), May 7, 1993, 4, NewsLibrary.com.

125. Lund, "Dear Daughters," March 1993, 2.

the South Carolina Daughters likely feared that any attempts to place the SCCRRM under the State Museum's authority would jeopardize the organization's influence over the museum itself. After all, under the House restructuring proposal, there was no guarantee that the South Carolina UDC would retain its close ties to the SCCRRM, or even that the SCCRRM would continue to exist once being subsumed by the State Museum.<sup>126</sup>

Realizing this, the South Carolina Daughters, led by Lund, took tangible actions to ensure that the SCCRRM would remain an independent institution and that they would maintain their sway over the museum.

Lund was an active advocate for retaining the SCCRRM's independent status. In her capacity as the South Carolina Division President, Lund spoke at multiple public meetings on the matter, including Senate hearings at the Brown Building and the Koger Center.<sup>127</sup> Following their president's lead, the South Carolina Daughters wrote letters to their senators and representatives; they created petitions expressing their opposition to the proposed plan; and they attended public hearings on the matter.<sup>128</sup> Though it is difficult to gauge the South Carolina UDC's specific impact, Boineau praised the South Carolina Daughters' efforts to keep the SCCRRM as a separate institution in her 1993 report on the museum. She specifically noted that the Daughters had played a "great part" in "contacting and educating those who would make the decision" on whether to place the

---

126. Day, "Confederate Museum Still Fighting," 18.

127. Mitchell H. Taylor, "Legislative Committee Report—1993," Minutes of the Ninety-Seventh Annual Convention, United Daughters of the Confederacy, South Carolina Division, 1993, 63, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 7, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

128. Taylor, "Legislative Committee Report—1993," Minutes of the Ninety-Seventh Annual Convention, 1993, 63; Wendy Burbage, "S.C. Division Historian's Report 1992-1993," Minutes of the Ninety-Seventh Annual Convention, 1993, 48.

SCCRRM under the State Museum. She also explained that the Daughters' work in contacting their legislators prompted many representatives to come "to see the Museum and its operation and to learn more about our purpose."<sup>129</sup>

When Governor Campbell signed the final version of the restructuring bill into law on June 18, 1993, his signature marked the most significant reorganization of South Carolina's government since the state constitution of 1895. The restructuring consolidated seventy-five state agencies into seventeen, and the governor had the authority to appoint and fire the director of eleven of those agencies. However, similar to the outcome in 1982, the SCCRRM remained an independent agency when the restructuring bill became law.<sup>130</sup> Mary Lund celebrated the UDC's victory in her 1993 President's Report with the assertion that "this was a major achievement for removal of the Relic Room to the State Museum would have meant the loss of the very valuable collection of memorabilia from almost 400 years of our history."<sup>131</sup> While the South Carolina UDC was not the only organization to oppose placing the SCCRRM under the State Museum, the Daughters played a central role in ensuring that the SCCRRM maintained its independent status. As Wendy Burbage, the Division Historian in 1993,

---

129. Dotsy Lloyd Boineau, "Confederate Relic Room and Museum," Minutes of the Ninety-Seventh Annual Convention, 1993, 59.

130. Cindi Ross Scoppe, "'It's History:,'" 14; Warthen, "The Revolution got Watered Down," 41; Cindi Ross Scoppe, "1993 Restructuring Law Gave SC Governors First Hint of Authority," *State*, February 1, 2016, 17, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

131. Mary Lund, "President's Report—South Carolina Division UDC," Minutes of the Ninety-Seventh Annual Convention, 1993, 35.



asserted, the South Carolina Daughters acted “when our Confederate Relic Room was threatened.”<sup>132</sup>

The SCCRRM’s 1985 reaccreditation report noted that the South Carolina UDC had “some influence with the state legislature.”<sup>133</sup> The same could be said for the South Carolina UDC in 1993. In 1993, the South Carolina UDC used its legislative clout to maintain the SCCRRM’s independence from the State Museum, thereby demonstrating the organization’s continued efforts to negotiate and protect its influence at the SCCRRM after 1986. Furthermore, per our museum stakeholder definition, a stakeholder is any individual or group of individuals who either has an influence on or who can be influenced by an organization’s ability to achieve its objectives. In the case of the 1993

---

132. Burbage, “S.C. Division Historian’s Report 1992-1993,” Minutes of the Ninety-Seventh Annual Convention, 1993, 48. Though the 1993 restructuring bill kept the SCCRRM as an independent agency, it called for a study to determine whether various independent cultural agencies should be reorganized. The cultural agencies to be considered were the SCCRRM, the State Museum, the Old Exchange Commission, the Department of Archives and History, the State Library, and the South Carolina Arts Commission. In 1994, the House’s version of the appropriations bill included a provision that combined the SCCRRM, the State Museum, the State Library, the Department of Archives and History, and the South Carolina Arts Commission into the Department of Cultural and Information Resources. The Senate’s version of the appropriations bill did not include this provision. Except for the director of the Department of Archives and History, all the other agencies were opposed to the proposed incorporation. In the end, the House’s provision did not make it into the final version of the appropriations bill. Act 181, 110th sess. (1993-1994), South Carolina Legislature, [https://www.scstatehouse.gov/sess110\\_1993-1994/bills/35461.htm](https://www.scstatehouse.gov/sess110_1993-1994/bills/35461.htm); “S.C. Arts Commission Should Stay Autonomous,” *State*, March 12, 1994, 8, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; “Leave Arts Commission as is,” *State*, May 26, 1994, 16, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; Jeffrey Day, “Insider Leading S.C. Arts Agency,” *State*, June 26, 1994, 60, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

133. Alexander, “Confederate Relic Room and Museum,” 3; Though Alexander completed his report in 1985, the AAM reaccredited the SCCRRM in 1986. South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, “South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum Annual Report 1985-1986,” 1986, 4.

government restructuring process, the South Carolina UDC played an instrumental role in securing the SCCRRM's continued existence as an independent agency. The South Carolina UDC's ability to affect the outcome of the restructuring issue, an outcome that had the potential to impact the museum's governing structure, mission, location, and even its existence, demonstrates the organization's continued role as an important SCCRRM stakeholder from 1986 to 1996. While the South Carolina UDC was able to successfully navigate the government restructuring crisis with its influence at the SCCRRM intact, another crisis was looming on the horizon that would engulf the state of South Carolina in controversy for years. Even as the debate over government restructuring subsided, the debate over the State House Confederate flag began to escalate.

## CHAPTER 2: THE SCCRRM, THE SOUTH CAROLINA UDC, AND THE CONFEDERATE FLAG DEBATE, 1994-2000

### THE HERITAGE ACT OF 1994

The year 1993 was one of government restructuring in South Carolina. The following year, the South Carolina Confederate flag debate moved into the limelight.<sup>134</sup> The Confederate flag controversy's origins can be traced some three decades prior, to 1962. During that year, the South Carolina legislature passed a concurrent resolution to raise the Confederate flag, specifically a rectangular version of the Southern Cross battle flag, above the newly restored flagpole on the capitol dome.<sup>135</sup> This flag joined two other Confederate banners in the Senate and the House chambers, which had been placed in their locations in 1938 and 1956 respectively.<sup>136</sup>

---

134. Lefever, "Furling the South Carolina Confederate Flag," 72; Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 202-203; Gerald R. Webster and Johnathan I. Leib, "Whose South is it Anyway? Race and the Confederate Battle Flag in South Carolina," *Political Geography* 20, no. 3 (March 2001): 276-277, [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-6298\(00\)00065-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-6298(00)00065-2).

135. Prince, *Rally 'Round the Flag*, 15-16, 47. The rectangular version of the Southern Cross battle flag is also known as the rebel flag, the Confederate battle flag, the Confederate Naval Jack, and the Banner of the Army of Tennessee. Prince, *Rally 'Round the Flag*, 15-16.

136. Prince, *Rally 'Round the Flag*, 15-16, 29, 31-32, 40-47. Though several Confederate flags were on the State House premises during the time period under study, this section specifically examines the SCCRRM's role in the fight to remove the Confederate battle flag from the State House dome. Consequently, unless otherwise indicated, the term "State House Confederate flag" is used in reference to the battle flag flown above the capitol.

Rumblings against the State House Confederate flag started in the late 1960s when teenager Robert Ford, then a student volunteer for the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, led the first known protest against the flag in 1967.<sup>137</sup> Flag opponents' early efforts to challenge its position on the State House dome coincided with the seating of Black lawmakers in the South Carolina General Assembly in 1970 for the first time in seventy years. In July 1972, Representative I.S. Leevy Johnson, one of three African American legislators elected to the General Assembly in 1970, along with other representatives of the Richland County legislative delegation held public hearings on the State House Confederate flag issue.<sup>138</sup> Following Johnson's lead, during the 1970s and 1980s, Black lawmakers instigated legislative activity to remove the Confederate flag from the capitol dome. Despite their efforts, the flag generated few serious debates during this time period, with white South Carolinians generally dismissing complaints by the state's Black residents against the Confederate banner as insignificant.<sup>139</sup> In fact, historian John Coski depicts Black lawmakers' early fight against the battle flag as "a periodic exercise in futility."<sup>140</sup>

Efforts to move the Confederate flag from atop the State House gained momentum in 1994.<sup>141</sup> In his detailed chronicle of the South Carolina Confederate flag

---

137. Prince, *Rally 'Round the Flag*, 130.

138. Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 212; Margaret N. O'Shea, "Flag Tug of War Focus," *State*, July 19, 1972, 31, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; Miles S. Richards, "Johnson, Isaac Samuel Leevy," South Carolina Encyclopedia, University of South Carolina, Institute for Southern Studies, last modified July 1, 2019, <https://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/johnson-isaac-samuel-leevy/>.

139. Prince, *Rally 'Round the Flag*, 130.

140. Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 245.

141. Lefever, "Furling the South Carolina Confederate Flag," 72; Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 202-203.

controversy up to 2000, historian K. Michael Prince describes 1994 as “the year that almost was—the year that brought real, serious negotiation on the flag issue and measurable progress toward a solution.”<sup>142</sup> One major development in the flag controversy took place in late May 1994 when, just one week before the end of the General Assembly session, a group of leading pro-flag and anti-flag legislators met in a closed-door meeting to hammer out a compromise on the contentious matter. Economic pressure brought to bear by the state branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and the South Carolina business community facilitated the meeting. The South Carolina NAACP threatened an economic boycott, lawsuits, and protests if the South Carolina General Assembly took no action on the State House Confederate flag. The South Carolina business community, fearing that the state’s continued refusal to remove the State House Confederate flag would negatively impact its industrial recruitment, urged lawmakers to craft a compromise.<sup>143</sup>

The plan that emerged from this meeting became known as the Heritage Act of 1994. This compromise plan, as written, would have removed the Confederate flag from the State House dome, required a square Army of Northern Virginia flag to be flown at the Confederate Soldiers Monument, which is located in front of the State House, and placed a Confederate First National flag, known as the Stars and Bars, at the Women’s Monument to the Confederacy on the capitol grounds. The First National flag is the official flag of the United Daughters of the Confederacy organization and is included in the UDC’s insignia design. In addition, the plan stipulated that no Confederate monument

---

142. Prince, *Rally ‘Round the Flag*, 152.

143. Lefever, “Furling the South Carolina Confederate Flag,” 74-81; Prince, *Rally ‘Round the Flag*, 162.

could be removed or relocated without the state legislature's permission, and it established a Civil Rights Monument Commission tasked with creating a State House monument to South Carolina's African American citizens.<sup>144</sup> As a final requirement, the proposal insisted that a statement be inserted in the Journals of the House of Representatives and the Senate that defined the Confederate battle flag as "military banners . . . not racist emblems."<sup>145</sup>

Borne out of a spirit of compromise, the Heritage Act had momentum, as it was backed by major pro and anti-flag supporters, including ardent flag defenders Senators John Courson, Glenn McConnell, and Verne Smith, six of the state's seven African American senators, Legislative Black Caucus chairman Joe Brown, the United Daughters of the Confederacy, and the South Carolina NAACP. Keeping the plan's momentum alive, the South Carolina Senate passed the compromise on June 2, 1994, in the first vote that the state's senators took on the Confederate flag issue. However, pro-flag legislators in the House were upset that they were not consulted on the Heritage Act. They also feared that passing legislation to remove the battle flag from the State House dome would jeopardize their political fortunes in the upcoming fall elections. In his discussion of the 1994 Heritage Act, Prince notes that House members were "closer to the passions of their constituents," and the representatives, particularly House Republicans, were "in no mood

---

144. Prince, *Rally 'Round the Flag*, 162-163; Lefever, "Furling the South Carolina Confederate Flag," 80-81; Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 54-55, 196-198.

145. Lefever, "Furling the South Carolina Confederate Flag," 80; Prince, *Rally 'Round the Flag*, 162; South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the Senate of the State of South Carolina*, 110<sup>th</sup> General Assembly, 2nd sess., June 2, 1994, [https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=%22Confederate%20flag%22&category=SENATEJOURNALS&year=1994&conid=36618575&result\\_pos=0&keyval=S11019940602&numrows=10#OCC](https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=%22Confederate%20flag%22&category=SENATEJOURNALS&year=1994&conid=36618575&result_pos=0&keyval=S11019940602&numrows=10#OCC).

for compromise.” In the end, Representatives Harry Hallman and Claude Marchbanks, both Republicans, killed the compromise through procedural means on the last day of the 1994 legislative session.<sup>146</sup>

Even after the Heritage Act’s defeat, Courson declared that “I believe the General Assembly will pass the Heritage Act next year if outside interests leave us alone.”<sup>147</sup> Belying Courson’s claim that “outside interests” were the source of the flag issue’s polarization, on August 9, 1994, more than seventy-five percent of Republican primary participants voted no to the question, “Should the Confederate flag be taken down from the State House dome?”<sup>148</sup> Republican primary voters’ overwhelming opposition to removing the State House Confederate flag gave Republican legislators little incentive to take it down, and it demonstrated Republican lawmakers’ ongoing ability to milk the Confederate flag issue for political capital.<sup>149</sup> In response to the Republican primary vote on the Confederate flag, Courson, who just a few months earlier had expressed optimism about the Heritage Act passing during the next legislative session, observed that after the primary result it would be more difficult to find common ground between the two camps.<sup>150</sup> Tellingly, pro-flag legislators did not reintroduce the Heritage Act in 1995, and

---

146. Prince, *Rally ‘Round the Flag*, 165-166; Nina Brook, Lee Bandy, and Cindi Ross Scoppe, “Lawmakers Leave; Battle Flag Stays: House Sinks Compromise as Assembly Adjourns,” *State*, June 3, 1994, 1, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; Cindi Ross Scoppe, “S.C. Leaders See New Hope for Flag Accord,” *State*, June 16, 1994, 15, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

147. Scoppe, “S.C. Leaders See New Hope,” 15.

148. Sammy Fretwell, “Battle Flag’s Fate is Among Questions on GOP Ballot,” *State*, August 7, 1994, 21, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

149. Prince, *Rally ‘Round the Flag*, 169-170; Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 203.

150. “Republican Primary Vote Makes Confederate Flag Decision Harder,” *State*, August 11, 1994, 17, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers. Only Republican voters had the chance to give their opinion on the State House Confederate flag during the primary, and the question itself did not ask voters about potential

Courson and McConnell reneged on their support for the compromise proposal.

McConnell attributed his new opposition to the Heritage Act to the NAACP-endorsed marches and boycott discussions that proliferated after the act's defeat. Despite his initial willingness to remove the Confederate flag from the State House dome, McConnell now asserted that he would not "abandon the position of the flag at the dome until we get a final agreement from the other side, an agreement that they will cease the attacks on our heritage."<sup>151</sup>

When it was initially created, the 1994 Heritage Act symbolized cooperation and the hope that the Confederate flag issue could finally be brought to a conclusion. The proposal's defeat and the Republican primary result undermined this spirit of compromise. The 1994 developments in the Confederate flag debate also revealed the schisms that were developing in the Republican Party from this dispute. Right-wing flag supporters like the SCV, which did not endorse compromising on the flag issue, challenged Courson and McConnell's support for the 1994 Heritage Act.<sup>152</sup> While press coverage of the Heritage Act linked its defeat to the Senate's failure to consult with House members on the proposal, Southern heritage groups trumpeted their role in the act's failure.<sup>153</sup> McConnell and Courson's eventual denunciation of the Heritage Act they helped to engineer reflects their own radicalization in relation to the Confederate flag

---

compromises to the Confederate flag controversy like the Heritage Act. "Republican Primary Vote," 17.

151. Prince, *Rally 'Round the Flag*, 170-171.

152. Prince, *Rally 'Round the Flag*, 163, 166-167; Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 246.

153. Brook, Bandy, and Scoppe, "Lawmakers Leave; Battle Flag Stays," 1; Nina Brook and Cindi Ross Scoppe, "Compromise Simply Couldn't Beat the Clock," *State*, June 5, 1994, 1, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 248.



debate, and a hardening of positions between the two opposing groups. The South Carolina Republican Party's resounding success in the 1994 midterm elections along with the defiant attitudes expressed by both pro and anti-flag groups after the Heritage Act's defeat signaled that the Confederate flag firestorm would not soon be put out.<sup>154</sup>

The 1994 Heritage Act and the subsequent Republican Party primary vote on the State House Confederate flag marked the first significant escalation in the South Carolina Confederate flag debate that embroiled South Carolinians, legislators and citizens alike, in an ongoing discussion of the meaning and status of the Confederate battle flag.<sup>155</sup> While the SCCRRM was not involved in the Heritage Act, anti-flag interests proposed relocating the State House Confederate flag to the museum as a possible solution to the Confederate flag controversy prior to and after 1994. As a result, from 1994 to 2000, the ongoing public debate about the Confederate flag's status included arguments about exhibiting the State House Confederate flag at the SCCRRM. The continued discussion concerning the battle flag and the SCCRRM in legislative proposals, newspaper articles, and letters to the editor provides revealing information about the various ways pro and anti-flag groups perceived the SCCRRM and articulated narratives about the museum's role in the Confederate flag firestorm.

#### THE SCCRRM AND THE CONFEDERATE FLAG DEBATE, 1979-1983

To understand how the SCCRRM became involved in the South Carolina Confederate flag debate in the first place, we must turn our attention to 1979. During the

---

154. Prince, *Rally 'Round the Flag*, 172-176; Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 248-249.

155. Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 202-203.

1979 legislative session, Black lawmakers in the House introduced several amendments to the appropriations bill to relocate the State House Confederate flags. While these amendments varied in their composition, they had one key element in common—they all proposed relocating the flags to the SCCRRM. On April 12, 1979, Representatives Kay Patterson and Julius Murray introduced an amendment to the appropriations bill that proposed displaying the Confederate flags “at the Confederate Relic Room in a place of honor.”<sup>156</sup> The House Speaker decided that the amendment was irrelevant to the appropriations bill since it did not appropriate any money. On that same day, Patterson, responding to the criticism directed against his prior attempt, proposed an amendment that appropriated \$500 to exhibit the State House Confederate banner at the SCCRRM. The House Speaker also ruled this amendment out of order due to the fact that its main consideration was the Confederate flags’ removal to the SCCRRM, not appropriating money.<sup>157</sup> Demonstrating persistence, on April 20, 1979, Patterson, along with other Black lawmakers in the House, offered several amendments to the appropriations bill related to the State House Confederate flags. While the amendments varied in how many Confederate flags they removed from the State House, the flags’ final destination was always the SCCRRM. The various amendments proved unsuccessful, as House members either ruled them out of order, tabled the amendments, or had them withdrawn.<sup>158</sup>

---

156. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina*, 103rd General Assembly, 1st sess., April 12, 1979, 1:1391, LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), *Journal of the House of Representatives*; Prince, *Rally ‘Round the Flag*, 131.

157. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, April 12, 1979, 1:1394.

158. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina*, 103rd General Assembly, 1st sess., April 20, 1979, 1:1599-1609,

Eventually, Black lawmakers paused their efforts to remove the flags during the 1979 legislative session after they were assured that legislators would introduce a bill establishing a committee to examine the matter. Ultimately, legislation to create such a committee did not pass the House.<sup>159</sup> Despite the amendments' failure, Black lawmakers' 1979 efforts to remove the State House Confederate flags demonstrate that proposals to relocate the Confederate banners to the SCCRRM were at the heart of anti-flag legislators' early maneuvers during the South Carolina Confederate flag controversy.

Building upon their aborted attempts in 1979, Black lawmakers continued to propose the SCCRRM as a viable location for the State House Confederate flags in the 1980s. In 1980, Patterson introduced an amendment to the appropriations bill that assigned \$100 of the SCCRRM's existing budget to move the Confederate flag from the House chambers to the museum. House Speaker Pro Tem Ramon Schwartz ruled the amendment out of order on the grounds that it was not germane to the appropriations bill.<sup>160</sup> In the same session, Representatives Patterson, Robert Woods, and McKinley Washington, Jr., all members of the Black Legislative Caucus, proposed an amendment apportioning \$500 of the SCCRRM's state appropriation to display the Confederate flag from the House chambers at the museum. The amendment stipulated that the flag "shall,

---

LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), *Journal of the House of Representatives*.

159. "House Budget Effort Ends in Failure," *State*, April 21, 1979, 21, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; "Blacks Continuing Fight Against Flag," *Columbia Record*, January 31, 1980, 14, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

160. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina*, 103rd General Assembly, 2nd sess., January 30, 1980, 1:530, LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), *Journal of the House of Representatives*; "Blacks Continuing Fight Against Flag," 14.

perpetually, be held in a place of honor in the Relic Room.” This amendment too was ruled out of order.<sup>161</sup> Undeterred, Woods, Patterson, and several other House members introduced another amendment to the appropriations bill that created a Confederate Flag Memorial Commission. Out of the funds allocated for this commission, the Clerk of the House of Representatives received \$50 to exhibit the Confederate flag from the House chambers across the state. Then, after its six-month exhibit tour, the flag would be displayed in the SCCRRM. However, House Speaker Rex L. Carter ruled the amendment out of order, as its goal was to remove the Confederate flag, not to appropriate money.<sup>162</sup>

The SCCRRM emerged more prominently in the Confederate flag debate in 1983 when Patterson introduced an amendment to the appropriations bill to remove the battle flags from the House chambers and the State House dome. This proposal assigned \$100 of the SCCRRM’s budget to “display the flag in a place of honor” at the museum.<sup>163</sup> While several Black lawmakers and one white lawmaker spoke in favor of the proposal, a push by Representative Patrick Harris to table the amendment passed by a vote of fifty-two to forty-four. Subsequent efforts to revive the amendment also failed, though Clark Surratt of *The State* newspaper described the proposal in 1987 as “about as close as any official action came to bringing the flags down.”<sup>164</sup>

---

161. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, January 30, 1980, 1:532-533.

162. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, January 30, 1980, 1:681-685; Douglas Mauldin, “House Adopts Pay Ceiling: State Employees Affected,” *State*, February 7, 1980, 17, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

163. “House Kills Move to Reduce Raise,” *Columbia Record*, May 4, 1983, 41, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

164. “Live Wire,” *Columbia Record*, May 19, 1983, 2, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; “Time to Come Down,” *Columbia Record*, May 17, 1983, 12,

While Black lawmakers' numerous attempts to relocate the State House battle flags to the SCCRRM proved unsuccessful, their amendments demonstrate anti-flag legislators' efforts to establish the SCCRRM as a possible resting place for the Confederate flags. In crafting their amendments, Black lawmakers couched their endeavor to relocate the flags to the SCCRRM in conciliatory language about the flags themselves. While the amount of money that Black lawmakers attempted to appropriate to remove the Confederate flags varied, the phrase "displayed at the Confederate Relic Room in a place of honor" was a recurring element in several of their proposed amendments.<sup>165</sup> One 1979 amendment stipulated that the Confederate flags had to be placed in the SCCRRM "in a proper and dignified manner."<sup>166</sup> Another amendment in 1980 explicitly stated "nothing contained herein shall be construed as evidence in any way to mangle or desecrate the confederate flag. It shall, perpetually, be held in a place of honor in the Relic Room."<sup>167</sup> Black lawmakers' continued emphasis on transferring the State House Confederate flags to a "place of honor" in the SCCRRM shows their

---

NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; "Beasley Campaign Defends his Anti-Flag Votes as Democrat," *Greenville News* (SC), June 17, 1994, 5, Newspapers.com; South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina*, 105th General Assembly, 1st sess., May 4, 1983, 2:2545, LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), *Journal of the House of Representatives*; Clark Surratt, "Flag Flap: Confederate Banner Dispute Rises Again," *State*, February 22, 1987, 4, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

165. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, April 12, 1979, 1:1391, 1394; South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, April 20, 1979, 1:1599-1609; South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, January 30, 1980, 1:530, 532-533, 681-685.

166. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, April 20, 1979, 1:1602.

167. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, January 30, 1980, 1:532-533.

attempts to frame the SCCRRM as a palatable alternative to displaying the Confederate flags at the State House for pro-flag legislators. Through the wording employed in their amendments, Black legislators characterized the SCCRRM as a place where the battle flags could be honored as historical symbols of the Confederacy and disassociated from their more recent connotations with segregation, white supremacy, and resistance to the civil rights movement.<sup>168</sup>

Black lawmakers' claim that the SCCRRM could exhibit the Confederate flags in a "place of honor" generated little debate in the House itself. As noted earlier, when the amendments did spark discussion, House members based their opposition to the amendments on the proposals' germaneness or, more precisely, their lack of germaneness to the appropriations bill; they did not debate whether the flags should be removed from the capitol dome.<sup>169</sup> The only known effort by pro-flag legislators to counter Black lawmakers' assertion that the Confederate flags should be relocated to the SCCRRM came in response to one of the amendments proposed by Black legislators on April 20, 1979. This particular amendment allocated \$100 to remove the flags and display them in the SCCRRM. Representative John Bradley, a prominent pro-flag legislator, argued that this amendment was not germane to the appropriations bill because the SCCRRM exhibited historic artifacts. Since the State House Confederate flags were not historic

---

168. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, April 12, 1979, 1:1391, 1394; South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, April 20, 1979, 1:1599-1609; South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, January 30, 1980, 1:530, 532-533, 681-685; Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 273, 282, 290-291, 302-304.

169. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, April 12, 1979, 1:1391, 1394; South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, April 20, 1979, 1:1599-1609; South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, January 30, 1980, 1:530, 532-533, 681-685.

artifacts, the museum could not have jurisdiction over the flags. Again, Bradley's opposition to the amendment rested on whether it belonged in the appropriations bill. However, his contention that the State House Confederate flags should not be exhibited among the SCCRRM's historic artifacts provides an early pro-flag reason for why the banners did not belong in the SCCRRM.<sup>170</sup> Bradley's differentiation between the SCCRRM's historic artifacts and the State House Confederate flags also illustrates the battle flag's increased association with popular culture and mass consumerism since the 1950s. As historian Thomas Brown argues, the South Carolina legislature's decision to fly a mass-produced version of the Confederate flag above the capitol dome in 1962 was akin to "the placement of a bumper sticker" on the State House.<sup>171</sup>

While Bradley's statement started to articulate pro-flag opposition to removing the Confederate flags to the SCCRRM, from the beginning, anti-flag forces shaped and dominated the narrative surrounding the SCCRRM and the Confederate flag debate. Their persistent attempts to place the State House Confederate flags in the SCCRRM in the late 1970s and early 1980s forged a link between the SCCRRM and the anti-flag position. This link, as demonstrated by Bradley, would lead pro-flag interests to craft their own narrative about why the battle flags should not be displayed at the SCCRRM.

Having outlined the SCCRRM's involvement in the South Carolina Confederate flag debate through 1983, it is important to recognize that proposals to relocate the State House Confederate flag to the SCCRRM were just one of several suggested solutions to

---

170. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, April 20, 1979, 1:1602; Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 245.

171. Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 206-211, 225-226.

the Confederate flag dispute. For perspective, in 2000 alone, lawmakers introduced at least twenty different legislative proposals to resolve the Confederate flag issue.<sup>172</sup> Additionally, arguments given during the Confederate flag controversy by pro and anti-flag forces were more expansive than deciding whether the battle flag belonged in the SCCRRM. The South Carolina Confederate flag debate encompassed conflicting views of the Confederate battle flag and the Civil War. For many flag opponents, the Civil War was primarily fought over slavery, and the Confederate flag was variously a divisive symbol, an emblem of white supremacy, a reminder of violent opposition to the civil rights movement of the mid-twentieth century, and a symbol of disrespect toward South Carolina's Black residents. Moreover, many flag detractors maintained that the Confederate flag did not belong in a position of sovereignty atop the State House. For many flag supporters, Southern defense of states' rights, not slavery, was the Civil War's central cause, and the Confederate flag symbolized Southern heritage and memorialized Confederate men and women. Flag defenders also resisted flag opponents' associations between the Confederate flag, slavery, racism, and treason.<sup>173</sup> While pro and anti-flag arguments are only cursorily explored here, they do frequently lie behind flag supporters' and flag opponents' perspectives on relocating the Confederate flag to the SCCRRM, and subsequently their SCCRRM perceptions. These perceptions, as articulated through the Confederate flag debate from 1994 to 1997, are the focus of the next section.

---

172. Margaret N. O'Shea, "Compromise not Easily Reached on Flag," *Augusta Chronicle* (GA), January 30, 2000, 8.

173. Prince, *Rally 'Round the Flag*, 62-76, 94, 104, 112; Lefever, "Furling the South Carolina Confederate Flag," 5, 50; Laura R. Woliver, Angela D. Ledford, and Chris J. Dolan, "The South Carolina Confederate Flag: The Politics of Race and Citizenship," *Politics & Policy* 29, no. 4 (December 2001): 718, <https://doi.org.pallas2.tcl.sc.edu/10.1111/j.1747-1346.2001.tb00612.x>; Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 212-216.



## THE SCCRRM AND THE CONFEDERATE FLAG DEBATE, 1994-1997

As indicated, the Heritage Act of 1994 instigated the first major public and legislative debate about the State House Confederate flag in South Carolina.<sup>174</sup> While the Confederate flag controversy waned in intensity after the 1994 Republican primary election, South Carolina Governor David Beasley reinvigorated this debate in November 1996 when, during his televised gubernatorial address, he declared his support for removing the Confederate flag from the State House dome, though he had promised when campaigning for the governorship that he would not take down the flag. Attributing his reversal on the issue to his own religious experience, his desire to ameliorate racial tension, and his need to protect the battle flag from misuse, Beasley expressed his desire to revive sections of the Heritage Act of 1994. These sections included moving the battle flag from the dome to the Confederate Soldiers Monument, adding the Stars and Bars to the Women's Monument to the Confederacy, and providing legal protection for South Carolina's Confederate monuments. Beasley's address marked the culmination of a series of speeches and statements that he gave, along with news reports that leaked information on his flag initiative, signaling his willingness to wade into the Confederate flag argument.<sup>175</sup>

---

174. Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 202-203.

175. David Beasley, "South Carolina Flying Confederate Flag," November 26, 1996, C-SPAN video, 00:07-9:13, <https://www.c-span.org/video/?77066-1/south-carolina-flying-confederate-flag>; Prince, *Rally 'Round the Flag*, 183; Michael Sponhour, "'Let's End this Debate,'" *State*, November 27, 1996, 1, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 249; Lefever, "Furling the South Carolina Confederate Flag," 85-87; Lee Bandy, "Beasley Seeks Truce on Flag," *State*, November 12, 1996, 1, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; Lee Bandy, "Flag Decision Puts Beasley on Spot," *State*, November 16, 1996, 1, NewsBank: South

In the wake of Governor Beasley's support for forging a compromise on the flag issue, Courson, in an article published in *The State*, was quoted as insisting that "the flag will not be taken down and put in a museum and forgotten about."<sup>176</sup> In making this statement, Courson announced his opposition to moving the State House Confederate flag to a museum, and he set forth his belief that museums are places where objects are erased from public memory. Though Courson did not distinguish between museums in general and the SCCRRM specifically, the SCCRRM's past involvement in the Confederate flag debate indicated that his view of museums also applied to the SCCRRM. Jeffrey Day, the article's author, made this implicit connection explicit for his readers. Day asserted that Courson's views on museums stemmed from stereotypes of these institutions as places where objects are "put away and silenced," and "too many visits to the dusty, tattered exhibits at the Confederate Relic Room."<sup>177</sup> As Day's comments denote, Courson's statement advanced the perception that the SCCRRM was a place where objects were forgotten by all who did not make the point to specifically visit them—a museum that is a mausoleum.<sup>178</sup>

Courson was not the first flag supporter to oppose relocating the State House Confederate flag to a museum on the basis that doing so would cause the public to forget about the flag. As early as 1983, Murrell C. Scott, a flag defender from Columbia, argued that "the idea of retiring it to a place of honor is a ploy. It would be like putting it in the

---

Carolina Historical Newspapers; Robert Tanner, "Beasley Feels Plan on Flag Publicized Prematurely," *Charlotte Observer* (NC), November 19, 1996, 48, Newspapers.com.

176. Jeffrey Day, "'Lively' Museums," *State*, November 24, 1996, 69, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

177. Day, "'Lively' Museums," 69.

178. Day, "'Lively' Museums," 69.

latrine. You would only see it if you went there.”<sup>179</sup> Scott’s letter did not specifically reference the SCCRRM or museums. However, it was written in response to a *Columbia Record* editorial that openly championed Patterson’s amendment to display the State House Confederate flag in a “place of honor” at the SCCRRM.<sup>180</sup> This added context makes it likely that Scott viewed the SCCRRM as a place where the Confederate flag would ostensibly be tucked away in a quiet corner outside of the public eye, only visible to those who sought it out.

Similar to Scott, McConnell, a noted Civil War buff and flag supporter, expressed his opposition to relocating the Confederate flag to a museum in his 1988 Confederate Memorial Day speech. McConnell’s speech provides important insight into flag supporters’ opposition to relocating the State House Confederate flag to a museum, including the SCCRRM. In his address, McConnell asserted that if flag detractors are allowed to “take these symbols down and tuck these symbols away to the quiet corners of museums, we will have allowed them to brand for eternity these emblems as emblems of shame.”<sup>181</sup> Once again, McConnell’s speech establishes the perception that museums, like the SCCRRM, are quiet places that erase objects from the general public’s view, making museums the antithesis of flag supporters’ desire to publicly display the Confederate flag in honor of their Confederate ancestors.<sup>182</sup>

---

179. Murrell C. Scott, letter to the editor, *Columbia Record*, June 7, 1983, 12, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

180. Scott, letter to the editor, 12; “Time to Come Down, 12.”

181. Glenn F. McConnell, “Confederate Memorial Day Celebration,” May 14, 1988, 6, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 18, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

182. McConnell, “Confederate Memorial Day Celebration,” 6-7; Prince, *Rally ‘Round the Flag*, 66, 147-152, 159, 196; Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 273, 282-283, 290-291.

Though flag supporters, like McConnell and Courson, portrayed moving the State House Confederate flag to a museum as a sign of disrespect to the banner, some in favor of displaying the Confederate flag at the SCCRRM argued that doing so would bring honor to the Confederate banner. This argument was advanced by Virginia Baker, a resident of Columbia, in a letter to the editor published in *The State* in 1997. Baker acknowledged that some people believed “that taking the flag down would be turning our backs on our heritage.” However, she refuted this claim by arguing that placing the State House Confederate flag in the SCCRRM, along with the museum’s other Confederate objects, would bestow the flag “with the dignity and honor it deserves.” Baker’s emphasis on the SCCRRM’s historic Confederate artifacts implied that exhibiting the State House Confederate flag in the midst of these relics from the Civil War would render the flag a neutral historical symbol of the Confederacy. In making this argument, Baker demonstrates her opinion that the SCCRRM, as a Confederate museum with other Confederate artifacts, could exhibit the Confederate flag in a manner that imbued the flag with honor, not shame.<sup>183</sup>

Those who supported placing the Confederate flag in the SCCRRM gave several other reasons for why this solution should be enacted. In 1995, Ruth Pitts of Columbia insisted that the Confederate banner belonged in the SCCRRM “along with all the other relics of that period.”<sup>184</sup> A 1996 editorial written by *The State* argued that the State House Confederate flag should be moved to the SCCRRM due to the fact that the museum was

---

183. Virginia Baker, letter to the editor, *State*, January 4, 1997, 7, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 273, 282-283, 290-291, 302-304.

184. Ruth E. Pitts, letter to the editor, *State*, May 29, 1995, 13, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

“supported by taxpayers for the express purpose of preserving and honoring heritage.”<sup>185</sup>

Collectively, these arguments articulate perceptions of the museum as variously an institution that housed Confederate relics and a state-funded museum that preserved and venerated South Carolina’s heritage.

Supporters of removing the State House Confederate flag to the SCCRRM also claimed that the museum was an institution capable of placing the battle flag in its historical context. Anti-flag legislator Robert Woods (D-Charleston) advanced this belief as early as 1980. In a speech given from the South Carolina House floor, Woods argued that the Confederate flag should be placed in the SCCRRM “so people of this state may go to that flag and read its history.”<sup>186</sup> Through this statement, Woods implied that the SCCRRM could provide the historic background needed for people to read the flag’s history.

Paralleling Woods’ perspective on the SCCRRM, Scott Wilson, in a letter to the editor published in 1995, observed that the SCCRRM would be “a far more appropriate place for the flag to fly” than on top of the State House. Wilson argued that atop the State House, the Confederate flag’s symbolism “presents an ambiguous message that can be misinterpreted any number of ways.” In contrast, displaying the battle flag in the SCCRRM would enable “Southern heritage” to be “presented historically in a variety of ways.” From Wilson’s perspective, the SCCRRM, with its plethora of authentic Civil War artifacts, could exhibit the State House Confederate flag as an apolitical historical

---

185. “Battle Flag is an Obstacle that Can’t be Wished Away,” *State*, January 12, 1996, 12, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

186. “Solicitors’ Pay Raises Approved,” *Columbia Record*, February 8, 1980, 1, 8, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

symbol. This was an alternative preferable to the banner seemingly representing “modern civil authority” on the State House dome and communicating an unclear political message that associated the state and the flag with a celebration of Confederate ideology, white supremacy, and violent resistance to the civil rights movement. Wilson’s argument also paralleled flag opponents’ desire to move Confederate symbols from public displays associated with state sovereignty to museums that could exhibit the symbols in their historic context.<sup>187</sup>

From 1994 to 1997, the SCCRRM remained a part of the public discussion over the State House Confederate flag sparked by the 1994 Heritage Act and reinvigorated by Governor Beasley.<sup>188</sup> In newspaper articles and letters to the editor, flag supporters and flag opponents posited reasons for why the battle flag should or should not be relocated to the museum. Several of the arguments employed by anti-flag groups framed the SCCRRM as an institution that could display the flag with honor by exhibiting the banner in a historic, not political, context.<sup>189</sup> In seeking to undermine anti-flag groups’ argument that the SCCRRM was a reasonable place to display the State House Confederate flag, pro-flag legislators Courson and McConnell crafted a narrative about the SCCRRM that portrayed the museum as a place outside of the public eye where objects went to be forgotten.<sup>190</sup> For flag supporters like Courson and McConnell, moving the State House

---

187. Scott Wilson, letter to the editor, *State*, May 16, 1995, 9, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 272-291; Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 212-216; Prince, *Rally ‘Round the Flag*, 159.

188. Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 202-203.

189. Wilson, letter to the editor, 9; Pitts, letter to the editor, 13; Baker, letter to the editor, 7.

190. McConnell, “Confederate Memorial Day Celebration,” 6; Prince, *Rally ‘Round the Flag*, 66, 147-152, 159, 196; Bandy, “Beasley Seeks Truce on Flag,” 1; Day, “‘Lively’ Museums,” 69.

Confederate flags to the SCCRRM was never an acceptable solution to the debate as such a move would taint the battle flag with shame, erase it from public memory, and disrupt the favorable interpretation of Confederate history that the State House Confederate flag's public display implied.<sup>191</sup>

#### THE SCCRRM AND THE CONFEDERATE FLAG DEBATE, 1999-2000

In July 1999, the South Carolina NAACP initiated the third and final phase of the South Carolina Confederate flag controversy up to 2000. During this month, the organization received permission at the NAACP's national convention to implement a tourism boycott for South Carolina. In October 1999, the organization's national board provided its official endorsement of the boycott. On January 1, 2000, the NAACP's boycott took effect.<sup>192</sup>

Paralleling the Confederate flag debate's increased intensity, in 1999, the SCCRRM's role in the Confederate flag dispute expanded once more from newspaper pages to the South Carolina legislature. During the 1999-2000 legislative session, Representatives Joe Brown, Walter P. Lloyd, and J. Seth Whipper, all Black lawmakers, introduced bill H. 4292, which sought to remove all of the State House Confederate flags to a place of "permanent display in the Confederate Relic Room."<sup>193</sup> In the same session,

---

191. Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 290-291; Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 219-220; McConnell, "Confederate Memorial Day Celebration," 6-7; Prince, *Rally 'Round the Flag*, 66, 147-152, 159, 188-189, 196.

192. Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 202-203; Prince, *Rally 'Round the Flag*, 200; Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 249.

193. H. 4292, 113th sess. (1999-2000), South Carolina Legislature, [https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=%22Relic%20Room%22&category=LEGISLATION&session=113&conid=36502410&result\\_pos=0&keyval=1134292&numrows=10](https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=%22Relic%20Room%22&category=LEGISLATION&session=113&conid=36502410&result_pos=0&keyval=1134292&numrows=10).

Senator Darrell Jackson, a local African American pastor from Columbia, put forth Senate bill S. 968. This bill proposed moving the State House Confederate flag to a flagpole outside of the SCCRRM at the War Memorial Building. Since the SCCRRM was slated to relocate to the Columbia Mills Building, the bill also stipulated that the battle flag should move with the museum and be placed “on the site of the Columbia Mills Building.”<sup>194</sup> Neither bill garnered significant support in the House or Senate, as both bills died in committee.<sup>195</sup>

A few days after Jackson pre-filed bill S. 968, *The State* published an article written by Jackson about his proposal to relocate the battle flag to the SCCRRM. In his article, Jackson described the Confederate banner as “an historic relic,” that, while offensive to African Americans, should be preserved as a part of South Carolina’s history in an appropriate institution. For Jackson, that appropriate institution was the SCCRRM, which he stated was “specifically created for the purpose of preserving Confederate memorabilia.” Taking this connection a step further, Jackson proposed appropriating state funding and raising private donations to expand and update the SCCRRM into a Confederate museum. Jackson argued that an expanded SCCRRM would enable those who “cherish the Confederate flag” to freely visit the flag and other Confederate artifacts while allowing those who oppose the banner to ignore its existence. In short, Jackson’s article served as an advertisement for his SCCRRM proposal, as it represented his efforts to sweeten the deal for pro-flag groups. Jackson was willing to give pro-flag interests a

---

194. Prince, *Rally ‘Round the Flag*, 160; S. 968, 113th sess. (1999-2000), South Carolina Legislature, [https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=%22Relic%20Room%22&category=LEGISLATION&session=113&conid=36502410&result\\_pos=0&keyval=1130968&numrows=10](https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=%22Relic%20Room%22&category=LEGISLATION&session=113&conid=36502410&result_pos=0&keyval=1130968&numrows=10).

195. H. 4292, 113th sess. (1999-2000); S. 968, 113th sess. (1999-2000).



modernized Confederate museum in exchange for relocating the Confederate flag to the said museum.<sup>196</sup>

The NAACP needed little persuasion to accept Jackson's SCCRRM proposal, as the organization ardently supported his plan to relocate the State House Confederate flag to the SCCRRM. In reference to Jackson's SCCRRM bill, James Gallman, president of the South Carolina NAACP, stated: "I am willing to discuss other locations and whatnot, but that one has a real good ring to me right now."<sup>197</sup> The NAACP's support for Jackson's proposal stemmed from its belief that the flag should be displayed in a historic context, and, subsequently, the organization's view that the SCCRRM was an institution that situated objects in a historic, not a political environment.<sup>198</sup> As Gallman explained, exhibiting the flag at the SCCRRM meant that "it's in a place of historical perspective and not in a position of sovereignty."<sup>199</sup> This statement not only illustrates the South Carolina NAACP's SCCRRM perceptions, but it also epitomizes the sovereignty argument made by anti-flag groups. This argument contended that the Confederate flag did not belong atop a government building intended to represent all of the state's residents.<sup>200</sup>

---

196. Darrell Jackson, "Expanded, Updated Relic Room Best Place for Confederate Flag," *State*, December 13, 1999, 9, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

197. Jim Davenport, "NAACP: Put Flag in Relic Room," *Times and Democrat* (Orangeburg, SC), February 3, 2000, 1, Newspapers.com; Leigh Strope, "NAACP March to Ratchet up Flag Pressure," *Greenville News*, December 23, 1999, 14, Newspapers.com.

198. Joseph S. Stroud, "Governor Lays out Plan," *State*, February 15, 2000, 3, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; Brock Vergakis, "Confederate Relic Room to Relocate," *State*, February 12, 2000, 8, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

199. Vergakis, "Confederate Relic Room to Relocate," 8.

200. Woliver, Ledford, and Dolan, "The Politics of Race and Citizenship," 718.

In contrast to the NAACP's enthusiastic response, Jackson's bill S. 968 landed with a thud among flag proponents. Courson remarked that the likelihood that Jackson's proposal would happen "is absolutely nil."<sup>201</sup> An article written on the Confederate flag controversy in *The Greenville News* described Jackson's SCCRRM bill as being "ardently opposed by flag supporters."<sup>202</sup> In his account of the South Carolina Confederate flag debate, Prince depicted Jackson's proposal to relocate the Confederate flag to the SCCRRM as a "nonstarter with flag defenders."<sup>203</sup> Flag supporters' complete denouncement of Jackson's plan underscores how thoroughly the SCCRRM became associated with the anti-flag position during the flag dispute. Jackson dangled the possibility of transforming the SCCRRM into a larger, modern Confederate museum, and not even Courson, who had attempted to do something similar just a few years earlier, took the bait.<sup>204</sup> Anti-flag forces claimed the SCCRRM as a viable alternative to flying the Confederate flag on the State House dome. In response, pro-flag forces denounced museums, like the SCCRRM, as places where objects went to die, therefore making museums unsuitable institutions for displaying the State House Confederate flag. In an ironic twist, during the Confederate flag controversy, pro-flag forces rejected the institution that had once served as the South Carolina UDC's Lost Cause tribute.<sup>205</sup>

---

201. Joseph S. Stroud, "Let's Talk, Hodges tells Flag Forces," *State*, October 27, 1999, 6, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

202. Tim Smith, "Some Look to Alabama's Flag Settlement," *Greenville News*, January 22, 2000, 1, Newspapers.com.

203. Prince, *Rally 'Round the Flag*, 210.

204. Jackson, "Expanded, Updated Relic Room," 9; Michael Sponhour, "Future is Brightening for Confederate Past," *State*, October 4, 1996, 14, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

205. Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 219-220; Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 290-291.

## THE SOUTH CAROLINA UDC AND THE CONFEDERATE FLAG DEBATE

While the SCCRRM's inclusion in the Confederate flag debate through legislation, newspaper articles, and letters to the editor provides insight into how pro and anti-flag groups perceived the museum in relation to the State House Confederate flag, perhaps the most interesting aspect of the flag dispute as it relates to the SCCRRM is the South Carolina UDC's noticeable absence from this conversation. Pro-flag legislators, anti-flag lawmakers, and members of the general public all expressed their sentiments on whether and why the State House Confederate flag should be displayed at the SCCRRM. The South Carolina UDC did not. The organization's absence from this argument is particularly striking considering that the Daughters did not agree with the pro-flag perception that the SCCRRM was a place where objects went to be forgotten. In 1901, the Daughters exhorted Confederate veterans to donate their wartime memorabilia to the museum because "the opportunity is offered you, soldiers, to give your own versions of the war between the States. Place here the materials where they will be in reach of the future historians and the story will be recorded as you have written it."<sup>206</sup> As the Daughters' plea for donations demonstrate, they created the SCCRRM for the specific purpose of remembering the Confederate generation.<sup>207</sup>

The South Carolina UDC's belief that the SCCRRM served as an effective venue for remembering the past, particularly South Carolina's Confederate past, extended to the 1986 to 2000 time period. In 1993, Mary Lund urged the South Carolina Daughters to

---

206. "The Relic Room: An Address from the Ladies to the Visiting Veterans," *State*, May 5, 1901, 12, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

207. Overton, "Girls of the Sixties," 13-20, 23.

“give or lend to the Relic Room any material which will enhance the collection.”<sup>208</sup>

Surely, Lund, as the South Carolina UDC president, would not have encouraged the Daughters to loan their relics of the past to a museum that she believed did not publicly preserve the past. Similarly, in 1995, Dotsy Boineau relayed to the South Carolina Daughters that around Memorial Day “hundreds came to see these relics of a proud past.”<sup>209</sup> As Boineau’s words indicate, the South Carolina UDC viewed the SCCRRM as an effective shrine to South Carolina’s past that promoted public remembrance of the state’s history with an emphasis on the Confederate period. For the South Carolina Daughters, the SCCRRM was not a place where objects were buried; it was a place where objects and their stories came to life.

Recognizing that the South Carolina UDC did not perceive the SCCRRM in a way similar to other flag supporters raises questions about why the organization chose not to engage in the Confederate flag-SCCRRM debate. As demonstrated in the first chapter, the South Carolina UDC was an important museum stakeholder that actively sought to advance and protect its influence at the institution. As an institutional stakeholder, the South Carolina UDC could have challenged perceptions about the SCCRRM presented by McConnell, Courson, and other flag defenders that equated the museum to a mausoleum and a latrine, but the organization did not. To understand why this was the case, we must first consider the South Carolina UDC’s role in the Confederate flag debate.

---

208. Lund, “President’s Report—South Carolina Division UDC,” *Minutes of the Ninety-Seventh Annual Convention*, 1993, 35.

209. Dotsy Boineau, “S.C. Confederate Relic Room and Museum,” *Minutes of the Ninety-Ninth Annual Convention*, 1995, 84.

Ironically, the South Carolina UDC, an organization once known as the “principal keeper of the Confederate flame,” did not play a significant part in the South Carolina Confederate flag dispute.<sup>210</sup> June Wells, president of the South Carolina UDC from 1999 to 2000, argued that the UDC was “not heard from more often in debates and arguments” about the Confederate flag, because the organization’s rules precluded it from becoming involved in political matters. Wells’ statement belies the South Carolina UDC’s early involvement in “highly politicized controversies over commemorative initiatives,” as well as the organization’s own political involvement in the Confederate flag debate.<sup>211</sup> However, the fact that Wells relied on this excuse to justify why the UDC was not more involved in the Confederate flag controversy illustrates the organization’s own halfhearted support for the issue.

This is not to say that the South Carolina UDC was not involved in the disagreement over the State House Confederate flag. The South Carolina UDC Legislative Committee provided updates to the Daughters on the flag issue when pertinent, and the South Carolina UDC leaders urged the Daughters to keep abreast of any flag developments.<sup>212</sup> The South Carolina Daughters also wrote letters to their

---

210. Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 123; Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 219.

211. Adam Parker, “June Wells, Confederate Museum Director and Proponent of the ‘Lost Cause,’ Dies at 86,” *Post and Courier*, December 1, 2020, [https://www.postandcourier.com/news/obituaries/june-wells-confederate-museum-director-and-proponent-of-the-lost-cause-dies-at-86/article\\_ab9fb90-3344-11eb-8f35-9f6ea19ff024.html](https://www.postandcourier.com/news/obituaries/june-wells-confederate-museum-director-and-proponent-of-the-lost-cause-dies-at-86/article_ab9fb90-3344-11eb-8f35-9f6ea19ff024.html); June Murray Wells, “United Daughters of the Confederacy: A Talk Given by June Murray Wells, President General, Jan 2000,” (speech, Columbia, SC, January 2000), Electric Scotland, accessed March 2, 2021, <https://www.electricscotland.com/history/america/udctalk.htm>; Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 219.

212. Mary Lund, “Legislative,” Minutes of the Ninety-Ninth Annual Convention, 1995, 76.

senators and representatives asking for their support for the State House Confederate flag.<sup>213</sup> In 1994, Mary Lund, as the South Carolina Division president, gave a speech during a Senate meeting on the Confederate flag issue in support of the flag.<sup>214</sup> In 2000, June Wells, in an address given at the South Carolina State House, asserted that, “I’m proud to be an American, not just any old plain kind, but a Southern American, one still proud to be represented by that flag of the Confederacy on the dome.”<sup>215</sup>

When the South Carolina Daughters did engage politically with the Confederate flag issue, however, they were more inclined to embrace compromise measures than other pro-flag groups like the SCV.<sup>216</sup> In 1994, the South Carolina UDC endorsed the Heritage Act whereas the SCV remained opposed to any proposal that removed the Confederate flag from the capitol dome.<sup>217</sup> In 2000, June Wells received backlash from other pro-flag groups when she indicated that she would be willing to substitute the Stars and Bars for the Confederate battle flag on the State House dome. Wells argued that the First National Flag was more representative of the entire Confederacy, both men and women, and it had a less controversial past than the Confederate battle flag. In response to the backlash, Wells did clarify that she wanted a Confederate flag, whether the First National or the Confederate battle flag, to fly atop the dome.<sup>218</sup> However, her openness to

---

213. Lund, “From Your Division President,” June 15, 1993, 1.

214. Mary Lund, “Remarks by Division President,” Senate Sub-Committee Hearing, Gressette Building, April 21, 1994, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

215. Wells, “United Daughters of the Confederacy,” *Electric Scotland*.

216. Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 219; Prince, *Rally ‘Round the Flag*, 163; Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 245-246.

217. Prince, *Rally ‘Round the Flag*, 163.

218. Susan Hill Smith, “June Wells: Preserving History of Confederacy is Her Life’s Work,” *Post and Courier*, February 26, 2000.

compromise stands in sharp contrast to rhetoric given by Gene Kizer, Jr., commander of the Congressman Preston S. Brooks Camp of the South Carolina SCV, who insisted that the only way to end the flag controversy was to “define the Battle Flag in terms of honor and write the flying of our Battle Flag into law.”<sup>219</sup> The South Carolina UDC’s willingness to consider alternatives to keeping the Confederate banner on the dome illustrates its own disinterest in the flag issue in comparison to the SCV and other pro-flag legislators.<sup>220</sup>

While the South Carolina UDC was inclined to support compromise measures to resolve the Confederate flag debate, the organization was a follower, not a leader during the flag dispute.<sup>221</sup> During the Confederate flag debate, the South Carolina UDC largely followed Courson’s and McConnell’s lead. In 1994, the South Carolina UDC endorsed the Heritage Act crafted in part by Courson and McConnell.<sup>222</sup> Furthermore, the South Carolina UDC’s public statements on the Confederate flag issue often followed the party line given by McConnell, Courson, and other pro-flag groups that the Confederate flag could not be dishonored by being removed from the State House dome.<sup>223</sup> In 1994, South Carolina UDC President Mary Lund asked members of the Senate to “allow a Confederate flag to fly over our State House.”<sup>224</sup> In 1996, Dot Broom, the South Carolina UDC president, sent a letter to Governor Beasley that explained, “It is our position in

---

219. Gene H. Kizer, Jr., “Recent Public Hearing on Battle Flag was Huge Victory for Us,” *Hit Him Again*, May 1994, 4, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boinea Papers, Box 18, Reports, 1993-94 folder, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

220. Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 219; Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 192, 197.

221. Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 219; Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 189, 192, 197.

222. Prince, *Rally ‘Round the Flag*, 163; Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 247.

223. Prince, *Rally ‘Round the Flag*, 204; Kizer, “Recent Public Hearing on Battle Flag,” 3; McConnell, “Confederate Memorial Day Celebration,” 6-7.

224. Lund, “Remarks by Division President,” April 21, 1994.

South Carolina that the flag should remain on top of the State House in a place where we can display the heritage of which we are all so proud.”<sup>225</sup> In 2000, June Wells stated that the Confederate flag should not be “lowered in dishonor.”<sup>226</sup> Wells’ position echoes McConnell’s own assertion that “to let the flag go from the dome would be to desert my ancestors, and to desert all the people who respect our heritage.”<sup>227</sup> Despite the South Carolina UDC’s close connections to the SCCRRM, the organization never attempted to contest McConnell’s and Courson’s argument that a museum, like the SCCRRM, was not an appropriate depository for the State House Confederate flag. Instead, the Daughters described Courson and McConnell as key legislative allies in the Confederate flag debate, and they asserted that McConnell had their “whole-hearted support” when it came to the flag issue.<sup>228</sup>

Again, the UDC’s silence on the Confederate flag-SCCRRM debate leads us back to the question, why? Why did the South Carolina UDC not challenge the pro-flag perception that the SCCRRM was a place where objects went to be forgotten? The organization’s complete silence on the matter makes it difficult to provide a definitive answer to this question. It is possible that the South Carolina UDC did not pose an alternative pro-flag narrative for the SCCRRM because the existing perception matched

---

225. Dot Broom to Governor David M. Beasley, November 14, 1996, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

226. Smith, “Preserving History of Confederacy is Her Life’s Work.”

227. Prince, *Rally ‘Round the Flag*, 172.

228. Mary Lund, “From Your Division President,” *United Daughters of the Confederacy South Carolina Division Newsletter*, December 1993, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; Lund, “Legislative,” Minutes of the Ninety-Ninth Annual Convention, 1995, 76.



with the organization's own views that a Confederate flag should fly from the capitol dome.<sup>229</sup> It is also possible that the South Carolina UDC did not want to risk its ties with pro-flag legislators by supporting the Confederate flag's relocation to the SCCRRM or presenting a narrative about the museum that challenged flag supporters' arguments about why the flag should not be moved there. The South Carolina UDC's connections to pro-flag lawmakers like McConnell, Courson, and Verne Smith were, after all, how the organization was able to use its legislative clout to advance and protect its influence over the museum. In other words, pro-flag legislators imbued the UDC with legislative power. Boineau made this connection explicit when she noted in her 1995 museum report to the South Carolina Daughters that McConnell was "always there when we need him."<sup>230</sup> From the Daughters' perspective, it was not worth it to antagonize their legislative allies over an issue that was not of paramount importance to their organization. Instead, the South Carolina UDC could use its acquiescence to McConnell's and Courson's leadership during the Confederate flag debate to build political capital for its organization with pro-flag legislators. This political capital could in turn aid the Daughters in a quest that was near and dear to their hearts—reclaiming authority over the SCCRRM.

#### REMOVING THE FLAG FROM THE DOME, 2000

Much of the discussion presented so far on the SCCRRM's involvement in the Confederate flag debate up to 2000 has revolved around opinions expressed about the

---

229. Fay M. Sloan, "Executive Board Meeting, December 7, 1996," Minutes of the One Hundred and First Annual Convention, United Daughters of the Confederacy, South Carolina Division, 1997, 78, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 6, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

230. Boineau, "S.C. Confederate Relic Room and Museum, Minutes of the Ninety-Ninth Annual Convention, 1995, 85.

museum by people who were not SCCRRM employees. It is, consequently, worthwhile to also consider the SCCRRM's role in the Confederate flag debate from the museum's perspective. At times, various legislators came to the museum to ask Roberson's advice on a particular legislative proposal to solve the Confederate flag debate, and the museum staff would offer their views on the proposal's feasibility. Additionally, during the first King Day at the Dome in 2000, the SCCRRM staff provided informational handouts about the Confederate flag from a historical perspective for participants in the protest. Moreover, Roberson explained that, as a state government agency, the museum would have adhered to any legislative directives to exhibit the State House Confederate flag at the museum. However, the SCCRRM tried to avoid becoming directly entangled in the politics that surrounded the Confederate flag controversy, and it was determined to stay neutral on the issue by not taking a side in the debate.<sup>231</sup>

As it happens, the SCCRRM never had to exhibit the State House Confederate flag, as the compromise that took the battle flag down from the State House dome sent it and the other State House banners to the State Museum.<sup>232</sup> This compromise measure, a close cousin of the 1994 Heritage Act, removed the battle flag from the capitol dome; it required that a square version of the Confederate battle flag fly at the Confederate Soldiers Monument; and it included a stipulation that prevented the removal or modification of historic monuments located on public property.<sup>233</sup> On April 12, 2000, the South Carolina Senate approved the Heritage Act of 2000 with a vote of thirty-six to

---

231. Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

232. Lee Bandy, "Two Ceremonies Planned for Day Flag Comes Down," *State*, June 16, 2000, 16, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

233. Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 250-251; Lefever, "Furling the South Carolina Confederate Flag," 93-95.

seven. On May 10, 2000, the South Carolina House voted sixty-three to fifty-six in favor of adopting the Senate compromise plan with certain revisions; for instance, the House version raised the flag pole's height at the monument to thirty feet. In the end, the compromise measure only received approval from three of the state's twenty-six Black representatives, and it was denounced by the South Carolina NAACP.<sup>234</sup> On May 23, Governor Hodges' signature made the Heritage Act a law. On July 1, 2000, the Confederate battle flag was removed from atop the State House. On July 4, 2000, the State Museum put on display the three Confederate flags previously located at the State House.<sup>235</sup>

Around twenty years later, journalist Adam Parker, in a newspaper article written in remembrance of June Wells, noted that Wells "did not seem terribly disappointed" after the Confederate flag was removed from the State House dome.<sup>236</sup> Parker's observation of Wells' calm acceptance of the 2000 compromise measure is one last indicator of the South Carolina UDC's tepid involvement in the South Carolina Confederate flag debate in comparison to other pro-flag groups. The South Carolina UDC acted as a follower, not a leader during the Confederate flag debate. Specifically, the organization followed the lead of pro-flag legislators Courson and McConnell. In mirroring their position on the flag debate, the South Carolina UDC did not attempt to articulate a counter narrative to Courson's and McConnell's claims that displaying the flag in a museum would taint the Confederate banner with shame and cause it to be

---

234. Lefever, "Furling the South Carolina Confederate Flag," 93-95; Prince, *Rally 'Round the Flag*, 245-246.

235. Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 250-251; "Confederate Flags Moved to Museum," *State*, July 4, 2000, 4, 8, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

236. Parker, "Confederate Museum Director."

forgotten by the public. While it is difficult to definitively evaluate the South Carolina UDC's silence in relation to the SCCRRM's position in the Confederate flag debate, it is possible that the organization did not want to risk its legislative influence by antagonizing pro-flag lawmakers over an issue that was not a top priority for the organization. As the next chapter demonstrates, the South Carolina UDC turned to one of these pro-flag legislators, Glenn McConnell, to advance its agenda for an issue that the organization cared deeply about—reclaiming its authority at the SCCRRM.

## CHAPTER 3: THE SCCRRM AND THE SOUTH CAROLINA UDC, 1996-2000

### A CONFEDERATE MUSEUM

For the SCCRRM, 1996 started much like 1986 had—with the museum’s director resigning. In July 1996, Martin, for reasons unknown, stepped down as the SCCRRM’s director, and Dr. Alan Pollack, from the South Carolina BCB, became the museum’s interim director.<sup>237</sup> Although the museum did not have a permanent director, an October 1996 article on the SCCRRM published in *The State* bore the optimistic headline “Future is Brightening for Confederate Past.” What was the reason for the article’s positive spin? According to Michael Sponhour, the article’s author, it was John Courson, a known Civil War buff and Confederate flag supporter, who had served in the senate since 1984. More specifically, Sponhour argued that the legislation Courson intended to introduce during the 1997 legislative session to “revamp the relic room” would help to “shake the dust” from the museum.<sup>238</sup>

In addition to officially placing the SCCRRM under the BCB’s control, Courson’s proposed legislation would transform the SCCRRM into a Confederate museum by removing all non-Confederate artifacts from the institution’s collection.

---

237. Boineau, “S.C. Confederate Relic Room and Museum,” Minutes of the Centennial Convention, 1996, 100.

238. Sponhour, “Future is Brightening,” 14; John Monk, “Longtime Richland Sen. Courson Resigns, Enters Guilty Plea in Corruption Probe,” *State*, June 4, 2018, <https://www.thestate.com/news/local/crime/article212475519.html>.

Courson maintained that narrowing the museum's exhibits and collection to the Confederate period would be a "real boom for tourism," as it would enable the museum to display many of its Confederate relics that were in storage.<sup>239</sup> Courson's promotion of his upcoming legislation to make the SCCRRM a Confederate museum came in the same year he was quoted as insisting that he would not support the State House Confederate flag being relocated to a museum, demonstrating flag critics' success in framing the narrative concerning the SCCRRM during the flag debate. The timing of Courson's legislative proposal suggests that his move to define the SCCRRM as a Confederate museum was driven by his desire to reclaim the museum for the Confederacy.<sup>240</sup>

The fact that Courson was discussing his plan to turn the SCCRRM into a Confederate museum implies that the museum itself was not already a Confederate museum, despite its name being the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum. As has already been discussed, the members of the Wade Hampton Chapter originally established the museum as a shrine to the Confederacy.<sup>241</sup> The SCCRRM's founding in 1896 coincided with the creation of several other Confederate museums across the South, including the Confederate Memorial Hall in New Orleans (1891), the Confederate Museum in Charleston (1894), and the Confederate Museum in Richmond (1896).<sup>242</sup> Unlike these Confederate museums, within a decade of its founding, the South

---

239. Sponhour, "Future is Brightening," 14.

240. Day, "'Lively' Museums," 69; Bandy, "Beasley Seeks Truce on Flag," 1.

241. Overton, "Girls of the Sixties," 9, 13-14.

242. John Bardes, "'Defend with True Hearts unto Death': Finding Historical Meaning in Confederate Memorial Hall," *Southern Cultures* 23, no. 4 (Winter 2017): 29-45, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26391717>; "About," The Museum at Market Hall, accessed March 2, 2021, <https://www.museumatmarkethall.com/about.html>; Reiko Hillyer, "Relics of Reconciliation: The Confederate Museum and Civil War Memory in the New South," *The Public Historian* 33, no. 4 (November 2011): 35-62,

Carolina Daughters sought to expand the SCCRRM's collection beyond the Confederacy to South Carolina history in general.<sup>243</sup>

According to the SCCRRM's institutional history, as early as 1901 the South Carolina Daughters collected artifacts from periods of South Carolina history outside of the Civil War because no other organization was doing so.<sup>244</sup> Records indicate that by 1926 the South Carolina Daughters were acquiring and preserving artifacts from other wars fought by South Carolinians, specifically the Spanish-American War and World War I. From 1962 to 1986, LaVerne Watson, as both the museum director and an UDC member, worked to expand the museum's scope to all periods of South Carolina history.<sup>245</sup> In 1982, the South Carolina Daughters supported the creation of a Confederate Relic Room and Museum Commission tasked with collecting, preserving, and exhibiting "artifacts pertaining to all periods of South Carolina history and culture."<sup>246</sup> In acquiring, preserving, and exhibiting artifacts related to general South Carolina history, the South Carolina Daughters expanded the SCCRRM into a museum of South Carolina history with an emphasis on the Confederate time period.<sup>247</sup>

---

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/tph.2011.33.4.35>; Emory M. Thomas, "Of Health and History," in *The Battlefield and Beyond: Essays on the American Civil War*, ed. Clayton E. Jewett (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2012), 310-325.

243. Cribb, "A Visit to the Confederate Relic Room and Museum," 5.

244. "The South Carolina Confederate Relic Room & Museum," *United Daughters of the Confederacy Magazine*, 19; "S.C. Confederate Relic Room and Museum," n.d., Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 18, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

245. DaFoe, "Shifting Authority," 9, 25.

246. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the Senate*, June 3, 1982, 2:2728.

247. DaFoe, "Shifting Authority," 25-28; Alexander, "Confederate Relic Room and Museum," 6-7.

As early as 1976, the SCCRRM's position as a South Carolina history museum was put into writing with a mission statement that included the collection and exhibition of "items of historical value from all periods of South Carolina history."<sup>248</sup> The SCCRRM's expansion into a museum that displayed artifacts related to South Carolina history in general is also evident in the institution's exhibits. At the War Memorial Building, the museum's home since 1971, the SCCRRM displayed objects in a lower and upper gallery. By 1986, in the museum's lower gallery, visitors could view items ranging from the early South Carolina pioneers to 1970s South Carolina history. For example, Case #9 contained a robe worn by Earle Morris, who was the state's Lieutenant Governor from 1971 to 1975. Case #12 exhibited artifacts about the burning of Columbia, such as a torch purportedly used by Sherman's men. The SCCRRM's upper gallery was dedicated to South Carolina veterans who fought in all the wars associated with the state. The gallery's displays largely appear to be arranged by time period. Time periods represented in the cases include the Revolutionary War, 1807-1850, the Confederacy, 1880-1900, World War I, World War II, the Korean War, and the Vietnam War. There were also cases on the USS *Columbia*, the Washington Light Infantry, and South Carolina astronauts.<sup>249</sup> In general, the SCCRRM's lower gallery held the majority

---

248. South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, "Annual Report Confederate Relic Room 1976-1977," 1977, 4.

249. Schoonover, "Possible Ways to Improve," 2; Cribb, "A Visit to the Confederate Relic Room and Museum," 6; South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, "Main Gallery," [ca. 1984], Dosty Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, "Upper Gallery," October 28, 1986, Dosty Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC. This sketch of the SCCRRM's lower and upper gallery in 1986 is based on written guides of the upper and lower galleries found in the Dosty Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers. The upper gallery guide is dated October 28, 1986. Unfortunately, the



of its exhibited Confederate artifacts. Boineau described the lower gallery as having a “very in-depth collection of artifacts, relics, and information on the Civil War,” and at least sixteen of the identified twenty-eight cases in the lower gallery contained some Confederate or Reconstruction artifacts. In contrast, of the sixteen known display cases in the upper gallery in 1986, only three cases exhibited objects related to the Civil War.<sup>250</sup> This breakdown in exhibits demonstrates that, while the Confederacy played a central role in the museum’s displays, the SCCRRM’s exhibits encompassed more than Confederate history. As a 1997 advertisement for the SCCRRM declared, the museum exhibited a “relic collection from the Colonial period through the space age with special emphasis on S.C.’s Confederate period.”<sup>251</sup>

The South Carolina UDC’s intentional efforts to position the Confederacy at the center of South Carolina history within the SCCRRM is particularly evident when comparing the SCCRRM’s development to that of the Confederate Museum in Charleston during the time period under study. In contrast to the SCCRRM, the Confederate Museum in Charleston, which was established by members of the Charleston

---

lower gallery guide is not dated, but it does have a written revision on it from 1984, making it likely that most of the guide’s information was applicable in 1986. South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, “Main Gallery”; South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, “Upper Gallery.”

250. Dotsy Boineau, “Upper Gallery Tour,” April 7, 1999, 9, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 19, South Carolinian Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, “Main Gallery”; South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, “Upper Gallery.” Not every display case that exhibited Confederate artifacts was exclusively devoted to the Confederacy. For instance, the museum’s 1807-1850 case in the upper gallery had a sword that was used during the Civil War along with other Mexican American War artifacts. South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, “Upper Gallery.”

251. DaFoe, “Shifting Authority,” 27-28; “Calendar,” *State*, December 26, 1997, 77, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

Chapter #4 in 1894, maintained its narrower focus on the Confederacy.<sup>252</sup> In 1988, June Wells, the Confederate Museum’s director, explained that the museum’s mission was to “show visitors the reality of the War Between the States,” and its 1995 advertisements in the *Post and Courier* still portrayed the museum as only exhibiting “flags, uniforms, swords, other Confederate memorabilia.”<sup>253</sup> From the SCCRRM’s early years, the South Carolina Daughters worked to tell the history of the Confederacy within the broader scope of South Carolina history, whereas the Confederate Museum in Charleston remained just that—a museum dedicated exclusively to the Confederacy.

In its efforts to expand the SCCRRM’s scope, the South Carolina UDC never sought to remove the Confederacy from the heart of South Carolina history or the museum’s interpretation. A 1986 article on the museum written by the South Carolina UDC indicated that the South Carolina Daughters were “collecting, preserving, and displaying the artifacts of the War Between the States, the period of history closest to our hearts.”<sup>254</sup> Likewise, Dotsy Boineau was still promoting the Lost Cause ideology at the

---

252. The Museum at Market Hall, “About”; June Wells, “Confederate Museum,” Minutes of the One Hundred and Sixth Annual Convention, United Daughters of the Confederacy, South Carolina Division, 2002, 88, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Unprocessed Additions Box, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

253. June Wells, “Confederate Museum Report 1988,” Minutes of the Ninety-Second Annual Convention, 1988, 67; “Museums,” *Post and Courier*, June 8, 1995, 46, NewsLibrary.com. In 2021, the Charleston Chapter #4 renamed the Confederate Museum to the Museum at Market Hall. Though the museum’s name changed, it retained its focus on the Confederacy. Robert Behre, “Behre: The Confederate Museum Continues On, Minus the ‘Confederate,’” March 16, 2021, *Post and Courier*, [https://www.postandcourier.com/opinion/commentary/behre-the-confederate-museum-continues-on-minus-the-confederate/article\\_752099f0-8112-11eb-9f3a-c30499770e83.html](https://www.postandcourier.com/opinion/commentary/behre-the-confederate-museum-continues-on-minus-the-confederate/article_752099f0-8112-11eb-9f3a-c30499770e83.html).

254. “The South Carolina Confederate Relic Room & Museum,” *United Daughters of the Confederacy Magazine*, 19.

museum. However, the South Carolina UDC envisioned the SCCRRM as a museum that centered the Confederacy within a larger story about South Carolina history. In 1996, Courson presented his vision for the SCCRRM that countered the South Carolina UDC's intentional expansion of the museum's collection beyond the Confederacy. In 1997, the South Carolina Daughters fought against Courson's efforts to constrain the SCCRRM's mission to Confederate history while simultaneously working to reclaim authority for their organization over the SCCRRM.

#### THE SCCRRM AND THE BUDGET AND CONTROL BOARD, 1997

Courson was certainly not the first nor the last person to suggest that the SCCRRM limit its mission to the Confederate time period. Recall that in 1982 Governor Riley vetoed the section in the 1982 appropriations bill creating a South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum Commission on the grounds that it extended the museum's mission beyond the Confederacy.<sup>255</sup> Paralleling Courson's efforts from 1996 to 1997, Darrell Jackson proposed expanding and updating the SCCRRM into a Confederate museum in 1999.<sup>256</sup> While Courson was not the only one to advocate for restricting the SCCRRM's focus, his efforts bear particular importance for the museum's story, because he actively championed his vision of the SCCRRM as a Confederate museum through legislation introduced during the 1997 General Assembly session. Though this legislation did not advance out of committee, Courson's bill prompted the South Carolina UDC, through McConnell, to craft its own legislation for placing the

---

255. South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives*, June 16, 1982, 1:4078.

256. Jackson, "Expanded, Updated Relic Room," 9.

SCCRRM under the BCB. The resulting legislation highlights the South Carolina Daughters' efforts to institutionalize positions of power for their organization in the SCCRRM and reclaim their authority over the museum.<sup>257</sup>

Though Courson's and McConnell's legislation contained distinct differences, they were both introduced to place the SCCRRM under the state BCB.<sup>258</sup> This similarity raises questions about why members of the South Carolina General Assembly sought to make the SCCRRM a state agency under the BCB in the first place. The answer to this question is multifaceted. First, the museum had no enabling legislation in 1997. It had existed as a line-item appropriation in the state's budget bill since 1909. The fact that the SCCRRM did not have a permanent place in the state's Code of Laws meant that it had no statutorily mandated mission, it did not have a defined reporting authority, and the museum's continued existence year-by-year depended on it receiving a yearly appropriation.<sup>259</sup>

In addition to not having any enabling legislation, the museum's governing board did not provide direct accountability over the SCCRRM director. The SCCRRM's 1985 reaccreditation report explained that the museum's governing board was composed of six

---

257. S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998), South Carolina Legislature, [https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=%22Relic%20Room%22&category=LEGISLATION&session=112&conid=36620092&result\\_pos=0&keyval=1120098&numrows=10](https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=%22Relic%20Room%22&category=LEGISLATION&session=112&conid=36620092&result_pos=0&keyval=1120098&numrows=10); Kenneth A. Davis to Glenn McConnell and J. Verne Smith, memorandum, February 5, 1997, 1, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 12, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998), South Carolina Legislature, [https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=Relic%20Room&category=LEGISLATION&session=112&conid=36519079&result\\_pos=0&keyval=1120548&numrows=50](https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=Relic%20Room&category=LEGISLATION&session=112&conid=36519079&result_pos=0&keyval=1120548&numrows=50).

258. S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998); S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998).

259. Schoonover, "Possible Ways to Improve," 3; Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

members. Three members were from the House Ways and Means committee and three were from the Senate Finance committee. All members of the governing board were appointed by their respective committee chairmen. The chairman of the Ways and Means committee served as the museum board's chairman. The museum governing board dealt exclusively with the financial aspects of the museum and left decisions about the SCCRRM's daily operations to the museum director. While the SCCRRM director enjoyed a "high degree of credibility" with the governing board, there was no defined authority over the museum director and staff, meaning that the SCCRRM had no accountability mechanism.<sup>260</sup> By 1996, members of the General Assembly were increasingly concerned with distinguishing who had oversight of the museum director. Alan Pollack, who was asked by the South Carolina governor to serve as the museum's interim director, explained in a 1996 letter written to Kim Igoe, the director of accreditation and museum standards for the AAM, that the state was "in the process of determining the actual governing laws for the director and staff of the museum," which would need to be clarified through legislation.<sup>261</sup> From the General Assembly's standpoint, then, giving the BCB administrative oversight of the SCCRRM would provide accountability for and a clear authority over the museum and the museum director.<sup>262</sup>

---

260. Alexander, "Confederate Relic Room and Museum," 2; Schoonover, "Possible Ways to Improve," 3.

261. Alan L. Pollack to Kim Igoe, July 31, 1996, Reaccreditation: Pre-1998 folder, Internal Archives, South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum, Columbia, SC.

262. Schoonover, "Possible Ways to Improve," 3.

The museum's artifacts provided a second reason for placing the SCCRRM under the BCB. More specifically, some members of the General Assembly were concerned that valuable items within the museum's collection were deteriorating due to a lack of preservation and necessary funding for their preservation.<sup>263</sup> Sponhour drew attention to the fragile state of some of the museum's artifacts in his 1996 article outlining Courson's legislative proposal. He observed that the banner carried by the Cedar Creek Rifles into battle during the Civil War was "in tatters, its shards stuffed in a plain paper box" in the SCCRRM.<sup>264</sup> Furthermore, Pollack, in his letter to Kim Igoe, stated that he was tasked with inventorying the museum's collection and creating a museum budget that would better enable the SCCRRM to "preserve, display, and acquire relics."<sup>265</sup> Placing the SCCRRM under the BCB's authority appears to have been part of a larger effort to conserve the museums' valuable but deteriorating artifacts, as members of the General Assembly believed that taking this action would provide the SCCRRM with more funds to preserve its collection.<sup>266</sup>

On January 14, 1997, Courson introduced bill S. 98 to create the South Carolina Confederate Museum.<sup>267</sup> In his initial discussion of the proposed legislation in 1996, Courson indicated that it was intended to place the SCCRRM under the State Budget and Control Board and revamp the SCCRRM into a Confederate Museum.<sup>268</sup> While

---

263. Schoonover, "Possible Ways to Improve," 3; Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

264. Sponhour, "Future is Brightening," 11.

265. Pollack to Igoe, July 31, 1996.

266. Schoonover, "Possible Ways to Improve," 3; Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

267. S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998).

268. Sponhour, "Future is Brightening," 14.

Courson's bill did establish the South Carolina Confederate Museum within the BCB, it essentially created a new Confederate museum from the SCCRRM's existing Civil War collection, as the legislation called for the SCCRRM's Confederate artifacts to be given to the new South Carolina Confederate Museum. Per the legislation's wording, the SCCRRM would cease to exist, and in its place would rise an exclusively Confederate museum.<sup>269</sup>

The bill's other provisions included a new South Carolina Confederate Museum Committee composed of five members, including the commander of the South Carolina SCV and the president of the South Carolina UDC, a clause that required the South Carolina Confederate Museum to "be a military and historical museum" limited to the "War Between the States" period, and a provision that bestowed the BCB's executive director with the authority to appoint the museum director. Similar to an existing proviso included in the state's annual funding since at least 1980, bill S. 98 also dictated that the South Carolina Confederate Museum could not dispose of any artifacts in its collection without the General Assembly's approval.<sup>270</sup>

Though Courson spearheaded the South Carolina Confederate Museum initiative, he was not the bill's sole sponsor. Other senators who introduced the bill with Courson included McConnell, Arthur Ravenel Jr., Verne Smith, and Joe Wilson, all champions of the State House Confederate flag.<sup>271</sup> After the bill's introduction, Ravenel explained to

---

269. S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998).

270. Act 517, 103rd sess. (1979-1980); S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998).

271. S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998); Prince, *Rally 'Round the Flag*, 146; Coski, *Confederate Battle Flag*, 246; Emily Bohatch, "Facing Fight of His Career, has SC's Wilson Done Enough in 19 Years to Win Reelection?" *State*, October 28, 2020, <https://www.thestate.com/news/politics-government/election/article246727726.html>.

the South Carolina UDC that he supported Courson's bill because he thought that the legislation was what the organization wanted. Ravenel's assumption could not have been further from the truth.<sup>272</sup>

On December 16, 1996, Dot Broom, president of the South Carolina UDC, sent Dotsy Boineau a draft version of Courson's bill.<sup>273</sup> To put it bluntly, Boineau tore bill S. 98 apart. Boineau disagreed with the bill's handling of the museum's name and artifacts. She argued that Courson's decision to change the museum's appellation from the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum to the South Carolina Confederate Museum ignored more than one hundred years of the institution's history, during which multiple publications had referred to the museum as the SCCRRM. She also denounced the legislation's stipulation that "Legal title or control of all artifacts, relics and historical records that relate to the period of the War Between the States" owned by the SCCRRM "must be transferred" to the South Carolina Confederate Museum. Boineau insisted that such an action could not and would not be taken because the South Carolina UDC had never given control of the SCCRRM's collection to the state of South Carolina and never intended to.<sup>274</sup>

Boineau also criticized the South Carolina Confederate Museum Committee's structure and functions. Under bill S. 98, the commander of the South Carolina SCV was listed before the president of the South Carolina UDC, making the SCV commander the

---

272. Dotsy Boineau, "Re Draft and Final Bill #98," 1997, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 14, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

273. Dot Broom to Dotsy Boineau, December 10, 1996, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 12, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

274. Boineau, "Re Draft and Final Bill #98"; S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998).



committee's chairman. This arrangement infuriated Boineau who maintained that the "SCV has never had anything to do with the Relic Room" and did not deserve to have control over the committee. Boineau argued that the UDC should not only have the chairmanship, but that the organization should constitute the majority of the committee members. She also asserted that limiting the UDC members on the committee to the present UDC president or her designee debarred other UDC members, who were more familiar with the museum, from participating. This comment likely reflected Boineau's own desire to serve on the museum committee, something that she would have found difficult to do under the structure established by bill S. 98.<sup>275</sup>

In addition to opposing the South Carolina Confederate Museum Committee's composition, Boineau disapproved of its delineated responsibilities. As written, the committee's duties included crafting rules for its operations, holding regular meetings, and writing an annual report for the General Assembly. Boineau, however, believed that the committee should provide other tangible assistance to the museum, such as raising funds for restoring artifacts. Essentially, Boineau wanted the committee to operate as a friends group for the museum. Her view that the committee members should raise funds to preserve the SCCRRM's artifacts reveals her own aversion to using state appropriations to restore items from the museum's collection. Boineau believed that using state money to preserve the museum's artifacts strengthened the state's claims to the museum's collection.<sup>276</sup>

---

275. Boineau, "Re Draft and Final Bill #98"; S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998).

276. Boineau, "Re Draft and Final Bill #98"; S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998); Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

The final significant criticism that Boineau leveled against bill S. 98 derived from the legislation's stipulation that the South Carolina Confederate Museum must limit its focus to collecting, preserving, and exhibiting "archives, books, records, documents, maps, charts, military equipment, uniforms, flags," and other artifacts related to the Civil War. In criticizing Courson's efforts to limit the SCCRRM's scope, Boineau highlighted the fact that the SCCRRM's, or in her view the UDC's, collection ranged from the colonial period to the present. She likewise denounced the draft bill's suggestion that any artifacts displayed in the War Memorial Building not pertaining to the Confederacy could be given to the State Museum for exhibition. While this proposal was removed from the bill's final version, Boineau maintained that the South Carolina UDC had compiled a significant collection of artifacts from "the late 1500's thru Desert Storm" that it would never allow to go to the State Museum or anywhere else for that matter. Of course, these provisions were key to creating Courson's vision for a South Carolina Confederate Museum from the SCCRRM, a vision that Boineau and the rest of the South Carolina UDC strongly opposed.<sup>277</sup>

The only provision that Boineau supported from Courson's bill, in either its draft or final form, did not make it into the legislation's final version. This section required the museum to be perpetually located at the War Memorial Building. From Boineau's perspective, bill S. 98 was "totally unsatisfactory to the UDC," and she minced few words in stating her opposition to Courson's attempts to create a South Carolina

---

277. Boineau, "Re Draft and Final Bill #98"; S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998); S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998), draft version, 1, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 12, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

Confederate Museum from the SCCRRM's collection.<sup>278</sup> Similar to the 1986 crisis over the accession books, Boineau's disapproval of S. 98 embodies the South Carolina UDC's perspective that its organization should have a significant say in the SCCRRM's operations as the museum's primary stakeholder, and its belief that the SCCRRM's artifacts belonged to the South Carolina UDC. According to Boineau, if a commission like Courson's South Carolina Confederate Museum Committee was necessary, then the UDC "would expect to have a majority 'say-so' as the collection, other than what has been purchased with State funds is almost entirely the UDCs."<sup>279</sup> As her comments indicate, from Boineau's perspective, bill S. 98 did not go far enough in recognizing the South Carolina UDC's long relationship with and influence over the SCCRRM, nor did it provide adequate avenues of influences through which the South Carolina UDC could exert control over the museum.

Moreover, Boineau's resistance to Courson's efforts to rename the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room further highlights how the South Carolina UDC's hostility to bill S. 98 was linked to the organization's efforts to protect and advance its influence at the SCCRRM. While Boineau's disapproval of Courson's name change may initially be dismissed as sentimental attachment, it is important to remember that the SCCRRM's name was intrinsically connected to the South Carolina UDC. As Boineau herself noted, the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room title was more than a hundred years old, stretching back to 1896 when the Wade Hampton Chapter first created the Confederate Relic Room. Though the museum's designation shifted slightly over the years from

---

278. S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998), draft version, 1; S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998); Boineau, "Re Draft and Final Bill #98."

279. Boineau, "Re Draft and Final Bill #98."

Confederate Relic Room to Confederate Relic Room and Museum, the core of the museum's name, much like its core constituency, remained the same.<sup>280</sup> The phrase South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum evoked a century-old relationship between the museum and the South Carolina UDC, a relationship that would be more obscured through a name change.

In the end, bill S. 98 met an inglorious end, as it died in the Senate Committee on Education. However, a few months after bill S. 98's demise, on March 19, 1997, McConnell introduced bill S. 548, which, among other provisions, called for the SCCRRM to be placed under the BCB's authority.<sup>281</sup> Though McConnell and Verne Smith introduced the bill, it was the product of at least three rounds of comments from Dotsy Boineau and the South Carolina UDC. On February 5, 1997, Kenneth Davis, the staff attorney with the Office of Senate Research involved in drafting the bill, sent McConnell and Verne Smith the first known draft of bill S. 548. In providing an overview of this draft legislation, Davis noted that while the legislation was modeled after bill S. 98, it contained changes that the senators had "suggested at the request of the

---

280. Kenneth A. Davis to Glenn McConnell and J. Verne Smith, memorandum, February 12, 1997, 2, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 11, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; Boineau, "Re Draft and Final Bill #98"; S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998); Girardeau and Thornley, *South Carolina Confederate Relic Room*, 3; "Interviews in Passing: May Visit Relic Room," *Columbia Record*, October 7, 1927, 6, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, "Annual Report South Carolina Confederate Relic Room 1981-1982," 1982, 1, South Carolina State Documents Depository, South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC, <http://hdl.handle.net/10827/17694>.

281. S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998); S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998).

United Daughters of the Confederacy.”<sup>282</sup> As Davis’s comments indicate, Dotsy Boineau and the South Carolina UDC ghost-wrote the bill.

At first glance, the South Carolina UDC’s active involvement in crafting legislation designed to make the SCCRRM a state agency directly accountable to the BCB seems incongruent. Why would the South Carolina UDC want to be involved in a bill that gave the state direct authority over the SCCRRM? While bill S. 548 made the SCCRRM a state agency under the BCB, the South Carolina UDC, led by Dotsy Boineau, used McConnell’s legislation to address Boineau’s criticism of bill S. 98 and create positions of power for the South Carolina UDC over the SCCRRM. Though the South Carolina UDC failed in its efforts to appoint a UDC member as the museum’s director in 1986, the organization was determined that any bill placing the SCCRRM under the BCB would advance, not diminish, the UDC’s influence at the museum. In playing an active role in bill S. 548’s creation, the South Carolina UDC moved from salvaging and protecting its influence over the SCCRRM after 1986 to directly attempting to reassert its control over the museum.

The first draft’s contents speak to the South Carolina UDC’s influence over the legislation, and its efforts to carve out positions of power for the organization through the bill. In contrast to Courson’s legislation, the early draft version of bill S. 548 called the museum the Confederate Relic Room, created a Confederate Relic Room Advisory Committee that listed the president of the South Carolina UDC first, stipulated that two UDC members should serve on the committee (one being the president and the other a

---

282. Davis to McConnell and Verne Smith, February 5, 1997, 1.

member elected by the UDC), and defined the museum's mission as encompassing the Civil War and "any period prior to or subsequent to the War." Another important provision in the draft legislation provided that none of the artifacts and records owned by the South Carolina UDC at the SCCRRM could be loaned, donated, or displayed without the organization's permission. The draft bill also required the museum to be located at the War Memorial Building, and it expanded the committee members' responsibilities to include fundraising obligations.<sup>283</sup>

In comparing the draft legislation with bill S. 98, it becomes clear that the draft bill addressed Boineau's major criticisms of Courson's legislation.<sup>284</sup> More importantly, through this bill, the South Carolina UDC would hold legislatively sanctioned authority over the museum. The bill did place the SCCRRM under the BCB, and the BCB would continue to appoint the museum's director, as the agency did in 1986. However, the draft bill specified that the BCB could not appoint a new SCCRRM director without UDC approval. The first draft version also required the SCCRRM director to "serve at the pleasure of the Board and UDC." Collectively, these provisions gave the South Carolina UDC veto power over candidates for the director position, and they designated the organization, in conjunction with the BCB, as the museum's main authority. Additionally, the South Carolina UDC was the only organization that held two positions on the Confederate Relic Room Advisory Committee, making the organization's voice two times stronger than other committee members.<sup>285</sup> In the aftermath of the 1986

---

283. S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998), first draft version, 1-3, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 12, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

284. S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998), first draft version, 1-3.

285. S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998), first draft version, 2.

director search, Dotsy Boineau buttressed the UDC's influence at the museum by acting as a UDC member employed by the SCCRRM and advancing the organization's Civil War ideology. However, as the draft bill's provisions indicate, the South Carolina UDC was no longer trying to maintain its influence at the museum through Dotsy Boineau's museum work; it was now actively reasserting its authority over the museum itself.

The first draft bill, however, was not the bill that McConnell introduced to the Senate. The early draft version aligned with the suggestions given by McConnell, Verne Smith, and the South Carolina UDC to improve bill S. 98, but Davis had his own concerns about the legality of some of the bill's provisions. Davis doubted the constitutionality of allowing the South Carolina UDC to elect an additional member to the Confederate Relic Room Advisory Committee. He also expressed concerns about the bill enabling the South Carolina UDC to approve the SCCRRM director. He observed that the draft legislation gave the UDC, a private organization, the "power to approve the appointment of a publicly-appointed and publicly-financed employee or official," which he described as a unique situation that could generate a court challenge. Davis further suggested that the Confederate Relic Room Advisory Committee have seven members instead of six in order to give the committee the chance to break any tie votes.<sup>286</sup>

Like Davis, Boineau also had her own criticisms of the first draft bill. She insisted that the name Confederate Relic Room and Museum be used throughout the draft legislation, instead of the term Confederate Relic Room. She questioned why the SCCRRM's annual report was not being sent to both the General Assembly and the BCB.

---

286. Davis to McConnell and Verne Smith, February 5, 1997, 1-2.

She also wanted to move the draft bill's provision that prevented the SCCRRM from deaccessioning any artifacts owned by the state in its collection without the General Assembly's approval to an earlier section of the legislation. Reflecting Davis's concerns, Boineau further recommended that the SCCRRM director serve as an ex-officio member on the Confederate Relic Room Advisory Committee, which would enable the board to have seven members. Additionally, Boineau added the phrase "financial goals for conservation, preservation, and acquisition" to the first draft bill's condition that "the committee shall primarily aid the room in developing financial goals."<sup>287</sup> This supplement to the existing provision mirrored Boineau's anxiety about using state funds to conserve, preserve, or acquire artifacts for the SCCRRM.<sup>288</sup>

In addition to providing her own comments on the draft legislation, Boineau met with Davis to address his concerns about the bill. In responding to Davis's doubts about the legality of the provisions related to the UDC election of a committee member and UDC approval of the SCCRRM director, Boineau requested that the South Carolina UDC retain the right to recommend a person for the director position. She also agreed to have the UDC endorse a candidate for the Confederate Relic Room Advisory Committee to an "appointing authority," rather than having the UDC elect a committee member.<sup>289</sup>

On February 12, 1997, Davis sent McConnell and Verne Smith the revised draft legislation. This new draft bill reflected both Boineau's comments on the original

---

287. Dotsy Boineau's Comments on First Draft Bill S. 548, 1997, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 12, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998), first draft version, 2.

288. Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

289. Davis to McConnell and Verne Smith, February 12, 1997, 1-2.



legislation and the compromises that Davis had reached with Boineau on key provisions during their meeting.<sup>290</sup> The phrase “financial goals for conservation, preservation, and acquisitions” was added at Boineau’s request. The SCCRRM director now had a place on the Confederate Relic Room Advisory Committee, and the committee now had to give an annual report to the BCB and the General Assembly. The section outlining the museum’s mandated collections policy was also moved to the beginning of the legislation. While these are relatively minor changes in wording and placement, the new draft legislation also contained more significant modifications. The South Carolina UDC no longer had the power to elect a UDC member to the Confederate Relic Room Advisory Committee. Instead, the South Carolina governor would now appoint a member to the committee based on the UDC’s recommendation. Furthermore, instead of approving the museum director, the South Carolina UDC now had the authority to recommend someone for the appointment. The museum director was also no longer tasked with serving at the UDC’s pleasure.<sup>291</sup>

While the new draft legislation was more circumspect in assigning the South Carolina UDC authority over the museum, the organization, both directly and indirectly, still had a say in choosing two members of the Confederate Relic Room Advisory Committee. Though this committee was advisory in nature, members of the committee could influence museum policy by making recommendations to the museum director about institutional goals, acquisitions, exhibits, and possible restorations. Likewise, the

---

290. Davis to McConnell and Verne Smith, February 12, 1997, 1.

291. S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998), second draft version, 1-3, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 11, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998), first draft version, 2.

legislation's provision that the UDC may recommend a person for the director position still gave the organization a seat at the table during any director searches. Through these measures, the draft bill still prescribed positions of power for the South Carolina UDC in relation to the SCCRRM, providing the organization with a legislative mandate for its future involvement in SCCRRM affairs.<sup>292</sup>

Though Boineau and the South Carolina Daughters had to cede some of the control that had been given their organization over the SCCRRM in the first draft bill, this was done to better ensure the legislation's passage and survival against any possible court challenges. For the South Carolina UDC, it was better to have a bill that created the SCCRRM as a state agency with formal statements of authority for its organization over the museum embedded in the legislation, than a bill that made the SCCRRM a state agency with no such requirements.<sup>293</sup> The South Carolina UDC's efforts to cement its influence over the museum as the institution's primary stakeholder through bill S. 548 is demonstrated in the process that produced the second round of draft legislation. At this point, the SCCRRM had no enabling legislation; it had no permanent place in the state's Code of Laws. Consequently, McConnell's legislation would not simply make the SCCRRM a state agency; it would create a legislatively mandated structure, policy, and mission for the museum. The South Carolina UDC was involved in this process to the point that Boineau's suggestions concerning the bill, no matter how nitpicky, were implemented to the letter. She literally was empowered to dictate the legislation's organization and meet directly with Davis, thus revealing the South Carolina UDC's

---

292. S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998), second draft version, 2-3.

293. Davis to McConnell and Verne Smith, February 12, 1997, 1-2; Dotsy Boineau's Comments on First Draft Bill S. 548.

ability to shape the museum's policy and its efforts to institutionalize its authority over the museum.<sup>294</sup>

While the second version of the draft legislation ameliorated Davis's concerns about the original version's constitutionality, it was also not the bill that McConnell introduced to the senate. On February 20, 1997, Davis sent McConnell and Verne Smith the third and final version of bill S. 548.<sup>295</sup> In many ways, the official bill was similar to its predecessors—except for three important additions. One of these changes is found in the provision dealing with the appointment of the museum's director. Bill S. 548 directed that the “UDC shall recommend” a person for the position, not “may recommend.” Though this change is small enough to be overlooked on a cursory reading of the draft legislation, there is a significant difference between the words “may” and “shall.” The word “may” implied that the South Carolina UDC could choose to recommend a person for the director position. The word “shall” left no doubt that the South Carolina UDC could and would take such action.<sup>296</sup>

A second, more obvious, addition stated that “all artifacts, relics, and historical records stored or displayed at the Confederate Relic Room and Museum are deemed the property of the South Carolina Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy,”

---

294. Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021; Schoonover, “Possible Ways to Improve,” 3; Dotsy Boineau's Comments on First Draft Bill S. 548; S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998), second draft version, 1-3.

295. Kenneth A. Davis to Glenn McConnell and J. Verne Smith, memorandum, February 20, 1997, 1, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 11, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

296. S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998), South Carolina Legislature, [https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=Relic%20Room&category=LEGISLATION&session=112&conid=36519079&result\\_pos=0&keyval=1120548&numrows=50](https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=Relic%20Room&category=LEGISLATION&session=112&conid=36519079&result_pos=0&keyval=1120548&numrows=50); S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998), second draft version, 3.

unless purchased by funds provided by the state. A related new provision asserted that “no artifacts, relics, or historical records stored or displayed at the Confederate Relic Room and Museum which are the property of the UDC shall be donated, used, transported, or displayed without approval of the UDC.”<sup>297</sup> Bill S. 548’s previous iterations also had a provision that recognized some UDC ownership over the museum’s collection. Specifically, the first and second draft bills stated that all the museum’s artifacts owned by the South Carolina UDC would “remain the property of the UDC.”<sup>298</sup> However, the earlier draft bills left the ownership of the museum’s collection up to interpretation, as these versions did not define which museum artifacts were owned by the South Carolina UDC. The new ownership provisions left no doubt that the South Carolina UDC owned all the museum’s artifacts that were not directly purchased through state funds.<sup>299</sup>

It should come as no surprise that bill S. 548, as it was introduced by McConnell and Verne Smith, contained a specific ownership provision suggested by Dotsy Boineau. Though Boineau raised the ownership issue to Davis, she did question whether it was prudent to include an ownership provision in the legislation. In describing her inquiry to McConnell and Verne Smith, Davis implied that there was ambiguity surrounding the South Carolina UDC’s claim to the museum’s collection. Davis argued that the South Carolina UDC had a reasonable claim to any artifacts purchased by the organization and any artifacts donated to the SCCRRM before the museum received a state appropriation.

---

297. S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998).

298. S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998), first draft version, 1; S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998), second draft version, 1.

299. S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998), first draft version, 1; S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998), second draft version, 1; S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998).

However, Davis also concluded that it was more difficult to determine whether the organization held ownership rights over any artifacts donated to the SCCRRM after the museum received state funding. For Davis, this ambiguity meant that an ownership clause could be both a benefit and a disadvantage for the UDC. The benefit of such a provision lay in the fact that it clearly defined the South Carolina UDC's rights to the museum's collection—potentially staving off future litigation. The disadvantage of such a provision lay in the fact that providing an overt ownership claim might raise questions about the validity of this claim. In the end, Davis asked McConnell and Verne Smith to decide whether the ownership sections would be included in the bill's final form, and they evidently concluded that the provisions' advantages outweighed their potential disadvantages.<sup>300</sup>

Bill S. 548's ownership provisions directly contradicted Courson's bill. Courson's legislation disregarded the South Carolina UDC's ownership claims over the SCCRRM's collection. In fact, bill S. 98 made these claims invisible by failing to acknowledge any direct UDC ownership of the museum's artifacts. From Courson's perspective, the museum's collection was controlled by the SCCRRM, not the South Carolina UDC.<sup>301</sup> In contrast, bill S. 548 proclaimed that the South Carolina UDC owned the museum's artifacts, unless they were purchased by funds given by the General Assembly or the state. It also rejected the view, expressed by Kenneth Davis during the drafting phase, that any artifacts donated to the SCCRRM after it began receiving state funding were actually donated to the state, rather than the South Carolina UDC, on the

---

300. S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998); Davis to McConnell and Verne Smith, February 12, 1997, 2.

301. S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998).

grounds that the SCCRRM could be considered a state agency upon receiving state funding. Bill S. 548's wording makes it clear that any items donated to the SCCRRM belonged to the UDC, regardless of when these items were donated. As such, bill S. 548 legitimized the South Carolina UDC's position that the majority of the museum's collection was UDC property.<sup>302</sup>

By establishing UDC ownership over a significant portion of the museum's collection, the legislation strengthened the South Carolina UDC's influence over the museum. After all, the organization that controlled the SCCRRM's artifacts would naturally have a significant say in the museum's operations. As an example, the bill specified that any artifacts owned by the South Carolina UDC in the museum's collection could not be used or displayed without the organization's approval. In effect, this stipulation provided the South Carolina UDC with veto power over any museum exhibit that contained artifacts owned by the organization, and, according to bill S. 548, the South Carolina UDC had ownership over the majority of the SCCRRM's collection.<sup>303</sup>

On March 19, 1997, McConnell introduced bill S. 548 to the senate. In some ways, the bill was similar to Courson's bill S. 98. Both bills placed the SCCRRM under the BCB. Both bills provided appropriations from the General Assembly for the museum. Both bills created a museum committee, though the bills differed in the responsibilities assigned to the committee. Both bills prohibited the museum from disposing of its artifacts without the General Assembly's approval, though tellingly bill S. 548 confined

---

302. S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998); Davis to McConnell and Verne Smith, February 12, 1997, 2; Boineau, "Re Draft and Final Bill #98."

303. S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998).

this provision to the artifacts owned by the state, not the UDC. However, bill S. 98 reflected Courson’s vision for the SCCRRM—a South Carolina Confederate museum. Bill S. 548 represented the South Carolina UDC’s vision for the SCCRRM—a museum that was still an integral part of the South Carolina UDC organization.<sup>304</sup>

Despite the vast differences between bill S. 98 and bill S. 548, they met the exact same end—both bills died in committee.<sup>305</sup> While Courson, McConnell, and the South Carolina UDC were not successful in enacting legislation that fulfilled their visions for the SCCRRM, the BCB received administrative oversight of the museum as a part of the 1997-1998 appropriations bill. By June 1998, the SCCRRM was officially a state agency under the BCB.<sup>306</sup> The SCCRRM-related provisions included in the appropriations bill provided that the museum could not deaccession any artifacts owned by the state without the General Assembly’s approval; they gave the BCB’s executive director the authority to appoint the museum’s director upon consultation with the president of the South Carolina UDC and the commander of the South Carolina SCV; and they transferred custody of the War Memorial Building to the BCB. It is important to note that these were temporary provisions. Unlike Courson’s and McConnell’s bills, the temporary provisions did not create a fixed position for the SCCRRM in the South Carolina Code of Laws.<sup>307</sup>

---

304. S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998); S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998).

305. S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998); S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998).

306. Act 155, 112th sess., (1997-1998), South Carolina Legislature, [https://www.scstatehouse.gov/sess112\\_1997-1998/bills/3400.htm](https://www.scstatehouse.gov/sess112_1997-1998/bills/3400.htm); Roberson, “The South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum,” *United Daughters of the Confederacy South Carolina Division Newsletter*, 3.

307. Act 155, 112th sess., (1997-1998); S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998); S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998).

As a whole, the SCCRRM section in the 1997-1998 appropriations bill was much smaller in scope than Courson's and McConnell's bills. It also reflected the South Carolina UDC's failure to embed authority for its organization over the SCCRRM in enabling legislation for the museum. Nevertheless, several of the provisions in this section demonstrate the South Carolina UDC's continued influence over the SCCRRM, as well as the organization's ability to affect legislation related to the museum. For instance, the SCCRRM section in the appropriations bill specified that the South Carolina BCB would appoint the museum director after consulting with the president of the South Carolina UDC and the commander of the South Carolina SCV. This stipulation guaranteed that the South Carolina UDC would continue to be involved in the museum's director searches. It also provided legislative recognition of the organization's position as an important institutional stakeholder.<sup>308</sup>

Another provision in the appropriations bill detailed the General Assembly's desire to relocate the SCCRRM to the Columbia Mills Building where it would operate as a "separate and distinct facility" from the State Museum under the BCB.<sup>309</sup> Though the South Carolina UDC would have preferred for the museum to remain in the War Memorial Building, it is significant that the provision moving the SCCRRM to the Columbia Mills Building, the State Museum's home, explicitly stated that the SCCRRM would remain separate from the State Museum. Martha Van Schaick, the South Carolina UDC president in 2004, attributed this phrasing to McConnell, whom she described as

---

308. Act 155, 112th sess., (1997-1998); S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998); S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998).

309. Act 155, 112th sess., (1997-1998); S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998); S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998).



being “instrumental in acquiring a distinctively designed section” for the SCCRRM in the Columbia Mills Building.<sup>310</sup>

The South Carolina UDC’s ongoing ability to wield its legislative influence in relation to the SCCRRM is also evident in the provisions that were not included in the 1997-1998 appropriations bill. As a case in point, the museum remained the Confederate Relic Room and Museum; it did not become a Confederate museum. In fact, the SCCRRM section in the appropriations bill did not delineate a mission for the museum. Similarly, the provisions did not address the ownership of the museum’s collection, either in favor or against the South Carolina UDC. On the surface, the absence of an ownership clause for the South Carolina UDC in the appropriations bill appeared to work against the organization. After all, the South Carolina UDC’s claim for authority over the museum rested on its assertion that the majority of the SCCRRM’s collection belonged to its organization. However, the appropriations bill also did not contain any provision giving the state full control over the museum’s collection, which was certainly in the UDC’s favor. Dot Broom recognized this point when she reported to the South Carolina Daughters that the appropriations bill did not include that “clause that would have claimed our possessions,” unlike Courson’s legislation.<sup>311</sup>

---

310. Boineau, “Re Draft and Final Bill #98”; Martha Van Schaick to Mrs. Lawrence L. Limpus, November 4, 2004, Dotsy Diane Llyod Boineau Papers, Box 9, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

311. Act 155, 112th sess., (1997-1998); Boineau, “Re Draft and Final Bill #98”; Dot Broom, “Officers’ Reports 1998,” Minutes of the One Hundred and Second Annual Convention, United Daughters of the Confederacy, South Carolina Division, 1998, 43, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 7, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC. The issue of who owns the SCCRRM’s collection is still unresolved. Roberson explained that the lead lawyer for the BCB at the time did not feel the need to delineate between what was and what was not owned by the South Carolina

While the South Carolina UDC's legislative pull did not extend to the successful passage of its handcrafted bill, the Daughters' legislative allies, specifically McConnell, ensured that their long-standing efforts to maintain the SCCRRM's independence from the State Museum would not be undermined. Despite its inability to create enabling legislation for the SCCRRM that institutionalized UDC authority at the museum, the South Carolina UDC's continued capacity to use its legislative clout to maintain the SCCRRM's independence and prevent the museum from becoming a Confederate museum demonstrates its ongoing importance to the SCCRRM as a primary stakeholder.

#### THE 1997 SCCRRM DIRECTOR SEARCH

As required by the 1997-1998 appropriations bill, the BCB initiated its search for a new SCCRRM director in 1997, and, similar to 1986, the South Carolina UDC was right in the middle of this process.<sup>312</sup> The South Carolina UDC viewed Martin's appointment to the museum's director position in 1986 as an aberration that hopefully would not be repeated in future director searches.<sup>313</sup> After all, Martin was the son of a powerful South Carolina senator. Surely his elevation to the museum director role was merely a reflection of his political connections rather than a harbinger of how future

---

UDC. In his mind, the ownership issue would not be a true issue unless the South Carolina UDC pursued a lawsuit against the museum. Additionally, dual ownership over the museum's artifacts was never a concern for the AAM, which accredits the museum. Ultimately, the BCB concluded that the South Carolina UDC had a legitimate claim to less than 10% of the museum's collection. However, the particulars over who owns what in the museum's collection remains undefined. Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

312. Act 155, 112th sess., (1997-1998); Alan L. Pollack to Kim Igoe, June 18, 1997, Reaccreditation: Pre-1998 folder, Internal Archives, South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum, Columbia, SC; Sloan, "Executive Board Meeting, October 9, 1997," Minutes of the One Hundred and First Annual Convention, 1997, 83-84.

313. Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

director searches would unfold.<sup>314</sup> Thus, in the wake of Martin's resignation in 1996, the South Carolina UDC saw its opportunity to reclaim the director position for the UDC, thereby cementing the organization's influence over the museum itself. As Dot Broom explained in her 1998 President's Report, she pursued two objectives during her involvement in the SCCRRM director search. Her first objective was to protect the UDC-owned artifacts at the SCCRRM. Her second objective was to "get one of our own appointed as the Director of the Relic Room and Museum."<sup>315</sup>

Broom's inclusion in the BCB's five-member selection committee facilitated her quest to secure the directorship for a UDC member. Broom, as the South Carolina UDC's president, was likely included in this search committee because of the 1997-1998 appropriations bill. Recall that this bill included a provision requiring the BCB's executive director to select the SCCRRM director in consultation with the president of the South Carolina UDC and the commander of the South Carolina SCV. While the South Carolina UDC failed to reclaim power for its organization over the SCCRRM through legislation, the provisions passed to place the SCCRRM under the BCB aided the organization's efforts to take back the SCCRRM directorship.<sup>316</sup>

Through her involvement in the search committee, Broom called attention to the South Carolina UDC's unique relationship with the SCCRRM and asserted the organization's right to have a say in the museum's operations. Broom communicated to

---

314. DaFoe, "Shifting Authority," 35.

315. Broom, "Officers' Reports 1998," Minutes of the One Hundred and Second Annual Convention, 1998, 43.

316. Sloan, "Executive Board Meeting, October 9, 1997," Minutes of the One Hundred and First Annual Convention, 1997, 83-84; Act 155, 112th sess., (1997-1998).

every candidate for the director position that the South Carolina UDC “had a major role” at the SCCRRM and that the UDC “was going to be there, we are going to be heard, and we are going to be reckoned with.”<sup>317</sup> She also “spoke very deliberately and distinctly to the members of the committee” when expressing her opinions about who should be the next director. Resolute and direct, Broom minced few words in her attempt to recover South Carolina UDC authority over the museum by securing the appointment of a UDC member as the next director. Broom’s words left no doubts that the South Carolina UDC saw itself as a power player at the SCCRRM.<sup>318</sup>

Having established the fact that the South Carolina UDC intentionally sought to have one of its own appointed as the museum’s next director, the question naturally becomes, who did the South Carolina UDC envision at the museum’s helm? The answer to this question brings our attention back to a familiar face—Dosty Boineau. Boineau had been in this position before. In 1986, she was one of the candidates considered by the BCB for the SCCRRM director position. However, in 1986, the BCB rejected Boineau in favor of Martin. More importantly, in 1986, the South Carolina UDC did not choose Boineau as its preferred candidate. Recall that the South Carolina UDC selected Renee Watts to become the museum’s next director. The South Carolina UDC’s preference for Watts over Boineau may have stemmed from the fact that Watts was a member of the

---

317. Sloan, “Executive Board Meeting, October 9, 1997,” Minutes of the One Hundred and First Annual Convention, 1997, 84.

318. Sloan, “Executive Board Meeting, October 9, 1997,” Minutes of the One Hundred and First Annual Convention, 1997, 84; Broom, “Officers’ Reports 1998,” Minutes of the One Hundred and Second Annual Convention, 1998, 43.

Wade Hampton Chapter, the South Carolina UDC chapter that had selected all the museum's former directors, and Boineau was not.<sup>319</sup>

In 1997, however, the South Carolina UDC rallied around Boineau as its preferred candidate for the museum's new director. In her June 12, 1997 letter to the BCB, Dot Broom, representing the South Carolina UDC, asked for Boineau to be appointed as the SCCRRM's next director. Broom explained that the South Carolina UDC was making this recommendation after polling more than 1700 members of the South Carolina Division. Broom and the South Carolina Daughters had made their decision. From their view, the next SCCRRM director should rightfully be UDC member Dotsy Boineau.<sup>320</sup> To reinforce the South Carolina UDC's decision, James Lander, Broom's senator from Senate District #18, and McConnell endorsed Boineau for the director position.<sup>321</sup> From Boineau's own perspective, the SCCRRM directorship was hers to lose. She was the heir apparent to LaVerne Watson and the South Carolina UDC's legacy at the museum.<sup>322</sup>

The South Carolina UDC endorsed Boineau for the director role, but the BCB's executive director was ultimately the person who would make the final decision. In 1997,

---

319. South Carolina Budget and Control Board, Minutes of State Budget and Control Board Meeting, Executive Session, March 25, 1986, 22; "Deaths and Funerals," *State*, October 29, 1990, 7; Beth Dickey, "Mrs. Boineau Believes in Service," *Columbia Record*, June 21, 1972, 23, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

320. Dot Broom to the Chairman of the Budget & Control Board, June 12, 1997, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 12, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

321. Broom, "Officers' Reports 1998," Minutes of the One Hundred and Second Annual Convention, 1998, 43; James A. Lander to Luther F. Carter, July 25, 1997, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 13, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

322. Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

Dr. Luther Carter served as the BCB's executive director.<sup>323</sup> While the South Carolina UDC viewed Dotsy Boineau as the most qualified person to lead the SCCRRM, in December 1997, Governor David Beasley, Richard A. Eckstrom (State Treasurer), Earle E. Morris, Jr. (Comptroller General), Senator John Drummond (Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee), and Representative Henry E. Brown, Jr. (Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee) endorsed Luther Carter's decision to appoint William Allen Roberson as the SCCRRM's next director.<sup>324</sup> Prior to his selection, Roberson had worked at the McKissick Museum and the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, and he was employed as a collections curator at the US Marine Corps Museum on Parris Island. The BCB saw Roberson as the ideal candidate to professionalize and revitalize the museum, as well as to oversee the institution's imminent move to the Columbia Mills Building.<sup>325</sup> The BCB hired Roberson as a part of its efforts to professionalize the museum staff.<sup>326</sup> Under Roberson's direction, the SCCRRM transformed from a museum focused on South Carolina history with an emphasis on the Confederate period to a museum of South Carolina military history.

---

323. Pollack to Igoe, June 18, 1997.

324. South Carolina Budget and Control Board, Minutes of State Budget and Control Board, December 9, 1997, 1, 24, Minutes and Attachments of the Budget and Control Board, 1940-1998, South Carolina Electronic Records Archive, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, SC, <http://earchives.sc.gov/file/sdb%3AdigitalFile%7Cc0dc3422-5a69-4b12-bf0c-c9e06b6e677f/>.

325. "State Report: News from Around South Carolina," *State*, December 10, 1997, 19, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers "Biography: Allen Roberson," accessed March 2, 2021, <http://sevcamp47beaufortsc.com/attachments/Allen%20Robertson%20Biography.pdf>.

326. Fritz Hamer, curator of history/archivist at the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum, email message to Caitlin Cutrona, April 7, 2020.

## A MUSEUM OF SOUTH CAROLINA MILITARY HISTORY

Roberson's appointment as the SCCRRM's new director and his subsequent efforts to refine the museum's scope to South Carolina military history brings us back to the question that started this thesis section—what type of museum would the SCCRRM be? As indicated, bill S. 98 and bill S. 548 were not just competing efforts to place the SCCRRM under the BCB, they also embodied competing visions of the SCCRRM itself. On one hand, bill S. 98 enacted Courson's vision to create a Confederate museum from the SCCRRM's collection. On the other hand, bill S. 548 legislated the South Carolina UDC's vision of the SCCRRM as a museum that placed the Confederacy at the center of South Carolina's history.<sup>327</sup> The 1997-1998 appropriations bill giving the BCB administrative oversight of the SCCRRM did not delineate a mission for the museum. This meant that the temporary provisions did not provide a definitive answer to the question of whether the SCCRRM should be a Confederate museum or a museum of South Carolina history with an emphasis on South Carolina's Confederate period.<sup>328</sup> Instead, Roberson ended this debate when he intentionally sought to change the SCCRRM from a museum that focused on general South Carolina history to a South Carolina military museum.<sup>329</sup>

Military history has always been a central part of the museum's interpretation. While the members of the Wade Hampton Chapter exhibited artifacts that commemorated and vindicated both Confederate men and women, many of these artifacts

---

327. S. 548, 112th sess. (1997-1998); S. 98, 112th sess. (1997-1998); Sponhour, "Future is Brightening," 14.

328. Act 155, 112th sess., (1997-1998).

329. W. Allen Roberson, interview by Caitlin Cutrona, March 9, 2021.

invoked memories of Confederate soldiers' wartime sacrifices, including swords, guns, cannonballs, shells, bullets, Confederate battle flags, and soldiers' knapsacks and canteens.<sup>330</sup> The museum's exhibits at the War Memorial Building also reflected its military history emphasis with the SCCRRM's upper gallery dedicated to South Carolina's veterans. In fact, fourteen of the sixteen known upper gallery exhibits in 1986 displayed artifacts related to South Carolina's military history.<sup>331</sup> As Courson, McConnell, and Wilson explained in their letter to Governor Campbell recommending Boineau for the Order of the Palmetto, the SCCRRM prior to Roberson's administration presented aspects of South Carolina's "cultural and military history."<sup>332</sup>

Under Roberson's direction, however, the SCCRRM shifted from being a general South Carolina history museum that exhibited artifacts related to the state's military history, particularly the Civil War, to a museum of South Carolina military history. During fiscal year 1997-1998, the SCCRRM's mission statement specified that the museum was "dedicated to the accumulation, preservation, and exhibition of a collection reflecting" South Carolina's heritage.<sup>333</sup> However, by 1999, the museum's mission statement read, "Our emphasis is on South Carolina's Confederate era, but we hold in trust artifacts, papers, art, and memorabilia of lasting historical and traditional value for the education, enrichment, and inspiration of all who are interested in South Carolina's

---

330. Overton, "Girls of the Sixties," 14-19.

331. South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, "Upper Gallery."

332. Courson, McConnell, and Wilson to Campbell, April 12, 1993, 1.

333. South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, "Confederate Relic Room," 1998, 1, South Carolina State Documents Depository, South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC, <http://hdl.handle.net/10827/17687>.



distinguished military heritage from the colonial era to the present.”<sup>334</sup> By 2002, the SCCRRM opened in its new location at the Columbia Mills Building with a permanent exhibit, known as the “South Carolina Martial Tradition,” that told a narrative about the state’s military history from the Revolutionary War to more current conflicts.<sup>335</sup> By 2006, the institution’s new military history mission was embedded in the museum’s name itself when the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum became the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum (SCCRRMM).<sup>336</sup>

A full examination of the changes that Roberson instituted at the SCCRRM upon becoming the museum director does not fit within this thesis’s scope or focus. However, a short survey of the museum’s changing mission, exhibits, and name reveal Roberson’s purposeful efforts to transform the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum into a South Carolina military museum. In leading the SCCRRM to this new mission, Roberson’s administration settled the debate over the museum’s purpose. The SCCRRM would not be a Confederate museum, nor a South Carolina history museum with an emphasis on South Carolina’s Confederate history. Instead, it became a museum of South Carolina military history with a focus on the individual men and women who fought for

---

334. South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, “South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum,” 1999, 1, South Carolina State Documents Depository, South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC, <http://hdl.handle.net/10827/17688>.

335. “Exhibits,” South Carolina Confederate Relic Room & Military Museum, accessed March 19, 2021, <https://www.crr.sc.gov/exhibits>; Schoonover, “Possible Ways to Improve,” 3.

336. “A Museum by Any Other Name,” *State*, July 1, 2006, 16, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

the Confederacy.<sup>337</sup> This shift in the SCCRRM's mission after Roberson's appointment to the director position parallels a similar shift in Confederate commemoration that occurred during the Confederate flag controversy when pro-flag groups sought to defend the Confederate battle flag by associating it with individual Confederate soldiers, not the Confederate government. This pro-flag defense was based on Americans' commemoration of Vietnam War veterans which also memorialized individual soldiers rather than the broader war.<sup>338</sup>

#### DOTSY BOINEAU: A CONTINUED INSTRUMENT OF UDC INFLUENCE, 1998-2000

As indicated, an in-depth interpretation of Roberson's ongoing directorship at the SCCRRM is beyond the thesis's scope. However, Dotsy Boineau's continuing employment at the museum during the early stages of Roberson's administration provides insight into the South Carolina UDC's persistent influence at the museum from 1998 to 2000 as an important museum stakeholder. Throughout 1997, the South Carolina UDC moved from salvaging and protecting its influence at the SCCRRM to attempting to reclaim direct authority over the museum itself. With the help of pro-flag legislator McConnell, the South Carolina UDC crafted museum enabling legislation that, across various iterations, placed the president of the South Carolina UDC on the museum's advisory committee, gave the organization ownership over the majority of the museum's collection, and required the museum director to serve at the UDC's pleasure. In other words, the South Carolina Daughters tried to establish their control over the SCCRRM

---

337. Wilkinson, "Relic Room Breaks Attendance Record," 6; "S.C. Confederate Relic Room and Museum," *State*, June 27, 2003, 76, NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers; Schoonover, "Possible Ways to Improve," 2.

338. Brown, *Civil War Canon*, 226-231.

through legislative means. When this effort failed, the organization sought to regain the museum director position, which was an endeavor that also ended in failure.

Yet, similar to its 1986 defeat, the South Carolina UDC continued to have a special relationship with the museum as one of the SCCRRM's core stakeholders from 1998 to 2000. This special relationship was evident prior to Roberson being selected as the museum's next director. During the director search, Stephen Osborne, director of the Budget and Analyses Division for the Budget and Control Board, reassured Dot Broom that regardless of who was chosen as the museum's new director, the BCB would ensure that the UDC's interests were taken into account.<sup>339</sup> The South Carolina Daughters would likely argue that their organization would benefit best from the BCB appointing a UDC member as the museum's director. However, the fact that Osborne assured the president of the South Carolina UDC that her organization's concerns would be considered in whatever decision was made demonstrates that the state entity operating as the museum's direct authority, not just the South Carolina UDC, had a vested interest in maintaining the special relationship between the museum and the South Carolina UDC.

Following through with Osborne's assurances, the BCB directed Roberson to work with the South Carolina UDC and retain a cordial relationship with the organization, because the UDC held a special position at the museum as the institution's founders.<sup>340</sup> Roberson demonstrated his conciliatory attitude toward the South Carolina

---

339. Sloan, "Executive Board Meeting, October 9, 1997," Minutes of the One Hundred and First Annual Convention, 1997, 84; Mark Berry, "President Osborne: The Wonderful Oz," *College of Charleston Magazine*, January 17, 2019, <https://today.cofc.edu/2019/01/17/president-osborne-the-wonderful-oz/>.

340. Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

UDC in his 2001 report to the organization. In this report, Roberson acknowledged that the SCCRRM had transformed from a museum founded by the Wade Hampton Chapter to a state-supported agency. However, he insisted that the “museum still maintains its original identity and mission and considers its ongoing relationship with the United Daughters of the Confederacy of paramount importance.”<sup>341</sup> Despite the many changes that the museum underwent since its founding, more than a hundred years later, the South Carolina UDC’s legacy lived on at the museum through Roberson’s assertion that the South Carolina UDC shared a personal connection with the SCCRRM.

Notwithstanding the BCB’s assurances, the South Carolina UDC had a rocky relationship with Roberson during the first few years of his administration.<sup>342</sup> Fissures in the South Carolina UDC’s relationship with the SCCRRM director were evident in the sometimes-contentious relationship between Roberson and the South Carolina UDC’s representative at the museum—Dotsy Boineau. Roberson explained that the first comment that Boineau made to him upon becoming the SCCRRM’s director was that he had stolen her job. Though Roberson and Boineau had moments of cordiality in their working relationship, they were often at odds with one another as Boineau worked to undermine Roberson’s position relative to the South Carolina UDC. She resented having Roberson as her superior, and she opposed Roberson’s decision to change her museum position to archivist rather than to historian sometime between 1998 and 1999. Symbolizing the tension that existed between Boineau and Roberson, Boineau lobbied

---

341. Allen Roberson, “South Carolina Relic Room and Museum,” Minutes of the One Hundred and Fifth Annual Convention, 2001, 95.

342. Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

Roberson's superiors at the BCB to be called the museum's historian emeritus, despite his decision to give the position to another staff member.<sup>343</sup>

While there was no love lost between Boineau and Roberson, Boineau, as the museum's archivist, continued to fulfill her role as an instrument of UDC influence at the SCCRRM after the 1997 director search. As a part of her museum activities from September 1998 to January 2000, Boineau reviewed a Jefferson Davis Highway pamphlet for the UDC Revisions Committee, created seating arrangements for the SC Division Convention, and met with Dot Broom about the 2001 UDC General Convention.<sup>344</sup> While these were all UDC-related activities, Boineau performed this work and attended these meetings as a museum staff member, not as a UDC member, thus demonstrating how Boineau persisted in amalgamating her museum and UDC responsibilities. Likewise, Boineau continued editing the *Recollections and Reminiscences* series for the South Carolina UDC as a part of her official museum duties. In fact, Roberson described Boineau's editing tasks as her main museum responsibility.<sup>345</sup> Boineau also continued to reinforce the South Carolina UDC's position as an important SCCRRM stakeholder through her yearly museum reports that provided the South Carolina Daughters with insider information about the museum itself.<sup>346</sup> In much the same way that she did from 1986 to 1996, from 1998 to 2000, Boineau advanced the perspective that the South

---

343. Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

344. Dotsy L. Boineau, "September, 1998 Report," 1, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 19, Monthly Reports folder, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; Dotsy L. Boineau, "January 2000 Report," 1, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 19, Monthly Reports folder, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

345. Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

346. Boineau, "South Carolina Relic Room and Museum," Minutes of the One Hundred and Fourth Annual Convention, 2000, 84.

Carolina UDC and the SCCRRM were synonymous; she promoted the Lost Cause ideology at the museum and she reinforced the UDC's position as an important institutional stakeholder. In many ways, then, Boineau continued to advance and embody the South Carolina UDC's influence at the SCCRRM from 1998 to 2000, just like she did after the 1986 director search. Through Boineau, the South Carolina UDC's efforts to salvage, protect, and reclaim its authority over the SCCRRM came full circle.

Much as it did from 1986 to 1996, the SCCRRM legitimized Boineau's efforts to advance UDC influence at the museum. Many of the functions that Boineau performed for the UDC were a part of her official museum responsibilities. For instance, of the five essential job responsibilities detailed in paperwork describing the museum's archivist position in 1998, two of them, maintaining the UDC records and editing the *Recollections and Reminiscences* series, were directly affiliated with the South Carolina UDC and accounted for fifty percent of the archivist's "performance success criteria."<sup>347</sup> By incorporating UDC-related work into the archivist's position, the SCCRRM sanctioned the tasks that Boineau completed on behalf of the UDC, further solidifying the two organization's symbiotic relationship.

With Boineau's assistance, from 1986 to 2000, the South Carolina UDC reinforced the perspective that the SCCRRM was an integral part of its organization; it advanced its Lost Cause ideology; it promoted its own institutional growth; it attempted to craft legislation that placed the SCCRRM under the BCB on terms favorable to the South Carolina Daughters; and it tried to reclaim the museum director role for the South

---

347. Roberson, "State of South Carolina Position Description," September 22, 1998.

Carolina UDC. In this way, the South Carolina UDC-SCCRRM relationship from 1986 to 2000 flips the script on existing museum stakeholder literature by demonstrating how an institutional stakeholder attempted to use its influence at a museum for its own benefit. In looking past 2000, however, Boineau's central role in maintaining UDC influence at the museum begs the question, would the South Carolina UDC continue to exert influence over the museum and operate as a primary museum stakeholder once Boineau retired?

## CONCLUSION

Due to ongoing health issues and at the advice of her doctor, Boineau retired from her position at the SCCRRM on June 6, 2000 at the age of seventy-one.<sup>348</sup> In a speech given at Boineau's retirement party, Allen Roberson remarked that "Dotsy fervently believed in this museum and its collection and was always quick in defense against any perceived threat to the Relic Room's proud traditions that developed for over a century."<sup>349</sup> While Dotsy was dedicated to the SCCRRM, as a UDC member she served as an instrument of UDC influence through her work at the museum. Consequently, Boineau's retirement, similar to John Martin's appointment as SCCRRM acting director in 1986, had the potential to be a watershed moment in the SCCRRM-UDC relationship.

Though the South Carolina UDC lost its direct authority to appoint a museum director in 1986, the organization used a variety of methods to advance and protect its influence over the museum as an important institutional stakeholder from 1986 to 2000. In the wake of multiple blows to South Carolina UDC authority over the SCCRRM in 1986, the organization sought to salvage its position of influence at the museum through Dotsy Boineau. Then, when government restructuring efforts in 1993 threatened to

---

348. Dotsy Lloyd Boineau to W. Allen Roberson, April 3, 2000, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 13, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; Boineau, "South Carolina Relic Room and Museum," Minutes of the One Hundred and Fourth Annual Convention, 2000, 84.

349. Allen Roberson, "Dotsy's Retirement Speech," November 2, 2000, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Unprocessed Additions Box, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.



subsume the SCCRRM into the State Museum along with the South Carolina UDC's influence at the museum, the organization used its legislative clout to ensure that the SCCRRM remained an independent institution, thereby protecting its own position as an important institutional stakeholder. After government restructuring efforts climaxed in 1993, the Heritage Act of 1994 initiated a vigorous Confederate flag debate that would consume South Carolina for the next six years. The South Carolina UDC took a backseat during this controversy. Following the lead of pro-flag legislators Courson and McConnell, the South Carolina UDC endorsed the Heritage Act in 1994. The Daughters advanced the view that the Confederate flag could not be removed from the dome in dishonor, and, more importantly, they did not pose a counternarrative to pro-flag assertions that museums like the SCCRRM were places where objects went to be forgotten. In 1997, the South Carolina UDC used its congenial relationship with pro-flag legislator McConnell to craft legislation placing the SCCRRM under the South Carolina BCB on terms amenable to the organization. Both the organization's legislative efforts and its attempt to have a UDC member appointed as the museum's new director in 1997 signify the climax of the UDC's efforts to advance and protect its influence over the SCCRRM from 1986 to 2000. After 1986, the South Carolina UDC sought to save and protect its influence at the museum. By 1997, the organization was ready to regain its authority over the SCCRRM. Though the South Carolina UDC's efforts to reclaim its power over the museum in 1997 ended in failure, Dotsy Boineau continued to reinforce the UDC's sway at the museum much as she did after 1986.

For fourteen years, then, the South Carolina UDC struggled to carve out influence for its organization over the SCCRRM as an important museum stakeholder. During this

time, Boineau was the tie that bound the South Carolina UDC and the SCCRRM together. With this tie severed, would the South Carolina UDC continue to exist as a significant institutional stakeholder? Signs that the South Carolina UDC was reevaluating its relationship with the museum came as soon as Boineau announced her impending retirement to the organization. On May 6, 2000, at the South Carolina UDC Executive Board Meeting, Boineau informed the organization that she would be retiring in June. She also stated that the organization's records needed to be moved from the SCCRRM because no one had been hired to take her place. Boineau implied that the SCCRRM played an active role in forcing the South Carolina UDC to remove its papers from the museum because the SCCRRM was not searching for an archivist or, more importantly, another UDC member to replace her. However, Roberson offered to retain the papers at the SCCRRM with the same access and security measures in place. Roberson explained to the South Carolina UDC president that the museum "values its continuing relationship with the United Daughters of the Confederacy."<sup>350</sup> Despite Roberson's offer, the South Carolina UDC relocated its records to the Confederate Museum in Charleston by the end of the year.<sup>351</sup>

---

350. Boineau, "South Carolina Relic Room and Museum," Minutes of the One Hundred and Fourth Annual Convention, 2000, 84; Josephine Walsh, "Executive Board Meeting-May 6, 2000," Minutes of the One Hundred and Fourth Annual Convention, 2000, 89; W. Allen Roberson to Mrs. John A. Morris, Sr., May 17, 2000, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 8, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

351. Mrs. John A. Morris, Sr., "Dear Daughters," *United Daughters of the Confederacy South Carolina Division Newsletter*, June 2000, 1, Dosty Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 12, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

The South Carolina UDC's decision to remove its papers from the SCCRRM, even after Roberson expressed his desire to retain the records, reflected its concern with protecting the organization's administrative control over its records after Boineau's retirement. This inference is strengthened by June Wells' assertion during the Executive Meeting on May 6 that the organization would not let "any Confederate article go unprotected," and the fact that the South Carolina UDC removed its records before Boineau's retirement in June.<sup>352</sup> More significantly, the South Carolina UDC relocated its organizational papers to the Confederate Museum, which was a museum entirely controlled and operated by Charleston Chapter #4.<sup>353</sup> Perhaps learning from the UDC's loss of direct authority at the SCCRRM, Charleston Chapter #4 intentionally sought to maintain full UDC control of the Confederate Museum. As a case in point, in 1992, despite the Confederate Museum not having the necessary funds to restore all of its artifacts damaged during Hurricane Hugo, Charleston Chapter #4 continuously refused assistance from other museums in the state, including the State Museum and the Charleston Museum, for fear that accepting such assistance would jeopardize the chapter's control of the museum's collection.<sup>354</sup> At the Confederate Museum, there were no questions about who owned the museum's collection, and Charleston Chapter #4 did not have to fight to have a say in the museum's affairs, because the women were the sole authority over the museum. The Confederate Museum embodied the direct UDC authority that the South Carolina UDC

---

352. Walsh, "Executive Board Meeting-May 6, 2000," Minutes of the One Hundred and Fourth Annual Convention, 2000, 89; Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021.

353. June Wells, "Confederate Museum," Minutes of the Centennial Convention, 1996, 75.

354. Kerri Morgan, "Museum Needs New Display," *Post and Courier*, February 10, 1992, 1, NewsLibrary.com.

wished would be a reality at the SCCRRM, and the organization turned to this museum to secure its records when Boineau retired from the SCCRRM.

In a June 2000 newsletter to the South Carolina Daughters, the South Carolina UDC president informed the Daughters about the organization's decision to move its records to Charleston. She also told them that now was the time to speak to Roberson about removing any items the UDC members had loaned to the museum, if the Daughters wanted to raise the issue with the museum director. In 1993, Mary Lund had urged the Daughters to donate objects to the SCCRRM. In 2000, the South Carolina UDC president directed the Daughters on how they could remove their objects from the SCCRRM. Likewise, from 1986 to 2000, the South Carolina UDC records had served as a symbol of UDC influence at the museum. By June 2000, the organization had removed this symbol of influence from the museum itself.<sup>355</sup> It truly appeared that the South Carolina UDC's efforts to advance and protect its influence over the museum as a primary stakeholder would end with Boineau's retirement in 2000.

However, as they say, appearances are often deceiving. The relationship between the SCCRRM and the South Carolina UDC after 2000 deserves its own extensive study, which cannot be adequately achieved in the closing pages of this thesis. However, even a cursory glance at the SCCRRM's history after 2000 reveals that the South Carolina UDC continued to maintain a special relationship with the museum as an important stakeholder. The records that the South Carolina UDC removed in 2000 were back by 2003. While it is

---

355. Lund, "President's Report—South Carolina Division UDC," Minutes of the Ninety-Seventh Annual Convention, 1993, 35; Mrs. John A. Morris, Sr., "Dear Daughters," 1.

unclear why the organization decided to return its papers to the museum, the fact that Roberson agreed to provide a home for the UDC records again, despite the precious museum storage space these records consume, illustrates the UDC's continued influence at the museum.<sup>356</sup> In a similar vein, in 2003, Roberson was still writing annual reports to the South Carolina UDC that reinforced the organization's special relationship with the museum, including his claim that the SCCRRM was striving to remain "true to our legacy, as bequeathed to us by the Wade Hampton Chapter."<sup>357</sup> In 2003, Roberson was also planning, with the South Carolina UDC's permission, to create a small exhibit based on the UDC's silver collection. The proposed exhibit's dependence on UDC approval demonstrates the organization's continued ability to affect the museum's objectives as an important institutional stakeholder.<sup>358</sup>

---

356. Roberson, interview, February 4, 2021; Allen Roberson to Dotsy Boineau, email, December 29, 2003, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 15, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

357. W. Allen Roberson, "The 2003 Annual Report of the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum to the South Carolina Division, United Daughters of the Confederacy," September 15, 2003, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Box 11, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC. After Boineau's retirement in 2000, Allen Roberson continued to submit a yearly report to the South Carolina UDC, typically with a short introduction from Boineau. At minimum, Roberson submitted an annual report in 2001, 2003, 2006, and 2007. Roberson, "South Carolina Relic Room and Museum," Minutes of the One Hundred and Fifth Annual Convention, 2001, 94; Roberson, "The 2003 Annual Report"; W. Allen Roberson, "S.C. Confederate Relic Room and Museum," Minutes of the One Hundred and Tenth Annual Convention, United Daughters of the Confederacy, South Carolina Division, 2006, 135, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Unprocessed Box, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC; W. Allen Roberson, "S.C. Confederate Relic Room and Museum," Minutes of the One Hundred and Eleventh Annual Convention, United Daughters of the Confederacy, South Carolina Division, 2007, 119, Dotsy Diane Lloyd Boineau Papers, Unprocessed Box, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.

358. Roberson, "The 2003 Annual Report."

The South Carolina UDC's ongoing relationship with and influence over the SCCRRM is perhaps best represented through the continued presence of the phrase "Confederate Relic Room" in the museum's name. For years, the SCCRRM's name has been a point of contention and confusion. As early as 1970, Hal Brunton, the University of South Carolina's Vice President of Business Affairs, suggested to LaVerne Watson that she consider changing the museum's name.<sup>359</sup> In his 1985 reaccreditation report, AAM examiner Edward Alexander asserted that the museum's name was "misleading and does not clearly designate a general museum of South Carolina History." He recommended several possible alternative designations, including South Carolina Confederate and Historical Museum, South Carolina Museum of History, and South Carolina Historical Museum.<sup>360</sup> In a 2004 report on the SCCRRM, museum administrative assistant Shirley Schoonover wrote that the SCCRRM should consider modifying its name because the museum's current title did not reflect its mission and provoked negative associations with the Confederacy. Her suggestions for new museum names included the South Carolina Historical War Museum, the South Carolina Heritage Museum, and the South Carolina History Museum.<sup>361</sup> Echoing Schoonover's comments, Roberson also believes that the museum's name needs to change. Roberson's support for replacing the institution's current designation stems from the fact that the museum's appellation is too long, its inclusion of

---

359. Hal Brunton to LaVerne Watson, September 9, 1970, Box 208, Correspondence (miscellaneous), 1931-1986, Folder 1, File #4017, Internal Archives, South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum, Columbia, SC.

360. Alexander, "Confederate Relic Room and Museum," 7.

361. Schoonover, "Possible Ways to Improve," 6, 12.

the word “Confederate” depresses fundraising and visitation, and the term “relic” is archaic.<sup>362</sup>

Efforts to alter the museum’s title have been countered through either direct opposition from the South Carolina UDC or fears from the museum staff about how the organization would react to a name change. In 1970, Watson disregarded Brunton’s suggestion to alter the museum’s appellation, and she privately mused that “many visitors have told me that the word ‘Confederate’ has a charm about it. . . This has made me wonder if we should keep the word ‘Confederate’ in the title.”<sup>363</sup> In 1997, Dotsy Boineau criticized Courson’s bill for replacing the SCCRRM’s name.<sup>364</sup> In her 2004 report, Schoonover noted that the SCCRRM’s reluctance to change its name stemmed from its concern that some of the museum’s supporters, such as the South Carolina UDC, would view the alteration “as an act of alienation.”<sup>365</sup> Similarly, the museum’s 2018-2019 accountability report observed that a name change was necessary to ensure that it would not become “obsolete and wither away,” but it also acknowledged that altering the museum’s name could alienate the South Carolina UDC.<sup>366</sup>

This is not to say that the South Carolina UDC’s continued influence at the museum is the only reason for why the phrase “Confederate Relic Room” remains in the museum’s

---

362. Jeffrey Collins, “South Carolina’s Confederate Relic Room Ponders Name Change,” *AP News*, February 1, 2000, <https://apnews.com/article/0444fcac10c8b77efaacb9740a71e4a5>.

363. LaVerne Watson, Notes on Move to War Memorial Building, 1968-1970, September 26, 1968, Box 208, File #4042, Internal Archives, South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum, Columbia, SC.

364. Boineau, “Re Draft and Final Bill #98.”

365. Schoonover, “Possible Ways to Improve,” 12.

366. South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum, “Fiscal Year 2018-19,” 2019, 11.

title. After all, the Heritage Act of 2000 made altering the institution's name a legislative act.<sup>367</sup> However, as the examples in the prior paragraph demonstrate, suggestions to rename the SCCRRM were often accompanied by direct opposition from the South Carolina UDC or concerns about how the organization might respond to any alterations in the museum's appellation, demonstrating the organization's continued ability to impact the museum's operations. While the SCCRRM became the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum (SCCRRMM) in 2006, the term "Confederate Relic Room" is still a core part of its name.<sup>368</sup> Thus, for over one hundred years, the phrase "Confederate Relic Room," a name directly associated with the South Carolina UDC, has remained indelibly linked to the museum itself. In retaining its name, the SCCRRMM carries a symbol of the South Carolina UDC's relationship with and influence over the museum into the twenty-first century.

---

367. Collins, "Confederate Relic Room Ponders Name Change."

368. "A Museum by Any Other Name," 16.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Primary Sources

#### *Acts/Bills*

- Act 517. 103rd sess. (1979-1980). South Carolina Legislature.  
[https://www.scstatehouse.gov/sess103\\_1979-1980/bills/3241b.htm](https://www.scstatehouse.gov/sess103_1979-1980/bills/3241b.htm).
- Act 155. 112th sess. (1997-1998). South Carolina Legislature.  
[https://www.scstatehouse.gov/sess112\\_1997-1998/bills/3400.htm](https://www.scstatehouse.gov/sess112_1997-1998/bills/3400.htm).
- H. 4292. 113th sess. (1999-2000). South Carolina Legislature.  
[https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=%22Relic%20Room%22&category=LEGISLATION&session=113&conid=36502410&result\\_pos=0&keyval=1134292&numrows=10](https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=%22Relic%20Room%22&category=LEGISLATION&session=113&conid=36502410&result_pos=0&keyval=1134292&numrows=10).
- S. 98. 112th sess. (1997-1998). South Carolina Legislature.  
[https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=%22Relic%20Room%22&category=LEGISLATION&session=112&conid=36620092&result\\_pos=0&keyval=1120098&numrows=10](https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=%22Relic%20Room%22&category=LEGISLATION&session=112&conid=36620092&result_pos=0&keyval=1120098&numrows=10).
- S. 548. 112th sess. (1997-1998). South Carolina Legislature.  
[https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=Relic%20Room&category=LEGISLATION&session=112&conid=36519079&result\\_pos=0&keyval=1120548&numrows=50](https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=Relic%20Room&category=LEGISLATION&session=112&conid=36519079&result_pos=0&keyval=1120548&numrows=50).
- S. 968. 113th sess. (1999-2000). South Carolina Legislature.  
[https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=%22Relic%20Room%22&category=LEGISLATION&session=113&conid=36502410&result\\_pos=0&keyval=1130968&numrows=10](https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=%22Relic%20Room%22&category=LEGISLATION&session=113&conid=36502410&result_pos=0&keyval=1130968&numrows=10).

#### *Archival Sources*

- Alexander, Edward P. "South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum, Columbia, South Carolina 29201 Reaccreditation Visit October 1, 1985," October 8, 1985. Reaccreditation: Pre-1998 Folder. Internal Archives, South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum, Columbia, SC.

- Brunton, Hal to LaVerne Watson, September 9, 1970. Correspondence (miscellaneous), 1931-1986, Folder 1, File #4017. Internal Archives, South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum, Columbia, SC.
- Dotsy Diane Llyod Boineau Papers. South Caroliniana Library. University of South Carolina.
- Patterson, Jessie B. to C. Alex Harvin, III, 1982. C. Alex Harvin, III Papers, Box 3, Confederate Flag. South Carolina Political Collections, Ernest F. Hollings Special Collections Library. University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.
- Pollack, Alan L. to Kim Igoe, July 31, 1996. Reaccreditation: Pre-1998 Folder. Internal Archives, South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum, Columbia, SC.
- Pollack, Alan L. to Kim Igoe, June 18, 1997. Reaccreditation: Pre-1998 Folder. Internal Archives, South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum, Columbia, SC.
- “SC Confederate Relic Room & Museum, Confederate Prisoners of War Exhibit/1<sup>st</sup> Floor,” October 27, 1999. Photograph. Box 208, SCCRRMM Photos-WWI Memorial Building Folder 2, File #4029. Internal Archives, South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum, Columbia, SC.
- South Carolina Budget and Control Board. Minutes and Attachments of the Budget and Control Board, 1940-1998. South Carolina Electronic Records Archive. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, SC.
- Wade Hampton Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy. “The Beginning or Organization of Wade Hampton Chapter, U.D.C.” Scrapbook, 1960-1967 (bulk, 1965-1966). South Caroliniana Library. University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC.
- Watson, LaVerne. Notes on Move to War Memorial Building, 1968-1970, September 26, 1968. Box 208, File #4042. Internal Archives, South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum, Columbia, SC.
- Ways and Means Committee and the Constitutional Laws Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, South Carolina House of Representatives. “Department of Parks, Tourism & Cultural Affairs Summary.” Draft Proposals for State Agency Restructuring and Consolidation, February 22, 1993. Box 2. Minutes and Public Hearings of the Judiciary Committee, 1993-1994, General Assembly, House of Representatives, Judiciary Committee. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, SC.

### *Interviews/Videos*

Beasley, David. "South Carolina Flying Confederate Flag." November 26, 1996. C-SPAN video, 00:07-9:13. <https://www.c-span.org/video/?77066-1/south-carolina-flying-confederate-flag>.

Martin, John A., Sr. "Interview with John A. Martin." Interview by James Duffy, November 9, 1999. Oral History Project, South Carolina Political Collections. University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC. <https://digital.tcl.sc.edu/digital/collection/scpcot/id/38/>.

Roberson, W. Allen. Interview by Caitlin Cutrona, February 4, 2021.

Roberson, W. Allen. Interview by Caitlin Cutrona, March 9, 2021.

### *Newspapers*

Baker, Virginia, letter to the editor. *State* (Columbia, SC), January 4, 1997. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

Bandy, Lee. "Beasley Seeks Truce on Flag." *State*, November 12, 1996. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

Bandy, Lee. "Flag Decision Puts Beasley on Spot." *State*, November 16, 1996. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

Bandy, Lee. "Two Ceremonies Planned for Day Flag Comes Down." *State*, June 16, 2000. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

Brook, Nina, and Cindi Ross Scoppe. "Compromise Simply Couldn't Beat the Clock." *State*, June 5, 1994. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

Brook, Nina, Lee Bandy, and Cindi Ross Scoppe. "Lawmakers Leave; Battle Flag Stays: House Sinks Compromise as Assembly Adjourns." *State*, June 3, 1994. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

Caughman, Linda. "She Joins Just to Participate." *State*, December 26, 1972. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

*Columbia Record* (SC). "Blacks Continuing Fight Against Flag." January 31, 1980. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

*Columbia Record*. "House Kills Move to Reduce Raise." May 4, 1983. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

- Columbia Record*. "Interviews in Passing: May Visit Relic Room." October 7, 1927. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- Columbia Record*. "Live Wire." May 19, 1983. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- Columbia Record*. "Mrs. LaVerne Watson, 74, Retired Director of Museum." March 8, 1988. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- Columbia Record*. "Solicitors' Pay Raises Approved." February 8, 1980. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- Columbia Record*. "Time to Come Down." May 17, 1983. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- Davenport, Jim. "NAACP: Put Flag in Relic Room." *Times and Democrat* (Orangeburg, SC), February 3, 2000. Newspapers.com.
- Day, Jeffrey. "Confederate Museum still Fighting Union." *State*, May 6, 1993. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- Day, Jeffrey. "'Lively' Museums." *State*, November 24, 1996. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- Fretwell, Sammy. "Battle Flag's Fate is Among Questions on GOP Ballot." *State*, August 7, 1994. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- Greenville News* (SC). "Beasley Campaign Defends his Anti-Flag Votes as Democrat." June 17, 1994. Newspapers.com.
- Hassell, John. "Carolina Day Honors Battle at Moultrie." *News and Courier* (Charleston, SC), June 25, 1989. NewsLibrary.com.
- Jackson, Darrell. "Expanded, Updated Relic Room Best Place for Confederate Flag." *State*, December 13, 1999. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- Mauldin, Douglas. "House Adopts Pay Ceiling: State Employees Affected." *State*, February 7, 1980. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- Morgan, Kerri. "Museum Needs New Display." *Post and Courier* (Charleston, SC), February 10, 1992. NewsLibrary.com.
- O'Shea, Margaret N. "Compromise not Easily Reached on Flag." *Augusta Chronicle* (GA), January 30, 2000.

O'Shea, Margaret N. "Flag Tug of War Focus." *State*, July 19, 1972. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

Pitts, Ruth E., letter to the editor. *State*, May 29, 1995. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

*Post and Courier*. "Confederate Museum Fans Rise Up Against Merger." May 7, 1993. NewsLibrary.com.

*Post and Courier*. "Museums." June 8, 1995. NewsLibrary.com.

Scoppe, Cindi Ross. "'It's History:' Campbell Signs Bill to Overhaul Government." *State*, June 19, 1993. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

Scoppe, Cindi Ross. "S.C. Leaders See New Hope for Flag Accord." *State*, June 16, 1994. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

Scott, Murrell C., letter to the editor. *Columbia Record*, June 7, 1983. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

Smith, Tim. "Some Look to Alabama's Flag Settlement." *Greenville News*, January 22, 2000. Newspapers.com.

Sponhour, Michael. "Future is Brightening for Confederate Past." *State*, October 4, 1996. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

Sponhour, Michael. "'Let's End this Debate.'" *State*, November 27, 1996. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

*State*. "Battle Flag is an Obstacle that Can't be Wished Away." January 12, 1996. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

*State*. "Calendar." December 26, 1997. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

*State*. "Collecting the Relics." May 14, 1896. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

*State*. "Confederate Flags Moved to Museum." July 4, 2000. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

*State*. "Deaths and Funerals." October 29, 1990. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

*State*. "Executive Items." April 22, 1984. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

- State*. "Government Restructuring Plans." May 26, 1993. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- State*. "House Budget Effort Ends in Failure." April 21, 1979. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- State*. "Leaders in South Carolina: Women of Character and Intellect." April 17, 1904. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- State*. "Mrs. Girardeau, Confederate Room Custodian, Dies." August 13, 1956. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- State*. "A Museum by Any Other Name." July 1, 2006. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- State*. "People on the Move." March 8, 1987. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- State*. "The Relic Room: An Address from the Ladies to the Visiting Veterans." May 5, 1901. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- State*. "Republican Primary Vote Makes Confederate Flag Decision Harder." August 11, 1994. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- State*. "S.C. Confederate Relic Room and Museum." June 27, 2003. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- State*. "State Report: News from Around South Carolina." December 10, 1997. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers
- Strope, Leigh. "NAACP March to Ratchet up Flag Pressure." *Greenville News*, December 23, 1999. Newspapers.com.
- Stroud, Joseph S. "Governor Lays out Plan." *State*, February 15, 2000. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- Stroud, Joseph S. "Let's Talk, Hodges tells Flag Forces." *State*. October 27, 1999. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- Surratt, Clark. "Flag Flap: Confederate Banner Dispute Rises Again." *State*, February 22, 1987. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- Surratt, Clark. "Riley Won't Back Down on Pay Raises." *State*, June 16, 1982. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

- Tanner, Robert. "Beasley Feels Plan on Flag Publicized Prematurely." *Charlotte Observer* (NC), November 19, 1996. Newspapers.com.
- Vergakis, Brock. "Confederate Relic Room to Relocate." *State*, February 12, 2000. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- Warthen, Brad. "The Revolution got Watered Down—but it's a Start," *State*, June 20, 1993. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- Wilkinson, Jeff. "Relic Room Breaks Attendance Record." *State*, September 2, 2009. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- Wilson, Scott, letter to the editor. *State*, May 16, 1995. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.

*Other Printed Sources*

- Bryan, John M. *The South Carolina State Museum: A History and Highlights from the Collection*. Columbia, SC: South Carolina Museum Foundation, 2000.
- Girardeau, Mrs. Claude, and Mrs. Thornley Walker. *South Carolina Confederate Relic Room of Wade Hampton Chapter U.D.C.* Columbia, SC: State House, 1924.
- The Historical Committee of the South Carolina Division of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. *U.D.C. Catechism of South Carolina Confederate History*. Rev. and enl. Clemson College, SC: Chambers Printing Co., 1923.
- South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum. "Fiscal Year 2018-19 Accountability Report." 2019. South Carolina State Documents Depository. South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC. <https://dc.statelibrary.sc.gov/handle/10827/32394>.
- South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum. "Annual Report Confederate Relic Room 1976-1977." 1977. South Carolina State Documents Depository. South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC. <http://hdl.handle.net/10827/17689>.
- South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum. "Annual Report Confederate Relic Room 1977-78." 1978. South Carolina State Documents Depository. South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC. <http://hdl.handle.net/10827/17690>.
- South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum. "Annual Report Confederate Relic Room 1982-1983." 1983. South Carolina State Documents Depository. South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC. <http://hdl.handle.net/10827/17695>.

- South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum. "Annual Report Confederate Relic Room 1983-1984." 1984. South Carolina State Documents Depository. South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC. <http://hdl.handle.net/10827/17696>.
- South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum. "Annual Report South Carolina Confederate Relic Room 1981-1982." 1982. South Carolina State Documents Depository. South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC. <http://hdl.handle.net/10827/17694>.
- South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum. "Confederate Relic Room." 1998. South Carolina State Documents Depository. South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC. <http://hdl.handle.net/10827/17687>.
- South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum. "South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum Annual Report 1985-1986." 1986. South Carolina State Documents Depository. South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC. <http://hdl.handle.net/10827/17698>.
- South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum. "South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum." 1999. South Carolina State Documents Depository. South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC. <http://hdl.handle.net/10827/17688>.
- South Carolina Division United Daughters of the Confederacy. *Recollections and Reminiscences 1861-1865 through World War I*. Vol. 10. South Carolina: South Carolina UDC, 2000.
- South Carolina Division United Daughters of the Confederacy. *Recollections and Reminiscences 1861-1865 through World War I*. Vol. 12. South Carolina: South Carolina UDC, 2002.
- South Carolina General Assembly. *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina*. 103rd General Assembly, 1st sess., April 12, 1979. LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), Journal of the House of Representatives.
- South Carolina General Assembly. *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina*. 103rd General Assembly, 1st sess., April 20, 1979. LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), Journal of the House of Representatives.
- South Carolina General Assembly. *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina*. 103rd General Assembly, 2nd sess., January 30, 1980. LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), Journal of the House of Representatives.



- South Carolina General Assembly. *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina*. 104th General Assembly, 2nd sess., June 3, 1982. LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), Journal of the House of Representatives.
- South Carolina General Assembly. *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina*. 104th General Assembly, 2nd sess., June 16, 1982. LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), Journal of the House of Representatives.
- South Carolina General Assembly. *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina*. 105th General Assembly, 1st sess., May 4, 1983. LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), Journal of the House of Representatives.
- South Carolina General Assembly. *Journal of the Senate of the State of South Carolina*. Regular sess., January 11, 1901. LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), Journal of the Senate of South Carolina.
- South Carolina General Assembly. *Journal of the Senate of the State of South Carolina*. Regular sess., February 15, 1901. LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), Journal of the Senate of South Carolina.
- South Carolina General Assembly. *Journal of the Senate of the State of South Carolina*. Regular sess., February 26, 1909. LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), Journal of the Senate of South Carolina.
- South Carolina General Assembly. *Journal of the Senate of the State of South Carolina*. 104th General Assembly, 2nd sess., June 3, 1982. LLMC Digital, U.S. States and Territories, South Carolina, South Carolina, Legislative (by date), Journal of the Senate of South Carolina.
- South Carolina General Assembly. *Journal of the Senate of the State of South Carolina*. 110th General Assembly, 2nd sess., June 2, 1994. [https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=%22Confederate%20flag%22&category=SENATEJOURNALS&year=1994&conid=36618575&result\\_pos=0&keyval=S11019940602&numrows=10#OCC](https://www.scstatehouse.gov/query.php?search=DOC&searchtext=%22Confederate%20flag%22&category=SENATEJOURNALS&year=1994&conid=36618575&result_pos=0&keyval=S11019940602&numrows=10#OCC).
- South Carolina Legislature, Senate, Senate Education Oversight Subcommittee. *Senate Education Oversight Subcommittee Summary Report on the South Carolina Museum Commission*. March 2016. <https://www.scstatehouse.gov/CommitteeInfo/SenateEducationCommittee/OversightReports/SCSM%20Final%20Report%20and%20Summary%2032316.pdf>.

South Carolina Museum Commission. "First Annual Report of the South Carolina Museum Commission." 1975. South Carolina State Documents Depository. South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC. <http://hdl.handle.net/10827/8393>.

Wells, June Murray. "United Daughters of the Confederacy: A Talk Given by June Murray Wells, President General, Jan 2000." Speech, Columbia, SC, January 2000. Electric Scotland. Accessed March 2, 2021. <https://www.electricscotland.com/history/america/udctalk.htm>.

### Secondary Sources

Bardes, John. "'Defend with True Hearts unto Death': Finding Historical Meaning in Confederate Memorial Hall." *Southern Cultures* 23, no. 4 (Winter 2017): 29-45. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2307/26391717>.

"Biography: Allen Robertson." Accessed March 2, 2021. <http://scvcamp47beaufortsc.com/attachments/Allen%20Robertson%20Biography.pdf>.

Bodenstein, Felicity. "The Emotional Museum. Thoughts on the 'Secular Relics' of Nineteenth-Century History Museums in Paris and their Posterity." *Conserveries Mémoires* (2011). OpenEdition Journals. <http://journals.openedition.org/cm/834>.

Brown, Thomas J. *Civil War Canon: Sites of Confederate Memory in South Carolina*. Civil War America. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2015.

Carsten Connor, Laura D., Angela M. Larson, and Carol E. Diebel. "What Matters to Stakeholders? Measuring Values at a University Museum." *Visitor Studies* 17, no. 1 (2014): 45-65. doi:10.1080/10645578.2014.885358.

Collins, Jeffrey. "South Carolina's Confederate Relic Room Ponders Name Change." *AP News*, February 1, 2000. <https://apnews.com/article0444fcac10c8b77efaacb9740a71e4a5>.

Coski, John M. *The Confederate Battle Flag: America's Most Embattled Emblem*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2005.

Cox, Karen. *Dixie's Daughters: The United Daughters of the Confederacy and the Preservation of Confederate Culture*. New Perspectives on the History of the South. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2003.

DaFoe, Kristie L. "Shifting Authority at the Confederate Relic Room, 1960-1986." Master's thesis, University of South Carolina, 2015. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global (Order No. 1589287).

- Ebitz, David. "Stakeholder Analysis for Educators: Obtaining Support and Reducing Obstacles." *The Journal of Museum Education* 35, no. 2 (Summer 2010): 187-191. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25801348>.
- Heyse, Amy Lynn. "The Rhetoric of Memory-Making: Lessons from the UDC's Catechisms for Children." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 38, no. 4 (Fall 2008): 408-432. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40232600>.
- Heyse, Amy L. "Reconstituting the Next Generation: An Analysis of the United Daughters of the Confederacy's Catechisms for Children." *Southern Communication Journal* 76, no. 1 (January-March 2011): 55-75. doi:10.1080/10417940902825689.
- Hillyer, Reiko. "Relics of Reconciliation: The Confederate Museum and Civil War Memory in the New South." *The Public Historian* 33, no. 4 (November 2011): 35-62. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/tph.2011.33.4.35>.
- Horwitz, Tony. *Confederates in the Attic: Dispatches from the Unfinished Civil War*. New York: Vintage Books, 1999. Kindle.
- Lefever, Grant Burnette. "Furling the South Carolina Confederate Flag: Political Expediency or Cultural Change?" Master's thesis, University of Mississippi, 2016. ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global (Order No. 10160615).
- Legget, Jane. "Measuring What We Treasure or Treasuring What We Measure? Investigating Where Community Stakeholders Located the Value in Their Museums." *Museum Management and Curatorship* 24, no. 3 (July 2009): 213-232. doi:10.1080/09647770903073052.
- Mitchell, Ronald K., Bradley R. Agle, and Donna J. Wood. "Toward a Theory of Stakeholder Identification and Salience: Defining the Principle of Who and What Really Counts." *The Academy of Management Review* 22, no. 4 (October 1997): 853-886. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/259247>.
- The Museum at Market Hall. "About." Accessed March 2, 2021. <https://www.museumatmarkethall.com/about.html>
- Overton, Rachel Wynne. "Girls of the Sixties: The Wade Hampton Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy, and the Founding of the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum." Master's thesis, University of South Carolina, 2003.

- Parker, Adam. "June Wells, Confederate Museum Director and Proponent of the 'Lost Cause,' Dies at 86." *Post and Courier*, December 1, 2020. [https://www.postandcourier.com/news/obituaries/june-wells-confederate-museum-director-and-proponent-of-the-lost-cause-dies-at-86/article\\_aba9fb90-3344-11eb-8f35-9f6ea19ff024.html](https://www.postandcourier.com/news/obituaries/june-wells-confederate-museum-director-and-proponent-of-the-lost-cause-dies-at-86/article_aba9fb90-3344-11eb-8f35-9f6ea19ff024.html).
- Pierce, Jon B. "Operation Lost Trust." South Carolina Encyclopedia. University of South Carolina, Institute for Southern Studies. Last modified October 20, 2016. <https://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/operation-lost-trust/>.
- Prince, K. Michael. *Rally 'Round the Flag, Boys! South Carolina and the Confederate Flag*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2004.
- Richards, Miles S. "Johnson, Isaac Samuel Leevy." South Carolina Encyclopedia. University of South Carolina, Institute for Southern Studies. Last modified July 1, 2019. <https://www.scencyclopedia.org/sce/entries/johnson-isaac-samuel-leevy/>.
- Scoppe, Cindi Ross. "1993 Restructuring Law Gave SC Governors First Hint of Authority." *State*, February 1, 2016. NewsBank: South Carolina Historical Newspapers.
- Schoonover, Shirley D. "Possible Ways to Improve the South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Museum." January 15, 2004. South Carolina State Documents Depository. South Carolina State Library, Columbia, SC. <http://hdl.handle.net/10827>.
- Smith, Susan Hill. "June Wells: Preserving History of Confederacy is Her Life's Work." *Post and Courier*, February 26, 2000.
- South Carolina Confederate Relic Room & Military Museum. "Exhibits." Accessed March 19, 2021. <https://www.crr.sc.gov/exhibits>.
- South Carolina Confederate Relic Room and Military Museum. "History at Home: Dr. B.H. Teague." June 3, 2020. YouTube video, 12:38-14:11. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Zi5XsrI9W60>.
- Thomas, Emory M. "Of Health and History." In *The Battlefield and Beyond: Essays on the American Civil War*, edited by Clayton E. Jewett, 310-325. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2012.
- Vergeront, Jeanne. "Stakeholders + Engagement." *Museum Notes* (blog), March 25, 2012. <https://museumnotes.blogspot.com/2012/03/stakeholder-engagement.html>.
- Webster, Gerald R., and Johnathan I. Leib. "Whose South is it Anyway? Race and the Confederate Battle Flag in South Carolina." *Political Geography* 20, no. 3 (March 2001): 271-299. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-6298\(00\)00065-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0962-6298(00)00065-2).

Woliver, Laura R., Angela D. Ledford, and Chris J. Dolan. "The South Carolina Confederate Flag: The Politics of Race and Citizenship." *Politics & Policy* 29, no. 4 (December 2001): 708-730. <https://doi-org.pallas2.tcl.sc.edu/10.1111/j.1747-1346.2001.tb00612.x>.

Zbuche, Alexandra, and Monica Bira. "Does Stakeholder Management Contribute to a Museum's Sustainable Development?" *Management Dynamic in the Knowledge Economy* 8, no. 1 (March 2020): 95-107. doi:10.2478/mdke-2020-0007.