
THE PROCEEDINGS

of

**The South Carolina
Historical Association**

2000

THE PROCEEDINGS

of

**The South Carolina
Historical Association**

2000

Marvin L. Cann
Editor

The South Carolina Historical Association
The University of South Carolina
Aiken, South Carolina
<http://www.usca.sc.edu/scha>

Officers of the Association

President: Katherine D. Cann, Spartanburg Methodist College

Vice-President: Fritz Hamer, South Carolina State Museum

Secretary: W. Calvin Smith, USC-Aiken

Treasurer: William S. Brockington, USC-Aiken

Executive and Editorial Board Members

Linda Hayner, Bob Jones University

J. Tracy Power, South Carolina Department of Archives and History

Marvin Cann, Lander University, editor

Membership Application

The SOUTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION is an organization that furthers the teaching and understanding of history. The only requirement for membership is an interest in and a love for history. At the annual meeting papers on German, British, Asian, U.S., Southern, and South Carolina history are routinely presented. Sessions on race relations, gender issues and the teaching of history are standard. Papers presented at the annual meeting may be published in *The Proceedings*, a refereed journal.

Membership benefits include: a subscription to *The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association*, notification of the annual meeting, the right to submit a proposal for a paper for presentation at the annual meeting, the quarterly *SCHA Newsletter*, and the annual membership roster of the Association.

SCHA membership is from January 1 to December 31. Student members must currently be enrolled in school. Regular members are those who are employed or are actively seeking employment. Life members are 10-year members of the organization who have retired. To renew or join, please return this application with your check to: William Brockington, Jr., Treasurer SCHA, Department of History, USC Aiken, 171 University Parkway, Aiken, SC 29801.

Telephone: (803) 641-3223; Fax: 803-641-3461; E-mail: billb@aiken.sc.edu.

Name and title (please print)

Address

City, state, and zip code

Phone/Institutional affiliation

E-mail address

Membership category (check one):

- Student (\$5)
- Regular (\$10)
- Life member

Membership status (check one):

- Renewal
- New

Area(s) of interest

————— **Program Questionnaire** —————

By completing this questionnaire you will assist future program committees in planning annual meetings of interest to Association members. The secretary will provide this information to the incoming chair of the program committee and to the editor of *The Proceedings*.

Name _____

Address _____

Institution _____

Topic of paper you wish to present _____

Have you presented a similar paper at another professional meeting? _____

If so, give location and date _____

List your two most recent publications _____

Would you be willing to review papers for publication in *The Proceedings*? _____

If so, on what general subject _____

Mail to: Professor Calvin Smith, secretary,
South Carolina Historical Association,
University of South Carolina at Aiken,
171 University Parkway, Aiken,
South Carolina 29801

Editor's Notes

The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association is a refereed journal containing selected papers and abstracts of papers presented at the annual meeting. The editor and the Executive Board serve as the editorial committee in conjunction with members chosen for their expertise. The editor disclaims any responsibility for the scholarship, statements of fact or opinion, and the conclusions of contributors.

By reviewing papers offered for publication, members of the editorial committee perform a task vital to the quality of *The Proceedings*. The editor wishes to acknowledge the assistance of reviewers for this volume:

John Benfield	University of South Carolina Law School
Fritz Hamer	South Carolina State Museum
Linda Hayner	Bob Jones University
Susan Ouellette	St. Michael's College
Nat Pendleton	South Carolina State Museum

Again, the Association is deeply indebted to Dr. Rodger Stroup and the South Carolina Department of Archives and History for assistance in publishing *The Proceedings*. In particular, the Association must recognize the exceptional contributions of Judy Andrews.

Contents

Anita Pollitzer: South Carolina Advocate for Equal Rights	1
<i>Amy Thompson McCandless, College of Charleston</i>	
The South Carolina Highway Patrol, 1930–1980	11
<i>William J. Mathias, University of South Carolina</i> <i>Michael G. Smith, Orangeburg-Calhoun Technical College</i>	
Grass Roots and Marble Columns: Civil Rights, Public Accommodations and South Carolina Federal Courts. 1955–1966	27
<i>Stephen Lowe, Lander University</i>	
The Search for National Identity: The U.S. in the Modern World —An Interdisciplinary Approach	43
<i>M. Ron Cox, Jr., USC-Salkehatchie</i> <i>Wayne L. Chilcote, USC-Salkehatchie</i>	
Creating a ‘Nazi Style’: The German Fashion Institute and State Efforts to Influence Fashion in the 1930s	51
<i>Kenneth McDonald, USC-Aiken</i>	
Membership of the South Carolina Historical Association	63
Constitution of the South Carolina Historical Association	81
A Notice to Contributors Concerning Style	83
Minutes of the 1999 Annual Meeting	85

Anita Pollitzer: South Carolina Advocate for Equal Rights

Amy Thompson McCandless

The social activism of Anita Pollitzer and her sisters, Carrie and Mabel, belies many of the stereotypes of southern club women. At a time when few women in the South were suffragists, all three women identified with the radical Congressional Union (after 1917, the National Woman's Party) of Alice Paul. From a state that did not allow women to become jurors until 1967 and did not ratify the Nineteenth Amendment until 1969, the Pollitzers were among the earliest and most tenacious supporters of the Equal Rights Amendment. At a time when most women's clubs met in private parlors, the Pollitzers along with other members of the Charleston Equal Suffrage League manned suffrage booths in the heart of the city's business district. After studying at the Art League in New York and earning a bachelor's degree from the School of Practical Arts at Columbia University in 1916, Pollitzer worked tirelessly for the passage of the Susan B. Anthony Amendment. In 1921 she was elected first national secretary of the newly reorganized National Woman's Party and began a lifelong campaign for the Equal Rights Amendment. Until her death in 1975, she served the Woman's Party in a variety of executive and administrative positions, traveling all over the world in the interests of women's rights. Yet it would be a mistake to make too much of her radicalism. Although she would later leave Charleston for the North, Pollitzer's feminism would forever bear the imprint of her southern heritage. Southern activists in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries—black and white—tended to come from elite families and to work with and around as well as against regional stereotypes of gender, race, and class. As an examination of her career in the years before World War II will show, a combination of personal and political factors help account both for Pollitzer's adherence to and departure from the path of southern ladyhood.

Pollitzer was born in Charleston on 31 October 1894, the youngest daughter of Gustave M. and Clara Guinzburg Pollitzer. Her father's family were German Jews who had immigrated to New York from Vienna before Gustav was born, later moving to Beaufort, South Carolina. His firm, G. M. Pollitzer & Company of Beaufort and Charleston, exported sea island cotton and cotton seed. Pollitzer's mother, from Baltimore, was the daughter of a rabbi. Gustave died in 1909, six years before Pollitzer joined the Woman's Party, but Clara, who lived until 1942, would actively support her daughters' efforts for social reform.¹

Pollitzer's older sisters, Carrie, born in 1881, and Mabel, born in 1885, were involved in various reform activities. Both were charter members of the Charleston Equal Suffrage League, with Carrie serving as corresponding secretary and membership chair and Mabel as publicity chair. Carrie was active in Charleston's City Federation of Women's Clubs, and on behalf of the City Federation, launched the petition drive that led to women's admission to the municipal College of Charleston in the autumn of 1918. She was the assistant principal of Memminger High School—also the city's normal school for white women—and was the director of the South Carolina Kindergarten Training School. For Carrie, education was the key to furthering women's rights. Mabel shared her feminist fervor. After receiving her degree from Columbia University in New York, she returned to Charleston to teach at Memminger, becoming active in various civic groups. She would later be elected South Carolina's state chairperson for the National Woman's Party.²

Given the community activism of her older sisters, it is not surprising that Pollitzer was introduced to various reform causes as an adolescent. After graduating from Memminger High School, Pollitzer headed off to New York to study art. Here, she met Alfred Stieglitz, the "photographer, publisher, and avant-garde entrepreneur" who became her "mentor in modernism." Here, also, she befriended fellow art student Georgia O'Keefe. It was Pollitzer who first showed O'Keefe's drawing to Stieglitz, and Stieglitz would consequently organize an exhibition of O'Keefe's works, sparking her successful career as an artist. The correspondence between the two women, covering the period from June 1915 to summer 1917, a time when O'Keefe was teaching in Virginia, South Carolina, and Texas, hints at young Pollitzer's interests and aspirations.³

Pollitzer's letters reveal a woman in love with life. She portrays people and activities with the detail of a novelist as well as the eye of an artist. Although she is proud of her Charleston roots, she can laugh at the city's quaint customs and characters. In a December 1916 letter to O'Keefe, Pollitzer describes her good friend Susie Allen as "so unusual for a Charleston girl—quite stimulating. . . ." Apparently, the two were discussing Pollitzer's drawings, and Susie "offered to pose minus clothes—at a minutes [sic] notice." Pollitzer was pleased since her prospective model was "so bully looking." Although Allen was engaged to a handsome local boy, she was determined not to be a conventional southern housewife: "Susie says she will not learn to sew—& will shock the family by being married in a fireproof building instead of a steepled one."⁴

Pollitzer's family, on the other hand, seemed unlikely to be shocked so easily. The sisters and their widowed mother traveled widely and read vociferously. Pollitzer's

interest in modern art seemed strange to her widowed mother, but Clara Pollitzer nonetheless supported her daughter's artistic endeavors: "Mama doesn't see the use of painting ugly things when you could make them pretty, but thinks it must be alright or I wouldn't do it."⁵ The Pollitzer women's independence shines through in Pollitzer's letters. When the sisters went to visit brother Richard at Harvard, Pollitzer wrote nonchalantly: "Carries [sic] wandering around Boston somewhere in the rain although its [sic] 9:30. I guess she's lost this time for good."⁶

Pollitzer first mentioned women's suffrage in a September 1915 letter to O'Keefe from the North Carolina mountains: "I've been doing Suffrage work on the side this summer—Just private conversations of course—I worked hard for it the week I was in Charleston—was one of a deputation to visit our Congressmen—gave out Suffrage Literature & Lemonade at a booth. . . ." She told O'Keefe that she'd brought a "trunk full of Art & Suffrage things up here" but clearly found herself in need of further edification: "Give me the name of some good war books, will you?"⁷

Back at school, Pollitzer found suffrage activities in New York "exciting." She wrote O'Keefe that "I wish I had time to help. I did a lot for it in Charleston. A Poster & lots of time at booths answering Antis . . ." But she concluded that "Politics & Art would be too much for 1 winter."⁸ Although O'Keefe and Pollitzer frequently discussed feminist writings in their letters, it was not until Pollitzer was back in Charleston in December 1916 that she again mentioned any direct involvement with social reform. "I am working like the Devil for Suffrage. The Pickets [for Woman's Suffrage] telegraphed me to come on to Washington, to picket & I was away at the beach."⁹

The following March found Pollitzer back in Charleston and once more involved in the cause. As in 1915, Pollitzer's activities seemed to have been spurred by her family. She noted the arrival of Elsie Hall, "a prominent Pacifist, Suffrage Leader, Charter Member National Woman's Peace Party-American Union against Militarism" who had come to town with her Congressman father. Young Hill phoned Carrie Pollitzer and asked her to come visit her at the hotel. Carrie was so taken with Hill's ideas that she asked her to give a talk in Charleston, even offering the Pollitzers' parlor if a hall could not be found. Soon all three sisters and a friend, Mrs. Gibbes, were involved in arranging the lecture. Mrs. Gibbes engaged the hall, and Pollitzer wrote articles announcing the forthcoming talk, entitled "Woman & War," for the local newspaper.¹⁰

Although Hill's lecture was on pacifism, she later talked to Pollitzer about resuming her suffrage activities: "I'd worked hard for suffrage when I got back from N.Y. in the summer 2 yrs ago," Pollitzer reminded O'Keefe, but "she wants me to work again." Pollitzer then explained the South Carolina situation to O'Keefe: "We

have a good local League—but the point is to push the thing thru Washington to do it. Federally instead of state by state. I am muchly interested anew & am going to try to get enuff people to get up a delegation to Congressman Whaley when he returns.”¹¹ From this point on, Pollitzer’s dedication to the National Woman’s Party would not flag.

Pollitzer’s personality made her a superb organizer, an engaging speaker, and an effective fund raiser. In an 25 August 1915, letter to Pollitzer, O’Keefe wrote: “Your letters are certainly like drinks of fine cold spring water on a hot day—They have a spark of the kind of fire in them that makes life worthwhile—That nervous energy that makes people like you and I want and go after everything in the world”¹² Stieglitz, too, was taken by Pollitzer’s promotional talents. When Pollitzer asked him for a job recommendation, he wrote her prospective employer that “she has ‘intuitive keen judgement of people, a sense of social values, organizing ability, accuracy, thoroughness, and ability to gear into an organization cooperatively, and stamina.’ She gives all of herself to whatever she tackles.”¹³

Alice Paul, reflecting in 1929 upon Pollitzer’s work as an organizer for the Woman’s Party, was even more effusive in her praise: “She has a great deal of initiative, enthusiasm, and personal charm. She was particularly good in press work, interviewing, money raising and speaking. She has a sunny, optimistic disposition and is easy to work with. She makes friends easily and does not antagonize. She is never tiring in her work, full of energy, and very painstaking. She has unusual courage, independence of thought, and intelligence.” And, Paul added significantly, “She has a high sense of honor.”¹⁴ It was this sense of honor which probably explains why Paul found Pollitzer so successful at party work in the South.

Her southern charm was clearly another factor in her successful lobbying efforts. As a reporter for the *New York Evening Telegraph* wrote 1923, Pollitzer Pollitzer did not fit the “old-time conception of a suffragette.” After describing her as the “youngest officer of the National Woman’s Party, and its youngest lobbyist,” the reporter remarked that most legislators would be delighted to be “‘lobbied’ by Miss Pollitzer. There’s nothing militant in her appearance. Cartoonists who used to draw pictures of suffragettes as hatchet-faced, severe-looking crusaders couldn’t find a subject in this girl from South Carolina. With creamy complexion, sparkling gray eyes, a wealth of hair—bobbed, it’s true—a pleasant smile and general good looks, Miss Pollitzer is anything but the suffragist of the cartoons.”¹⁵

Interestingly enough, one of the rare criticisms of Pollitzer came from her beloved Elie Edson, whom she would marry in December 1928. A New Yorker and Harvard classmate of Franklin Roosevelt, Edson was extremely proud of his wife’s

efforts on behalf of the Equal Rights Amendment, and his descriptions of Pollitzer's activities usually sounded a good bit like the press releases he wrote for a living. But in an 9 August 1925, letter to his future spouse, he warned that she needed to be more focused: "Anita . . . you have in you the makings of a big woman of National Size, but if you wish to accomplish, you must specialize and not spread yourself out too thin." Edson conceded that Pollitzer was a talented artist and musician but emphasized that "life, and Alice Paul, has caused you to be labeled a leading feminist . . ." As a result, he told her, "your allied arts have come to be the art of writing, and public speaking in conjunction with your demonstrated genius for organization."¹⁶

Pollitzer's marriage to Edson in 1928 was very much a love match and did not lessen her commitment to the fight for equal rights. As one friend wrote in her letter of congratulation, "Somehow I do not feel that marriage will mean the giving up of things you care about. . . . Elie Edson . . . has always had such a nice attitude towards the Woman's Party." If anything, it was Edson who readjusted his career interests to mesh with the demands of Pollitzer's politicking: "to be consistent," he wrote her in 1936, "you should remain in a vortex in which you have won national recognition while I find a way to snuggle close by."¹⁷ Significantly, Pollitzer continued to use her maiden name after their marriage. As she told an interviewer from the *Baltimore Post* in March 1929, "With women making strides in the business and professional world there is no reason why they should be handicapped by having to change their names. Ten years from now no one will question the right of a woman to keep her own name after marriage."¹⁸

While Pollitzer's family support and personal characteristics help, in part, to explain her feminist activism, they do not account for her affiliation with the more radical wing of the woman's movement. Why did she not join the American Woman Suffrage Association of Carrie Catt or align herself with the more moderate League of Woman Voters after the suffrage was achieved? Pollitzer's support of the Equal Rights Amendment was very much intertwined with the history of her region. She came of age during the successful campaign for women's suffrage through the passage of a federal amendment. As a South Carolinian, she was quite aware of the futility of relying on the individual states to promote social reform. Only three states of the former Confederacy ratified the Nineteenth Amendment—Texas, Arkansas, and Tennessee. If women's suffrage had been left to the states to decide, Pollitzer and most other southerners would not have been enfranchised.

Southern legislators were similarly unwilling to rewrite their state constitutions or to change state laws to eliminate inequities. And inequities there were. After studying the various state laws which impacted the family, Pollitzer noted that in Texas

a “wife cannot dispose of any of her separate property including stocks and bonds without the consent and signature of her husband” although a “husband alone may dispose of their community property without consulting the wife In South Carolina even a wife’s clothes have been held to be the property of her husband. In . . . Georgia . . . the husband can take his wife’s wages and spend them and can collect for loss of her services In . . . Alabama and Georgia, the father is preferred as a guardian of a minor child’s person and property.”¹⁹

In her speeches and writings advocating a federal rather than a state approach to equal rights, Pollitzer argued unless there was a constitutional amendment guaranteeing equal rights for women, women would continue to be discriminated against economically, socially, and politically. If the elimination of legal injustice was left to the whims of state legislators, how could equality ever be permanently guaranteed? What would keep one legislative session from undoing the reforms of its predecessors? “For instance,” she wrote in the 15 May 1937, issue of *Equal Rights*, “the Virginia Legislature in 1916 enacted a law giving mothers equal rights with fathers over the custody, services and earnings of their minor child. A few years later a new code was drafted and again the father was made the natural guardian and the mother given almost no authority.”²⁰

The southern antipathy to a federal amendment was not unconnected to the region’s racial policies. Establishing equal rights for women might lead to a demand for racial equality as well. It is difficult to gauge Pollitzer’s personal feelings on this issue. Did she, like many of the South’s early suffrage leaders, prefer not to endanger the cause of women’s rights by associating it with that of blacks? Or did she believe that an Equal Rights Amendment would solve the problems of racial as well as sexual inequality. Nowhere in her speeches and publications before 1945 is there a discussion of the separate and unequal conditions under which black southerners lived.

There is an intriguing reference to the “Negro question” in a 1918 letter from Alice Paul to Pollitzer. From the tone of Paul’s response, it appears that Pollitzer had written critically to her about the speech of one of the party members, Mrs. Gould. Paul responded: “This action of Mrs. Gould was an entirely individual one, and in no way [is] connected with the Woman’s Party. We have members in the organization with every conceivable point of view on the negro question and on every other question. We are only unanimous, as you know, on suffrage.” Paul went on to say that she was “sorry if Mrs. Gould’s address hurt in any way the campaign for the federal amendment” in South Carolina. “We always endeavor to see that our speakers keep strictly to suffrage and take up no other subjects when on our platform. We cannot, of course, regulate their speeches when they are talking for some other organization.

I will, however, take the first opportunity to bring to Mrs. Gould's attention the effect which you state her remarks are having in the South." Paul promised Pollitzer that she would talk to Gould about the issue and concluded by assuring her that Gould "will be most anxious to avoid anything in her speeches which would be harmful to suffrage."²¹

Because opponents were eager to play the "race card" in their campaign against women's suffrage, white southern suffragists tried to avoid the issue as much as possible. As Marjorie Spruill Wheeler argues in her study of the women's suffrage movement in the southern states, "Southern suffragists were radical for their culture on the subject of woman's rights, including her right to the franchise; however, on the subject of black suffrage, which dominated Southern politics at the turn of the century, radical they were not." Wheeler finds it ironic that "Women who spoke eloquently of the inalienable right of women as citizens to self-government advocated or at least acquiesced in the restoration of white supremacy that took place contemporaneously with the Southern woman suffrage movement."²² In her epilogue, Wheeler notes that although many southern suffragists "continued as political activists and reformers" after the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment, none of the eleven women whose lives she chronicled "publicly defended the voting rights of African-American women" or "was involved in the Southern interracial movement of the 1920s."²³ Although Pollitzer was not one of the women profiled in Wheeler's book, her later career similarly exhibits little concern for racial equality.

The rise of fascism certainly made the Pollitzer and Edson families aware of racial injustice abroad. As Jews, they were in personal contact with refugees from Hitler's Germany. In March 1939, Pollitzer and Elie received a letter from Pollitzer's brother Richard and his wife Cora, who had just returned to their home in Greenville after visiting sisters Carrie and Mabel and mother Clara in Charleston. "I listened to a broadcast yesterday from London, Paris, and Prag [sic], which gave the views of correspondents on the latest European situation," Richard wrote. "I was a pacifist, but am no longer. I hope that England prepares rapidly enough, and that she does not wait too long. What surprises me is that so many in the U. S. fall for the Nazi propaganda." Nor was Richard the only Pollitzer whose pacifism had been undermined by the threat of fascist aggression. "I was interested in the change in Carrie's view," Cora noted.²⁴

Pollitzer's speeches in the 1930s often referred to the threat fascism posed to women throughout the world. In a talk to the Women's University Club of Los Angeles in December 1935, Pollitzer asked her audience to "Look at conditions existing in Germany and Italy concerning the status of women. . . . The women of Germany, who

a few years ago, were considered among the most advanced in the world have been reduced to a condition of helpless subservience.” And as go the women, Pollitzer reminded her audience, so goes the nation. “Historians and sociologists tell us,” she elaborated, “that the status of women in a society is an index of the degree of civilization of that society. So long as women, who make up one-half of the population, are denied complete equality of human rights, no country can boast of the enlightenment [sic] of its ideas.” The Woman’s Party believed that “all human endeavors should be used to the fullest extent and equally. . . . All men and women have the same frailties and potentialities.”²⁵

In 1940 Pollitzer came before the Resolutions Committee of the Democratic Party to urge them to add support for the Equal Rights Amendment to their party platform. She began by telling the gentlemen seated before her that asking the Democratic Party to “declare for ‘equal justice to all and special privileges to none’” was a bit like “carrying coals to Newcastle.” Either she did not see or did not want to bring to their attention the parallels between the status of blacks and that of women. Pollitzer may not have articulated the racial implications of her proposal, but most southern Democrats were quite aware by 1940 of the growing challenge to Jim Crow. Significantly, it was the Republican Party, which had been losing black northern voters to the Democrats in the 1930s, that first added an Equal Rights plank to its party platform.²⁶

America’s entrance into World War II provided still another justification for the passage of an Equal Rights Amendment. “Women cannot help to cure the evils of the world,” Pollitzer wrote in a 1943 essay for *Woman’s Day*, “unless they have power to do so—this means power to direct with men the national and international policies of the world. The home no longer depends solely on what we do within our four walls. The outside world comes into our four walls, and can disrupt our lives as this world crisis has shown us.”²⁷

From our hindsight in the late-twentieth century, the failure of Pollitzer and her fellow members of the National Woman’s Party to associate their cause with that of black Americans in the years before World War II is ironic. When Congress eventually did pass the Civil Rights Act in 1964, of course, it was designed to end racial, not gender, discrimination. And, as every historian of women knows, sex only became a protected category because Representative Howard W. Smith of Virginia was sure that its addition to the list of prohibited discriminations would defeat the measure.

Pollitzer’s southern heritage explains both the nature and limitations of her radicalism. As a South Carolinian, a Jew, and a woman, she was sensitive to the inequities of the legal system; she looked to the federal government and the Constitution as

the best protection against discrimination. But as a white southern woman, she was unwilling to endanger the cause of women by associating it with that of blacks.

ENDNOTES

1. Gustave M. Pollitzer papers, 1845–1968, South Carolina Historical Society.
2. Mabel L. Pollitzer papers, 1871–ca. 1975, South Carolina Historical Society; Anita Pollitzer family papers, 1845–1979, South Carolina Historical Society; Sidney R. Bland, *Preserving Charleston's Past, Shaping Its Future: The Life and Times of Susan Pringle Frost* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1994), 52.
3. Benita Eisler, "Introduction," *Lovingly, Georgia: The Complete Correspondence of Georgia O'Keefe & Anita Pollitzer*, ed. Clive Biboire (New York: Simon & Schuster Inc., 1990), xvi.
4. Anita Pollitzer to Georgia O'Keefe, December 1916, *Lovingly, Georgia*, 230.
5. *Ibid.*, 10 June 1915, 4.
6. *Ibid.*, September 1916, 178.
7. *Ibid.*, September 1915, 20.
8. *Ibid.*, October 1915, 37.
9. *Ibid.*, December 1916, 225.
10. *Ibid.*, 20 March 1917, 250–51.
11. *Ibid.*, 251.
12. Georgia O'Keefe to Anita Pollitzer, 25 August 1915, *Lovingly, Georgia*, 14.
13. Alfred Stieglitz to Jean Earl Mochle, 23 August 1929, *Lovingly Georgia*, 279.
14. Alice Paul to Jean Earl Mochle, 22 August 1925, Anita Pollitzer Papers, Manuscripts Division, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina.
15. "New Type 'Equal Rights' Crusader Belies the Old-Time Conception of a Suffragette," *New York Evening Telegraph*, 23 March 1923.
16. Elie Edson to Anita Pollitzer, 9 August 1925, Anita Pollitzer Papers, South Caroliniana Library.
17. Maud Younger to Anita Pollitzer, 12 January 1929, Anita Pollitzer Papers, South Caroliniana Library; Elie Edson to Anita Pollitzer, 31 August 1936, Anita Pollitzer Papers, South Caroliniana Library.
18. Mildred Geare, "Advocates Women Using Their Maiden Names After Marriage," *Baltimore Post*, 30 March 1929.
19. Anita Pollitzer, "Is The Law Unfair to Women?", flyer reprinted from August 1943 issue of *Woman's Day Magazine*, Anita Pollitzer Collection, Manuscripts Division, South Caroliniana Library.
20. Anita Pollitzer, "Pass The Equal Rights Amendment Now," flyer reprinted from *Equal Rights*, 15 May 1937, Anita Pollitzer Papers, South Caroliniana Library.

21. Alice Paul to Anita Pollitzer, 1 April 1918, Anita Pollitzer family papers, 1845–1979, South Carolina Historical Society.

22. Marjorie Spruill Wheeler, *New Women of the New South: The Leaders of the Woman Suffrage Movement in the Southern States* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 101.

23. *Ibid.*, 187.

24. Richard Pollitzer to Anita Pollitzer and Elie Edson, 20 March 1939, Anita Pollitzer Papers, South Caroliniana Library; Cora Pollitzer to Anita Pollitzer, 21 March 1939, Anita Pollitzer Papers, South Caroliniana Library.

25. Anita Pollitzer, “Womens [sic] Place in This Changing World,” typed transcript of a speech given at the Women’s University Club, Los Angeles, California, Anita Pollitzer Papers, South Caroliniana Library.

26. Anita Pollitzer, typed transcript of speech given before Resolutions Committee, Democratic Party, Chicago, Illinois, 12 July 1940, Anita Pollitzer Papers, South Caroliniana Library.

The South Carolina Highway Patrol: the First Half Century, 1930–1980

William J. Mathias and Michael G. Smith

Sheriffs, constables and militias have enforced laws since colonial days, albeit on an uneven basis. The forerunner of state level law enforcement is the Texas Rangers established by the Republic of Texas in 1835 primarily to deal with border issues between Texas and Mexico.¹ Two other similar forces were established soon after the turn of the century, the Arizona Rangers (1901) and the New Mexico Mounted Police (1905).²

The next state police force was the Massachusetts State Constables, formed in 1865, which became the Massachusetts District Police in 1879. Its primary focus was upon commercialized vice, especially gambling and liquor, although it was granted general police powers. A small such force was organized by Connecticut in 1903 also to deal with commercialized vice, but it also had other authority such as fire marshal duties, but it did not have general police powers. Thus, Massachusetts claims the honor of having the first state police organization.³

“Modern” state law enforcement organizations were created because of many and varied forces, including the shift from an agricultural economy to an industrial economy, labor strife, the ineffectiveness of the few primitive police organizations in existence at that time, and the development of state highway systems. Most modern state law enforcement organizations, both state police and highway patrols, were founded between 1905 and 1939.⁴

The Pennsylvania State Police, founded in 1905 primarily to deal with labor strife in the coal mining industry,⁵ was the prototype of the “state police” model, which is defined as a state-level law enforcement agency that holds arrest powers for criminal and highway laws. The next state police was established by New York in April 1917. It was created partly to cope with labor issues but also as an outgrowth of the Progressive Movement.⁶ Michigan followed a month later in April 1917 with the development of the forerunner of the Michigan State Police. This agency was established primarily to provide domestic security for the state’s industries, which were crucial to America’s involvement in World War I.⁷ The West Virginia State Police was formed in 1919 primarily in response to the labor strife in the coal industry, as was the Pennsylvania State Police.⁸

Some other states chose to implement the “highway patrol” model defined as

a state level law enforcement agency that primarily enforces highway traffic safety laws and other violations of laws related to the highways, such as drivers licenses, automobile registrations, automobile license tags, and vehicular titles. Although highway patrols generally have some authority to enforce criminal laws, this authority is limited, and the circumstances under which criminal laws may be enforced varies considerably from state to state.

The earliest organizations established under this model were Maryland, Delaware, and Washington. The Maryland agency was established with only traffic enforcement capacity but was converted to a “state police” model in 1935, the only “highway patrol model to fully change from one model to the other. The Delaware agency was vested with statewide arrest powers from the outset, but because it was under the state highway department, it has largely confined its efforts to motor vehicle and highway law violations.⁹

The Washington State Patrol, founded in 1921, had full peace officer powers from its beginning; its general arrest powers, however, could be used only when ordered by the governor or requested by other law enforcement agencies.¹⁰ The South Carolina Highway Patrol was instituted by legislation in 1930.¹¹ In 1933 the Ohio State Highway Patrol was established,¹² as was the Kansas Highway Patrol.¹³ In 1935 “state highway patrol” models were formed in Alabama,¹⁴ Iowa,¹⁵ and South Dakota.¹⁶ The state highway patrols in the midwest were established partly as a reaction to “organized crime” activity of such notorious figures as Bonnie and Clyde, Pretty Boy Floyd, Alvin (Kreepy) Karpis, and John Dillinger.¹⁷ This was in stark contrast to the events that led to the development of the South Carolina Highway Patrol.

South Carolina experienced the effects of the Civil War in many ways, including lagging economic development, low per capita income, poor health of its citizens, poor education for its citizens, and an almost total reliance upon an agricultural economy. In spite of these impediments upon the economy and well-being of the state, the impact of the automobile was experienced early in South Carolina, and the legislative response to this impact made a significant change in the way the criminal law was administered.

Prior to this time, the only two facets of criminal justice administered by the state were criminal courts with circuit riding judges and the South Carolina Penitentiary to house long term offenders. Circuit courts had been in operation since 1772, and corrections became primarily a state function with the completion of the State Penitentiary in 1866.¹⁸ Law enforcement had been exclusively a local function carried out by sheriffs in every county and by municipal police departments in a small number of the more populous towns.¹⁹ The structure of law enforcement in South

Carolina, however, was changed forever as a result of the automobile, which led to the creation of the South Carolina Highway Patrol (SCHP) in 1930.

In the early-twentieth century, almost all roads in South Carolina were dirt and had been constructed primarily for the movement of horse-drawn wagons for commerce and carriages for the transportation of people.²⁰ Motorcycles had also become common means of transportation.²¹ Roads were of varying width and usually riddled with ruts and mudholes. Fallen trees frequently impeded travel. Long distance trips were by railroad, and trips of over thirty miles usually required an overnight stay.

Although automobile ownership was available primarily to people of means, such as doctors and wealthy land owners and farmers, auto traffic had increased to such a level that the South Carolina General Assembly in 1917 passed the Vehicle Registration Act.²² This act required for the first time that a state license plate be displayed on each vehicle.

In 1920, thirteen vehicle license inspectors were employed by the South Carolina Highway Department to enforce this new law.²³ These inspectors typically traveled by train or horse-drawn buggy from town-to-town to walk the streets looking for vehicles not displaying a license tag. First time violators were given an opportunity to purchase a tag. Non-compliant owners were charged and taken before the local magistrate.²⁴ The first registration fee was twenty-five cents per horsepower.²⁵ For a Cadillac of the day with a thirty-two horsepower engine, the fee was eight dollars. The basis for license fees was changed in 1920 when the present "classification by weight" system was established by the General Assembly.²⁶

In the 1920s, the Highway Department began to request ever larger appropriations in an effort to meet the growing needs for paved highways to accommodate the rapidly increasing number of motor vehicles in the state, to provide matching funds required by federal legislation, and to authorize the Department to issue bonds to fund road construction.²⁷ In 1930, South Carolina had 9,180 miles of road, but only 1,676 were paved. Five counties—Chesterfield, Edgefield, Hampton, Lancaster, and McCormick—had no paved roads at all, while five other counties—Anderson, Greenville, Richland, Sumter and Spartanburg—each had ninety or more miles of paved roads.²⁸ In this year also, the General Assembly passed the "Pay As You Go" Act, which required the state to pay construction costs as the roads were being built. In a state with limited financial resources such as South Carolina, road construction proceeded at a very slow pace. To hasten the paving of roads, counties issued bonds for this purpose, and later in this year, the Highway Bond Act was passed, which enabled the state to borrow money for road construction. These bonds were paid by a gasoline tax of six cents per gallon with five cents of that dedicated to road construction.²⁹

Despite the general lack of paved roads, there were 188 traffic accidents with death or personal injury in the first six months of 1930.³⁰ The causes of these accidents were attributed to two factors: the lack of driver's license law and inadequate traffic regulation. The public demanded action, and the General Assembly passed the Driver's License Act of 1930. It was introduced by Senator Fred D. West of Abbeville County and signed into law by Governor John G. Richards on April 4, 1930.

In addition to creating a licensing law, this act established that the South Carolina Highway Patrol (SCHP) would enforce the laws regulating the operation of motor vehicles on the roads of the state. Ben M. Sawyer, chief highway commissioner, offered thirteen license inspectors who had previously been employed to issue driver's licenses an opportunity to join the SCHP with the rank of lieutenant. Because of the uncertain future of this new agency, however, only three inspectors chose to do so. The original patrol was authorized sixty-nine positions with the patrol commander carrying the rank of captain. Five months after the creation of the SCHP, Sam E. Owen, Jr., who was from St. Matthews and a graduate of the University of South Carolina, was appointed the first captain.³¹

The SCHP became enmeshed in some of the political machinations of the opposing sides involved in the rapidly expanding system of roads. One side favored the centralization of road construction through the Highway Department, and the other side supported road building as a local function.

During this debate in the early years of the 1930s, forces led by Olin D. Johnston introduced legislation to replace the Highway Patrol with a state police. Highway Commissioner Ben Sawyer politically countered this by saying that it was the first step in converting all local law enforcement to state control. This proposal died when the sheriffs of the state joined forces with the supporters of the Highway Department to oppose the legislation.³²

Upon taking office in 1935, Governor Olin D. Johnston continued to lead a populist assault against the Highway Department in an effort to return the road building function to local governments. These bitter political skirmishes between the pro- and anti-Highway Department factions resulted in Governor Johnston calling up sixty-four members of the South Carolina National Guard. The unit activated was Company D of the 118th Infantry, a machine gun unit headquartered at Orangeburg. At the direction of the governor, it took control of the Calhoun Building, which was near the State Capitol and the home of the Highway Department. Governor Johnston ordered Highway Patrol Major Frank Barnwell to seize the bank accounts of the Highway Department. This action was immediately ruled illegal by the state attorney general, and the funds were frozen the next day by the South Carolina Supreme Court.

The National Guard occupied the Calhoun Building for several months before it was deactivated and returned to civilian life. Although the SCHP did not participate in the “takeover” of the Highway Department, officers were relieved of their weapons and disarmed for a brief time, but the weapons were reissued several hours later.³³

The SCHP was initially responsible for the enforcement of traffic and criminal laws. Patrolmen were issued a pistol, badge, uniform, motorcycle, and a few verbal instructions. Fourteen officers were assigned to administer driver license examinations, and they traveled from county to county to educate the public and create goodwill.³⁴ The SCHP grew to seventy-nine by 1934. The SCHP was a de facto “state police,” but this was changed in 1935 when the General Assembly shifted the enforcement of criminal laws to the State Constabulary, a forerunner of the State Law Enforcement Division (SLED).³⁵ In 1938, Johnston supporters introduced a bill to merge the SCHP and the State Constabulary into a state police. This effort failed, and the idea of creating a state police in South Carolina was mentioned only one other time—in the inaugural speech of Governor Burnet Maybank in 1939.³⁶ Thus, the responsibility of the SCHP was limited to the enforcement of traffic laws, which remains its mission today.³⁷

The SCHP continued to grow slowly to a total complement of ninety positions by 1941 when the United States entered World War II. The activities of the SCHP were in a holding pattern until 1945 as most of the nation’s efforts were devoted to the war. Gasoline and tires were rationed, and highway travel in the nation was substantially reduced.

Following the end of World War II, there was an unprecedented growth in South Carolina motor vehicle registrations, expanding the SCHP to 242 traffic enforcement officers by 1948; 270 by 1950;³⁸ 385 by 1956, and 650 by 1972.³⁹

In 1967 the first black patrol officer, Israel Brooks of Newberry County, was hired. After basic training, he was assigned to Beaufort County and later promoted through the ranks to the position of major.⁴⁰

It was a decade later when the SCHP hired its first female patrol officers after signing a consent order in response to a lawsuit filed by the United States Department of Justice under the Civil Rights Act of 1964.⁴¹

Although the original highway patrolmen were placed in the field with no formal training, the SCHP soon recognized the importance of training. Its first training school was three months long in Columbia at Camp Jackson (now Fort Jackson) in 1932. In the same year, the SCHP launched its first safety campaign, consisting of a series of safety lectures from the National Safety Council.⁴² In 1935 Lt. George E. Hurteau, Jr., established a unit to inspect public school buses. This training was

presented at the "Area Trade School," today known as the Wil Lou Gray Opportunity School in West Columbia.⁴³ Other early training included advanced first aid in 1939, taught by Patrolman Luke Dobson of Gaffney,⁴⁴ and firearms training in 1940.⁴⁵

In 1941 all license examiners were trained to administer the state's first driver's license test, which met the standards of the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators. Lt. George Hurteau in the same year authored the state's first driver's handbook.⁴⁶ Prior to this time, residents twelve years or older as a "matter of right" could be licensed to drive simply by paying a small fee. SCHP personnel continued to serve as license examiners for the next twenty-five years until these duties were transferred to the Motor Vehicle Division of the South Carolina Highway Department.⁴⁶

By 1950 the patrol training program was reduced from three months to eight weeks. Three weeks were devoted to classroom instruction, and five weeks were spent in field training. This system of training remained in effect until 1963.⁴⁷ Col. P. F. Thompson instituted the first in-service training program in 1957;⁴⁸ a report in the *Williamsburg News*,⁴⁹ however, indicated that additional training was still needed.

After a [State Patrolman] stopped a speeder in the town of Gourdin, he began writing a traffic ticket. When he got to the section of the ticket that asked for the nearest location, he asked the violator if he knew how to spell Gourdin. Neither the patrolman nor the speeder knew how to spell the name of this small South Carolina town. [The patrolman] became frustrated and thus, requested that the speeder drive to the nearby town of Lane. [The patrolman] said, 'I know how to spell Lane.'⁵⁰

In 1963 the training program was expanded from eight weeks back to the original twelve weeks, and a greater emphasis on driver training and weapons familiarity was incorporated into the SCHP basic training program.⁵¹ In 1966 as large civil rights demonstrations became common, SCHP personnel were trained in crowd control techniques by the FBI.⁵² Perhaps the highest profile event in the history of the SCHP was its involvement in the "Orangeburg Massacre." In 1968 during the days of Civil Rights demonstrations and student sit-ins, students at the historically black South Carolina State College were active in their community as were African-American students in many cities and towns in the United States. As their efforts to desegregate a local bowling alley escalated and tensions grew, a large force of state law enforcement personnel were assembled in Orangeburg, including the Highway Patrol, SLED, Department of Corrections, and others. During a tense standoff on the evening of February 8, 1968, something caused the state forces to fire their weapons. During this

volley of gunfire, three students of South Carolina State College were killed. Nine patrolmen were found not guilty of a misdemeanor that carried a maximum penalty of one year in prison and a \$1,000 dollar fine.⁵³ While there is still some debate as to what precipitated the gunfire, there is no doubt that this tragedy was the darkest day in the history of South Carolina law enforcement. For a complete account see *The Orangeburg Massacre* by Jack Bass and Jack Nelson.⁵⁴

Basic training for the SCHP has been conducted at the South Carolina Criminal Justice Academy in Columbia since its construction in 1972.⁵⁵ The first trainees were issued .38 caliber pistols manufactured by Colt or Smith & Wesson. The pistol had a blue-steel finish, five-inch barrel, and held six rounds. It was carried in a holster suspended from a shoulder strap and attached to the belt by snaps. This rather unstable holster was modified by removing the shoulder strap, which also allowed the patrolman to carry an additional six rounds of ammunition. This weapon remained the SCHP standard issue until the adoption of the .357 Smith & Wesson in 1985.⁵⁶ The first SCHP patrolmen were issued Harley Davidson, Henderson, or Indian motorcycles. Lieutenants were issued Model A Fords, and sergeants were issued Model B Fords.⁵⁷

An early patrolman, I. Byrd Parnell, later sheriff of Sumter County for twenty-eight years, was originally stationed in Spartanburg County. There were no radio communications at this time, so he designed his motorcycle patrol route in the shape of a "figure 8." At the intersection of his route, there was an old country store with a telephone. If Parnell was needed to answer a call, the SCHP would telephone the store and leave a message, which he would pick up on his next stop by the store. He also reported traveling from Spartanburg to Columbia by motorcycle on a winter day that was so cold his "nose froze closed."⁵⁸

Because the motorcycles were obviously uncomfortable during winter and inclement weather, patrolmen requested a change from motorcycles to automobiles as the standard patrol vehicle. The first patrol car, a 1934 Phaeton, was issued to Patrolman Rochelle Boyles, who would be the last survivor of the original patrol officers hired.⁵⁹ The Phaeton had a cloth top and was purchased for \$500 as an experiment to test the feasibility of automobiles instead of motorcycles. When hardtops came out in 1937, the SCHP began to change from motorcycles to automobiles because a Ford could be purchased for about the same cost as a motorcycle. The motorcycles were retained for several years and used as a form of discipline for errant patrolmen.⁶⁰

The SCHP used only Ford vehicles until 1949 when the South Carolina Highway Department began purchasing patrol cars by low bid. Patrol cars at this time were moonstone gray and were generally of three makes: Ford, Chevrolet or Plymouth.

They had red lights on the front center and whip antennas on the left rear.⁶¹

An unmarked car was first utilized in April 1965 for the purpose of traffic enforcement. Only one was purchased, and it was rotated among the patrol districts with no one officer driving it for more than three consecutive days. Historically, the maintenance depot in Columbia has performed all engine repairs and bodywork on the SCHP fleet.⁶²

Specialized vehicles have been utilized over the years as needs have developed. The first was a truck in 1947 used to transport portable truck weighing scales so that the SCHP could spot-check and weigh large tractor-trailers. The goals of the truck weighing program were twofold: to prolong the life of the highways by ensuring that trucks did not exceed the maximum weight permitted by law, and to reduce the number of accidents involving these large trucks. An early law addressed the need to reduce the number of accidents involving large trucks.⁶³ This law stated that any truck and load weighing 20,000 pounds or more being driven on the state's highways shall slow down to a speed not exceeding twenty miles per hour when meeting oncoming traffic; failure to do so was a misdemeanor punishable by a fine not to exceed \$100 or thirty days imprisonment.⁶⁴ This code section was later repealed.

Initially, the SCHP did not have radios; each patrolman covered his assigned area in a manner similar to Patrolman Parnell by using telephones in country stores, gas stations, or in other locations to call the SCHP office to which they were assigned periodically. This method of communication was followed until one-way radios were installed in 1937, which made possible the transmission of messages to patrolmen, but did not permit officers in the field to contact the patrol office.⁶⁵ Finally in 1947, under the leadership of Captain T. P. Brown, each patrol car was equipped with a two-way radio, which permitted communication between each patrolman and the office as well as car-to-car communications.⁶⁶

The early two-way radios were manufactured by Motorola. A knob was hand-turned to tune the radio, but it was not very precise. In addition, the broadcast area was limited, and reception was vulnerable to interference. Gradually the Motorola radios were replaced by General Electric models, which had preset buttons for the various frequencies thus improving the clarity of radio communications.⁶⁷

The SCHP initially used red lights as did other police agencies; blue lights were not used until the 1960s. With the first patrol cars in the 1930s, the red light was mounted in the manner most feasible for a particular model of car. At various times, they were mounted on the front fender, front bumper, or hood. With some models, it was impractical to mount an emergency light anywhere, and the patrolman used a spotlight with a red lens. In the mid-1950s, red lights were mounted on the roof of

the patrol cars for the first time. The most popular model at this time was the bullet-shaped Federal WLR, a combination red light and siren. Unmarked patrol cars in 1965 were equipped with a tear-drop-shaped revolving or flashing light mounted on the dashboard.⁶⁸ On January 1, 1967, State Law 56-5-4700 mandated the use of blue lights instead of red lights and restricted the use of blue lights for law enforcement only. This was to enable the public to easily differentiate law enforcement vehicles from other emergency vehicles such as ambulances and fire trucks.

Although laws against driving under the influence of alcohol had been in effect in South Carolina since 1928,⁶⁹ there was no instrument available to determine whether a driver was under the influence of alcohol until the early 1950s. The first such device, the alcoholmeter, had been developed in 1941 by Dr. Leon A. Greenburg, a Yale professor.⁷⁰ After eleven years of extensive research and additional delay due to World War II, large scale production of this piece of equipment began in 1952. It was recommended by the American Medical Association, the American Bar Association, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, and the National Safety Council.⁷¹ California in 1962 became the first state to adopt its use.⁷²

In 1954, Robert Borkenstein invented the breathalyzer, which detects the percentage of alcohol in a person's breath by measuring the amount of color change when alcohol reacts to potassium dichromate. The process takes about ninety seconds and yields a numerical expression of the percentage of alcohol expressed in hundredths of a percent. In addition, the breathalyzer discriminates between alcohol and other substances.⁷³ This method was deemed far more accurate than the previous device; the only test with greater accuracy was a blood test, a procedure not practicable for use in the field.⁷⁴ Although the SCHP had a device to measure blood-alcohol content, patrolmen could not require drivers to submit to the breathalyzer until South Carolina adopted the Implied Consent law in 1969. Under this law, those who were suspected of DUI and refused to take the breathalyzer test had their licenses suspended for six months in addition to any other penalty assessed.⁷⁵

Radar was developed during World War II to detect the presence of planes and ships. During the late 1940s, it was further developed for use by law enforcement agencies as a tool for apprehending speeders.⁷⁶ Before 1955, many violators challenged the accuracy and validity of radar. In that year, however, the Supreme Court of New Jersey affirmed the validity of radar to detect the speed of vehicles,⁷⁷ and courts in other states followed this legal precedent. The SCHP adopted radar for routine use in December 1962⁷⁸ and selected the MR-7 manufactured by Kustom Electronics Company. It was mounted on the outside of the patrol car and could not be utilized while the vehicle was stationary.⁷⁹

The type and style of uniform over the years has been directly influenced by the type of patrol vehicle in use and, to a lesser extent, the fashion of the day. The first uniforms were designed for the comfort of patrolmen riding motorcycles and were 100 percent wool. In 1933 in a contest with 527 entries sponsored by the National Association of Uniform Manufacturers and Distributors, the SCHP was recognized as the "best dressed state law enforcement agency in the nation." The uniforms were distributed by Louis Hope, who maintained a limited supply in the old SCHP supply depot warehouse. Officers were shown what was available, and they fitted themselves as best they could.⁸⁰

By 1945 patrolmen were custom measured for their uniforms, which were made by Hope-Davis Tailors of Columbia.⁸¹ Delivery was made about four weeks after measurements were taken. Trousers and shirts were gray, and a black leather bow tie snapped onto the shirt collar. The legs were tailored to closely fit from the knee to the ankle to protect patrolmen from the weather. Patrolmen also wore heavy leather gloves called gauntlets and black leather jackets for protection against the weather. Initially patrolmen purchased their own footwear and wore low-cut brown shoes. These were later replaced by black knee length leather boots. From 1945 to 1948, the SCHP uniform was topped by a visored cap.⁸²

In 1949 the SCHP changed the color of the uniform for the first time. The new uniform consisted of taupe trousers with green stripes down the outside seams, tan shirts, tan shoes, and a black Sam Brown belt and shoulder strap with brass accessories. Patrolmen wore one black and gold shoulder patch on the left sleeve and a badge over the left breast pocket of the shirt. Nametags were not worn at that time. Patrolmen wore dark green campaign-style hats until 1956 when a forest green trooper-style hat was adopted.⁸³ Short sleeved shirts were authorized in 1968.⁸⁴

The original badge and shoulder patch was designed in 1930 by Carl Metz, an employee of the Highway Department. Although the SCHP adopted a different badge in 1940, the original badge was readopted in 1945 and is still in use today. Metz also designed the emblem, a wing of black on yellow, which is displayed on the front door of all patrol cars to the present.⁸⁵

While the primary duties of the SCHP are to patrol the highways and to enforce the South Carolina Vehicle Code of Laws, the agency has, since the early years, offered extensive public education programs. In January 1936, Patrolman Leo Burrell offered the first such course teaching Clinton High School students a safety course utilizing a textbook entitled, *Man and the Motor Car*, which emphasized the fact that most accidents are the result of some form of thoughtlessness on the part of one of the drivers. Each Friday, some seventy-five boys and girls in grades nine through

twelve participated in the course taught in the gymnasium. Students who successfully completed this course were exempt from taking the written test when applying for a driver's license. Burrell taught while in full uniform as regulations at that time stated that all on-duty officers must be in uniform.⁸⁶

In November 1938, the SCHP established a Bicycle Safety Club for children in elementary and junior high schools to promote bicycling safety. Students had to sign a card pledging themselves to observe the twelve principles of safe conduct while riding a bike, and they had to have their bikes inspected at a bicycle shop to ensure that they met safety requirements. Parents also were required to sign a card pledging their willingness to cooperate with the club's goals and activities. Upon meeting these requirements, an emblem was issued for the bicycle to show the child was a member in good standing.⁸⁷

In 1939 Patrolman H. W. Stewart launched an educational program for pedestrians, which included seven rules for safety. They were as follows:

1. always walk on the left side of the highway
2. at night, place a white object on the chest or arm
3. when two or more persons were walking together, walk single file
4. obey the traffic control signs
5. always yield the right-of-way to vehicles
6. never hitch-hike, and
7. always be careful.⁸⁸

In June 1951, as a result of the School Bus Driver Training Act, the SCHP began training drivers of the state's school buses, most of whom were high school students. Seven training centers were established around the state, and each center conducted two courses simultaneously in order to complete the training of the 3,200 drivers who had to be certified by the opening of school that year. This was a difficult course mentally and physically. One Georgetown boy quit stating that, "he had rather [drive] a team of mules" than complete this training program.⁸⁹

There was classroom instruction from 7:00 in the morning until lunch at 12:15. Topics included the responsibilities of the school bus drivers to their schools, their passengers, and the buses they drove as well as lectures on parallel parking and safe stopping distances at various speeds. During the afternoon training from 1:00 to 5:00, the bus drivers-in-training applied what they had learned in the classroom to the streets and roads of the state. They drove the buses into and out of narrow spaces; they parked, backed, and drove on the streets under the supervision of a patrolman. They also received a condensed course in mechanics in which they learned to recognize and repair minor problems. Much of their driving was on country roads, far

from any source of readily available assistance in case of a breakdown.⁹⁰

At the conclusion of the course, a driving test was administered, and successful candidates received a certificate. Because school officials in several counties did not realize that the law applied to adult drivers in addition to students, they failed to send the adult drivers for training. Thus few adults were trained in the first program.⁹¹ In 1973 responsibility for the training of all school bus drivers was transferred to the South Carolina Department of Education.⁹²

This overview of the South Carolina Highway Patrol describes a unit of state government that has steadily increased its professionalism. Contrary to the Jacksonian ideal that the work of government is so simple an ordinary citizen can do it, the SCHP has emerged a unit of modern government in which complex skills and a high degree of expertise are required. Specialized knowledge and the standards for its application are the foundations of professionalism. Through the first half century, the SCHP gives ample evidence that it has developed both standards for action and measures for successful performance. By reducing self-interest and by exercising more control over its activities, the SCHP has responded to changing conditions and benefited the public interest as defined by the General Assembly.

ENDNOTES

1. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, *Task Force Report: The Police* (Washington: U.S. Government Office, 1967).
2. Bruce Smith, *The State Police: Organization and Administration* (Montclair, NJ: Patterson Smith, 1925), 39. Hereafter Smith, *The State Police: Organization and Administration*.
3. *Ibid.*, 39.
4. *Ibid.*, 23–36.
5. Pennsylvania State Police. "History of the Pennsylvania State Police," 27 October 1999. Available on Internet at http://www.state.pa.us/PA_Exec/State_Police/history/history.htm; accessed 4 November 1999.
6. New York State Police. "New York State Police History by Decade." Available on Internet at <http://www.troopers.state.ny.us/INTRO/HIST1917-29.html>; accessed 9 November 1999.
7. State of Michigan Department of State Police. "History." Available on the Internet at <http://www.msp.state.mi.us/history/history.html>; accessed 4 November 1999.
8. Merle T. Cole, *A Comprehensive History of the West Virginia State Police, 1919–1979*; available on the Internet at <http://www.wvstatepolice.com/history/wvphist.html>; accessed 4 November 1999.
9. Smith, *The State Police: Organization and Administration*, 39.

-
10. Washington State Patrol. "Where We've Been," 16 April 1999. Available on the Internet at <http://www.wa.gov/wsp/about/wevebeen.html>; accessed 9 November 1999.
 11. *Acts and Joint Resolutions of South Carolina*, 1930, 1: 1058–68.
 12. Ohio State Highway Patrol. "The Ohio State Highway Patrol: Our Proud Heritage." Available on the Internet at <http://www.state.oh.us/ohiostatepatrol/history.html>; accessed 9 November 1999.
 13. Kansas Highway Patrol. "Kansas Highway Patrol History." Available on the Internet at <http://www.ink.org/public/khp/history.htm>; accessed 9 November 1999.
 14. State of Alabama Department of Public Safety. "Alabama Department of Public Safety History: 1935–1990," 7 October 1999. Available on the Internet at <http://www.dps.state.al.us/history.html>; accessed 9 November 1999.
 15. Iowa State Patrol. "Iowa State Patrol Time Line Beginnings to 1950," 24 May 1999. Available on the Internet at <http://www.state.ia.us/government/dps/isp/timeline2.html>; accessed 9 November 1999.
 16. South Dakota Highway Patrol. "South Dakota Highway History," 26 October 1999. Available on the Internet at <http://www.state.sd.us/state/executive/dcr/hp/history.htm>; accessed 9 November 1999.
 17. Kansas Highway Patrol. "Kansas Highway Patrol History." Available on the Internet at <http://www.ink.org/public/khp/history.htm>; accessed 9 November 1999.
 18. John C. Thomas, "The Development of "An Institution: The Establishment and First Years of the South Carolina Penitentiary 1795–1881" (Masters thesis, University of South Carolina, 1979), 2.
 19. Jack K. Williams, *Vogues in Villainy* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1959), 60.
 20. J. H. Moore, *The South Carolina Highway Department 1917–1987* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1987), 133–58. Hereinafter Moore, *South Carolina Highway Department*.
 21. J. C. Pace, interview by William Mathias, Columbia, SC, 12 April 1996. Hereinafter, Pace interview.
 22. *Code of Laws of South Carolina*, 1976 Amended (Rochester, NY: Lawyers Co-operative Pub. Co.), 110–12
 23. *Acts and Joint Resolutions of South Carolina*, 1930, 1: 1058–68.
 24. "History of the South Carolina Highway Patrol Given," *Columbia State*, 6 July 1958.
 25. *Acts and Joint Resolutions of South Carolina*, 1930, 1: 1058–68.
 26. "History of the South Carolina Highway Patrol Given," *Columbia State*, 6 July 1958.
 27. Moore, *South Carolina Highway Department*, 106.
 28. B. M. Sawyer, "Ten Years of Progress," *The Bulletin*, 15 September 1939.
 29. *Code of Laws of South Carolina*, 1976 Amended, 110–12.

30. *Acts and Joint Resolutions of South Carolina*, 1930, 1:1058–68.
31. “Today’s Patrol: Educated, Equipped—A Stark Contrast to Patrol of the ’30s,” *Carolina Highways* 35, pt. 3 (1980): 4–5. Hereinafter “Today’s Patrol,” *Carolina Highways*.
32. Moore, *South Carolina Highway Department*, 106, 128.
33. *Ibid.*, 104, 110–11, 113.
34. Judy Nielson, *History of the State Highway Patrol* (Columbia, State Highway Department, n.d.), 2. Hereinafter Neilson, *State Patrol*.
35. “Today’s Patrol,” *Carolina Highways*: 4–5.
36. Moore, *South Carolina Highway Department*, 128.
37. “Today’s Patrol,” *Carolina Highways*: 4–5.
38. “Department Maintains Truck-weighing Detachments,” *Carolina Highways* 2, pt. 6 (1950): 16–17.
39. “Traffic signs to change,” *Columbia State*, 19 April 1972.
40. Israel Brooks, interview by William Mathias, Columbia, SC, 23 February 1999.
41. “Col. Thompson Leads Patrol in Many Improvements,” *Carolina Highways* 35, pt. 3 (1980): 16–17. Hereinafter “Col. Thompson,” *Carolina Highways*.
42. “First Aid Work Completed Here,” *The Bulletin*, 30 April 1939.
43. “History of the South Carolina Highway Patrol Given,” *Columbia State*, 6 July 1958.
44. “Highway Safety Rules for Those Who Walk,” *The Bulletin*, 19 January 1939.
45. “Patrol’s Pistol Team Wins in North Carolina Meet,” *Palmetto Patrolman*, 14 May 1940.
46. P. W. Gulley, interview by William Mathias, Columbia, SC, 17 April 1996. Hereinafter Gulley interview.
47. Michael Smith, “A Historical Perspective of the S.C. Highway Patrol” (masters thesis, University of South Carolina, Columbia, 1997), 33. Hereinafter Smith, “A Historical Perspective.”
48. *Ibid.*
49. “Gourdin’s Finest!”, *Williamsburg News*, 10 July 1959.
50. *Ibid.*
51. G. D. Williams and N. H. Carithers, *Precision Pursuit* (Columbia: South Carolina Highway Patrol, 1992), 16.
52. “Col. Thompson,” *Carolina Highways*: 16–17.
53. Jack Bass and Jack Nelson, *The Orangeburg Massacre* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1984), 157.
54. *Ibid.*, 143–57.
55. “Col. Thompson,” *Carolina Highways*: 16–17.
56. Gulley interview.
57. Rochelle Boyles, “Last Living Member of Original Patrol Recalls the Early Years,” *Carolina*

-
- Highways*, 35, pt. 3 (1980): 12.
58. I. Byrd Parnell, interview by William Mathias, Columbia, SC, ca. 1982.
59. "Today's Patrol," *Carolina Highways*: 4–5.
60. Ibid.
61. "1980—50th Year of S. C. Highway Patrol," *Times and Democrat*, 17 July 1980.
62. Gulley interview.
63. "Department Maintains Truck-weighing Detachments," *Carolina Highways* 2, pt. 6 (1950): 16–17.
64. *South Carolina Motor Vehicle Laws and Regulations*, 1946, part. 3, sec. 41.
65. Gulley interview.
66. "History of the South Carolina Highway Patrol Given," *Columbia State*, 6 July 1958.
67. Smith, "A Historical Perspective," 79.
68. Gulley, interview.
69. South Carolina Uniform Acts Regulating Traffic on Highways, 1952, Amended.
70. "New machine protects innocent, wrecks "two beers" alibi," *Carolina Law* (Summer 1952): 21.
71. R. A. Milam III, *Breath Examiner Specialist* (Darien, CT: Dunlap and Associates, Inc., 1980)
72. "New machine protects innocent," *Carolina Law* (Summer 1952): 21.
73. Smith, "A Historical Perspective," 83.
74. L. P. Watts, "Some Observations on Police-Administered Tests for Intoxication," *The North Carolina Law Review*, 45, pt. 1 (1966): 41–68.
75. *Code of Laws of South Carolina*, 1976 Amended, 110–12.
76. *The Micropedia Encyclopedia Britannica*, vol. 9 (Chicago: Encylopedia Britannica), 883.
77. *State v. Dantonio*, 49, *American Law Review* 2d (1955), 460.
78. "Today's Patrol," *Carolina Highways*: 4–5.
79. Gulley interview.
80. Pace interview.
81. R. Thompson, "South Carolina Highway Patrol Named "best dressed" in the United States," *South Carolina Trooper* (Fall 1993): 11.
82. Nielson, *State Patrol*, 2.
83. G. Miller, "SCHP adds color to shoulder patch," *South Carolina Trooper* (Summer 1991): 12–13.
84. Gulley interview.
85. "Waiting!," *The Palmetto Patrolman* (September 1941): 7–11.
86. "Novel Safety Course Conducted at Clinton by Highway Patrolman," *The Bulletin* (February

1936): 20.

87. "Just a second bicyclist!," *The Bulletin* (October 1939): 40.

88. "Novel Safety Course," *The Bulletin* (February 1936): 20.

89. "School Bus Driver Training Program Reaches Halfway Mark," *Carolina Highways* (Summer 1951): 10–12.

90. Ibid.

91. Ibid.

92. Gulley interview.

**“Grass Roots and Marble Columns:
Civil Rights, Public Accommodations
and South Carolina Federal Courts, 1955–1966”**

Stephen Lowe

In February 1955, Sarah May Flemming of Columbia sued the South Carolina Electric and Gas Company, which operated the city’s bus system, for enforcing state law by making her sit in seats and use the exit designated for African Americans. The case came before Judge George Bell Timmerman, a staunch segregationist, who quickly ruled that Flemming’s case had no standing since the state codes in question were constitutional. *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), he wrote, “is not applicable in the field of public transportation. . . . One’s education and personality is [sic] not developed on a city bus. . . . To hold that the *Brown* decision extends to the field of public transportation would be an unwarranted enlargement of the doctrine announced in that decision and an unreasonable restriction on the police power of the state.”¹ Timmerman dismissed the case.

Failure to win in the Flemming case did not daunt black South Carolinians, however. In May 1955 a group of African Americans in Charleston County met at the office of local realtor and NAACP leader J. Arthur Brown to discuss the idea of writing to get permission to use the Edisto Beach State Park, the only park in the state that was closed to African Americans by law. Blacks in the Charleston area had threatened to sue for some years, though they had taken no action, and the issue had been on the back burner since 1953.² Now, in the aftermath of *Brown v. Board of Education*, the time seemed ripe to reopen the issue. Etta Mae Clark, the second vice president of the NAACP branch in Charleston, was among the participants at the May meeting, as were John Chisolm and Charles Mason, both of whom were on the local executive board of the NAACP. Clark initiated the meeting because she “was going to have some friends down in June and . . . wanted a place to take them, which we do not have, and [she] went to [her] friends and asked about the Edisto Beach Park. . . . [T]hey said they don’t see any reason why we shouldn’t write and ask for admission. We were not going down, but we wanted to find out what was legal or right for us to do.” Clark and the others wrote park superintendent J. M. Pope to ask for permission to use the park’s facilities on 25 May, and they received this response from Pope’s successor Donald Cooler: “. . . This park was established in 1935 for the exclusive use of white persons, and based on custom and precedence we will have to deny your request.” Further, Cooler informed the group that “several of the state parks in South

Carolina are designated for Negro use only. One park in this area, Hunting Island, has separate white and Negro areas. I suggest that you visit that park where you will be most welcome." Clark and the others then brought suit against the state forester, C. H. Flory, along with State Park Director C. West Jacocks and Cooler. They argued that the sections of the 1952 state Code of Laws that specifically limited the use of the Edisto Beach State Park to whites violated the Fourteenth Amendment.³

The state responded that "the natural inclination of each race at this time to associate with members of its own race," as well as "the present natural, historical, cultural and deep-rooted mental attitudes and feelings of each race against the social and sexual mixing of the races" made it necessary to continue segregation at the park. The state's answer accused the plaintiffs of "blocking the establishment" of a separate park for blacks, for which the state had appropriated \$50,000, because of "plaintiffs' objection to any segregated system, no matter how equal, and their insistence upon full integration, irrespective of the detrimental affects which will result from such a policy to members of their own and of the white race."⁴

At the first hearing in the case held on 23 August, presiding Judge Ashton H. Williams asked John Wrighten, the plaintiffs' attorney—who himself had sued to integrate the University of South Carolina Law School⁵—whether it might not be a better idea if the plaintiffs accepted \$50,000 to build their own beach. He was "wondering whether or not [Wrighten] would rather see this beach closed altogether and the state surrender it [to private sale], rather than to accept the \$50,000 and build a beach of your own?" Wrighten demurred, citing Supreme Court case law, but Williams persisted: "We have got an unusual and extra-ordinary situation in Charleston County and in this section of the state, and I think that you are practical enough to realize that." Later on, Williams made his views perfectly clear: "[I]f I had been sitting on the Supreme Court, I wouldn't have signed the opinions that were signed on May 17, 1954 and May 31, 1955."⁶

In December, the attorneys in the case met with Judge Williams. A similar case in Maryland had been decided in favor of a group of African Americans in that state, and under agreements reached in the August hearing, the Maryland case controlled the issue in South Carolina. Since, however, the Supreme Court did not address the facts of the Maryland case—which were similar to, but not exactly the same as, those in South Carolina—it remained unclear to the state's attorneys that the Edisto Park should automatically be opened to African Americans. The parties therefore agreed to trial in the District Court, and the date was set for 6 February 1956.

Assistant State Attorney General James S. Verner questioned Etta Clark at length early in the February trial, and after establishing the NAACP memberships of the

principals, moved into the area of the \$50,000 for establishing the private park for blacks that Judge Williams had mentioned in the earlier hearing. Clark declared that she had no knowledge of any such effort beyond reading about the attempt. Verner then asked Clark a question that brought the issues in the case clearly into focus: "Suppose that the state would put a park for the Negro people and one for the white people, would you be satisfied with that, or do you want only one park open to all?" Clark responded concisely: "As of today, I want one. . . . Any place that is open and supported by tax money, I would like to be allowed to go."⁷

Verner seemed incredulous: "You are perfectly willing for the park to be shut down so long and no matter how much other people sought it, so long as a Negro cannot go to any park, no matter where it is or what it is, is that correct?" Again, Clark's response was to the point, not of the question, but of the system itself: "They never cared how I felt. I never had any place to go."⁸

When J. Arthur Brown took the stand, W. Newton Pough, the co-counsel for the plaintiffs, established that the local NAACP had had some conferences about the matter and had hired an attorney to look into the matter. Brown also noted that there had been efforts to look into buying other areas for a recreational beach for blacks in Charleston county, though nothing had ever come of the efforts.

On cross-examination, Brown faced questioning from Verner. Verner asked whether Brown's and the others' reasoning behind trying to get access to the beach for black people was just "to put this matter to a test and get justice, if you call it justice, and get it over with," instead of truly desiring, after forty-one years of life in Charleston county, finally to go to the beach for fun. Verner's next tack was to question whether racial peace would continue in the county: when asked if he thought the racial situation was "disintegrating due to the present pressures that are being exerted," Brown responded, "I feel that if agitation is not brought about by some hot-heads, that people will get along together." Verner attempted to paint Brown as one of the local "hot-heads" in the matter of racial policy. Brown had been involved in petition drives calling for the integration of local school districts in Charleston county. He had also typed the letters to the park superintendent, though he insisted that he did not ask anyone to sign the letters—that was a purely voluntary matter.⁹

Judge Williams allowed his own views to intrude into the courtroom after Verner finished his questioning by bringing up the prospect of criminal activity by the blacks who would be using the park. "Now, we might as well be perfectly frank with each other, and we know that there is a greater criminal tendency in Charleston among the Negroes than there is among the white people."¹⁰

Desperately, Verner and Williams attempted to get Brown to work out a com-

promise by which the court could issue an order allowing the beach authorities to set aside a portion of the beach for use by blacks. Williams remained concerned over the prospect of interracial violence and was not convinced, despite repeated assurances from Brown, that any violence would be the result of individual disagreements rather than racial animosity. Of course, Williams also remained concerned that the beach would be “abandoned” by whites if he opened the beach to everyone. Verner offered that “that practically happened in the Maryland case. When it was opened, the whites quit using it in Maryland to a large extent.” Brown continued to insist that once the park was opened, it may very well take a transition period in which whites would refuse to come to the park, but like other facilities in Charleston, the beach would eventually be integrated as whites began to return. “I think that when those people find out that being around Negroes, that we aren’t any type of creature who will eat them or try to tear them apart . . . and that we are just another group of human beings [things will return to normal].” Verner remained skeptical.¹¹

On 8 February the State Forestry Commission ordered the park closed, even though it would still remain open to whites. The park was little-used in winter except by fishermen, and the Columbia *State* noted that C. H. Flory had said that any fishermen who showed up could go right ahead and fish—as long as they were white fishermen.¹² The following day the state Senate began consideration of a bill that would close the park officially pending the legislature’s determination of how to deal with state funding for the park system. There was already, in the appropriations bill, a provision to consider only funding the state park system if it continued to be operated on a segregated basis. Ultimately, the legislature amended the state code of laws to require segregation in all state parks and to close the Edisto Beach State Park.

On 2 March Williams wrote the attorneys for both sides, saying that since the legislature had passed the proposed law closing the park, there was “no further question to be considered in the Park case.” He ordered a hearing on the 21st on the question of dismissing the case. Then, on 8 March the governor signed the act closing the park altogether. The plaintiffs refused to remove their complaint: the issue was not whether the state had the power to close the park but whether the statutes that mandated segregation in the park violated the 5th and 14th Amendments. Since the commission and legislature had closed the park, they could immediately reopen it if the plaintiffs withdrew.¹³

The state’s argument in the dismissal hearing therefore relied on the contention that since legislative action taking at least until the next year would be required to reopen the park, the case now before the court was moot and hypothetical. Under the agreement of the two sides, the statutes in question had been ruled unconstitutional

by the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in the Maryland case. Thus, if all the plaintiffs wanted was a declaration that the laws were unconstitutional, they had it—though not from Judge Williams. The only issue left was whether the judge would order the park opened to all, and since there was no park left to open, the issue had dissolved.

Williams refused to issue any ruling concerning all the state parks in South Carolina. Only the Edisto Beach park was at issue in the case, and since no African Americans had applied for admission to any of the other parks—and might never do so as far as Judge Williams knew—there was no reason to issue a blanket ruling. He was, however, prepared to “state here and now that the Supreme Court of the United States has already ruled that [the] plaintiffs have a right to use the Edisto Beach if it is ever used as a public place.”¹⁴ Judge Williams then spoke at length with Callison, Verner, Pough, and Wrihten regarding the issue of whether to issue a formal ruling or to dismiss the case. Ultimately, he decided to defer action, keeping the case open but undecided. Noting appeals by leaders of both national political parties, Williams called for a “common sense” solution to the problem, lest South Carolinians of both races find themselves not only without parks, but without schools as well. The state legislature was “playing for keeps,” and Williams apparently did not want to be the judge who caused the state to close its schools.¹⁵

The Clark case had resulted in a stalemate: the Supreme Court had determined that segregation in state parks was unconstitutional, but the state legislature had made that moot by closing the only state park that was specifically intended in the state code of laws to exclude blacks. As a result, it would not be until 1963 that South Carolina's African American population could enjoy the same state parks that the state's whites did. The case of *Brown v. State Forestry Commission*, which was first filed in 1961 and decided (on appeal) in 1963, revealed the continued determination of state officials to prevent African Americans from enjoying the state parks.

In August 1960, just prior to the end of the season, J. Herbert Nelson and a group of friends attempted to enter the Myrtle Beach State Park. Officers at the park, led by J. P. Strom, the head of the State Law Enforcement Division, refused to admit the group, and Nelson heard on the radio on his drive back to Sumter that the park had been closed early because of prior knowledge of the attempt by the group of blacks to enter the park. If true, Nelson's reported radio reception would explain the presence of the state's top law enforcement official. Nevertheless, nothing came of the affair until the following summer when a second group of African Americans from across the state attempted to enter Sesqui-Centennial State Park, located near Columbia, following a state meeting of the NAACP. They were prevented from doing so by the state park superintendent, an aide to the governor, the sheriff of Richland

County, and again, J. P. Strom. Having been prevented forcibly from enjoying the park, the group wrote to Matthew Perry to request his services.¹⁶ J. Arthur Brown was a member of both groups.

Depositions in the case reveal the growth of the plan to gain access to the Columbia park, and the role of ordinary people in the cases. In addition to Arthur Brown and Herbert Nelson, six other African Americans were named in the suit. Harold White was a nineteen-year-old clerk at an A & P store in Columbia. He had just graduated high school, and he had no plans for college. Following the meeting at New Ebenezer Baptist Church at which Medgar Evers spoke, a group of people led by I. DeQuincey Newman, the national field secretary of the NAACP for South Carolina, discussed the prospect of going to Sesqui-Centennial Park the following day, though White was unable to remember who had actually made the suggestion. White did reveal that upon being refused entry to the park, the cars returned to the NAACP offices in Columbia, where White and the others signed the document authorizing Perry to take the case to court.¹⁷

Nurses aide Mary Nesbitt, who had been told of the meeting in Columbia through her local NAACP branch in Spartanburg, went to Columbia for the meeting at the church along with two other members of the Spartanburg branch. She related that she, Murray Canty, and Edith Davis had gone to Columbia to hear Medgar Evers, who delivered the keynote speech; after leaving the church she and the others were told that they were going to a park the following morning, and she went along.

Jerrivoch Jefferson of Belton installed underground cable for the phone company, but he happened to be on vacation when a call came from his local chapter in Anderson for three volunteers to go to Columbia. Jefferson recalled that he had been invited on a picnic following Evers speech, but he recalled no mention of trying to enter the park, though after being refused entry he asked separately to be represented by Jenkins and Perry in "any legal action which was fit to take." Sam Leverette was a student at South Carolina Area Trade School in Denmark and a member of the Anderson branch of the NAACP. Leverette, along with Jefferson and Gladys Porter, had already been involved in an attempt to desegregate a waiting room in Greenwood by going into the white waiting room there while on their way to Columbia for the Evers speech.¹⁸

The class action suit Perry filed on 8 July 1961 subsumed the Myrtle Beach and Sesqui-Centennial Park groups. Perry asked for a three-judge court to hear the case as well as temporary and permanent injunctions. Circuit Judge Simon Sobeloff decided against the merits of appointing a three-judge panel, however, and the case assumed its place on the regular docket of Judge Timmerman. The first case challenging an

entire state park system thus began its way through the courts.¹⁹

As usual, the NAACP membership of the principal plaintiffs came to the fore quickly. H. P. Sharper of Florence had been president of the state convention at the time of the attempt to enter the Myrtle Beach park, and Brown now held that role. Nelson was the chair of the group's veterans committee. Daniel McLeod, the state attorney general, assisted by David W. Robinson, the principal attorney for the segregationist Gressette Committee of the state legislature, argued that the national NAACP was the true plaintiff in the case. It was the goal of the NAACP and the Legal Defense Fund "to destroy the park system of South Carolina pursuant to their purposes to require all persons to integrate regardless of the wishes of the peoples." At depositions held in August 1961, Robinson asked Brown numerous questions concerning the role of the NAACP in the case, even going so far as to demand "a list of all the NAACP employees or agents or attorneys that are employed by either the State Branch or the National Branch or by . . . the Legal Defense Group [sic], and what their compensation is."²⁰ Ultimately, however, the state relied on a police powers argument that only segregation could prevent the inevitable violence that would result if the two races were allowed "to bathe in the same area."²¹

Ultimately, the questions themselves were moot. In 1961 Judge Timmerman stepped down from the bench and was replaced by J. Robert Martin, who would soon become chief judge of the South Carolina district. The state park case languished, however, until the summer of 1963. That spring, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in a Tennessee case that the continuation of segregated public facilities under the rubric of separate but equal was impermissible.²² Martin therefore had no choice but to grant the plaintiffs' motion for a summary judgement. He issued his decision after the July Fourth holiday but delayed implementation for sixty days, making sure that the parks would not be opened on an integrated basis until after Labor Day. The transition period was necessary, he argued, because of the safety concerns that had been brought up at trial—specifically, the effect of having members of both races in close proximity without police protection.²³

Following Martin's decision, the State Forestry Commission closed all twenty-six state parks. South Carolina thus became practically the only state to shut down its recreational facilities in response to a court order to desegregate. In fact, of four instances in which facilities were closed, three were in South Carolina. Nevertheless, national parks and some municipal facilities throughout the state had voluntarily opened their facilities to African Americans by 1963.²⁴

State parks were not the only venue that came under fire for segregating whites and blacks in the late 1950s and early 1960s. In November 1958, Air Force civil service

employee Richard Henry, whose job required him to fly throughout the country, was forced to use the segregated waiting room at the Greenville Airport. Henry had come to Greenville from his station at Selfridge Air Force Base in Michigan to assist with a troop carrier exercise, arriving and leaving through Greenville's airport. He arrived at the airport forty-five minutes before his flight left and sat in the terminal's waiting room. The airport manager, O. L. Andrews, told Henry after a few minutes that "we don't allow colored people in here," and Henry responded that he was an interstate traveler. After being "put out" of the waiting room, Henry called the local air force base and his home base, and waited outside for his plane to board, which it soon did.²⁵

The case was heard before Judge Timmerman, who almost from the beginning made the plaintiff's case difficult. In the hearing for a preliminary injunction, held in July 1959, Timmerman consistently placed obstacles in the path of NAACP attorney Jack Greenberg, who had come from the national office of the Legal Defense Fund in New York to assist with the case. Forced to pursue the preliminary injunction with only the sole affidavit of the plaintiff for support because Timmerman refused to allow additional affidavits or testimony at the hearing, Greenberg started out at a disadvantage. Timmerman at first refused to hear the motion for the preliminary injunction, even though Greenberg pointed out that he could hear evidence from witnesses in support of such a motion. Timmerman claimed that "it could aid one side or another to get an advantage that they are not entitled to. I don't intend being a party to that," and he told Greenberg that he would allow the hearing only if it was based solely on Henry's affidavit.²⁶

Greenberg reluctantly agreed to be heard based on the single affidavit. He argued that "it is now rather late in the day for anyone to argue that a governmental body may maintain racial segregation in any of its facilities. . . . [I]t is perhaps one of the fundamental principles of our jurisprudence that this is something that a governmental body can not do." Timmerman, acting more as advocate than impartial judge, countered that most of the complaint was "made up of references to statutes and constitutional provisions. There is a very small part of it that deals with the factual issues. . . . It looks like somebody had picked up a digest of cases or a digest of the constitution and just at random picked out a whole lot of provisions to plead."²⁷

In turn, Thomas Wofford, the attorney for the Greenville Airport Commission, replied with a 26½-page oration on everything from the jurisdiction of the court (it should be denied because Henry never alleged damages over \$10,000) to the state of Michigan ("why he wants to go back God Almighty in all of his own infinite wisdom only knows"). Wofford also offered several recent cases in which federal courts had

allowed the doctrine of separate but equal to stand.²⁸ Greenberg might have thought better of even trying to justify the preliminary injunction after the speech by Wofford, preferring instead to wait until the trial and the actual admission of evidence from witnesses, because he said nothing after Wofford was finally finished. Timmerman refused the motion for an injunction, and a second hearing was held the following September following an appeal to the Fourth Circuit.²⁹ In denying the injunction, Timmerman actually implied that it was Henry who should be a target for injunction, given that it was he who was “deliberately mak[ing] a nuisance of himself to the annoyance of others. . . . The right to equality before the law, to be free from discrimination, invests no one with authority to require others to accept him as a companion or social equal.”³⁰

Henry testified that he had gone into the main waiting room to read a magazine and see the aircraft on the runway, but Wofford quizzed him as to his knowledge of the existence of the segregated waiting room. While it is not clear whether Henry saw the sign for the “Colored Lounge,” he did offer that if he had seen the sign, he would not have gone in. Wofford asked Henry about his representation, establishing, over Greenberg’s objections, that Lincoln Jenkins had not been paid and that the NAACP had recommended his services. Wofford also argued with the witness as to the exact words in his original deposition. (Wofford apparently was trying to get Henry to admit that at no time did Andrews or anyone else say that blacks were not allowed in the main waiting room, though it was clear that that was the case.)

Reverend J. S. Hall testified that on several occasions he had been forced to use the segregated waiting room, though not on every occasion that he had used the airport. Once in 1958 he had accompanied someone to the airport and sat undisturbed in the main waiting room. In October of 1959 he had gone to the airport to see off Jackie Robinson along with several other people. Andrews had told them to move. Then on 7 July he and A. J. Whittenburg flew to Charlotte from the Greenville airport, and Mark Tolbert accompanied them to the airport. On that occasion, the three men were asked, again by airport manager Andrews, to leave the main waiting room.³¹

Wofford, like most white southern attorneys representing segregationist interests, invoked the strategy of implying illicit involvement by the NAACP. In the Henry case, however, Judge Timmerman himself participated in the state’s defense. When Wofford questioned of the validity of Henry’s affidavit and hinted at possible collusion by the NAACP and Henry in bringing the case, Timmerman as much as badgered Henry about when and where—and whether—he had actually signed the affidavit. When Greenberg tried to object to questioning about whether Henry had

paid Lincoln Jenkins a fee, Timmerman overruled him and directed Henry to answer the questions. Henry had to admit that Jenkins had been recommended to him by the NAACP after the organization had been apprised of the incident in Greenville.³² Later in Wofford's cross-examination of Henry, Timmerman became irritated with the witness. Wofford had asked if the NAACP was financing his suit, and Henry had answered that he understood that to be the case. Timmerman interjected to ask if Henry ever expected to pay anything on the case and whether he had known attorney Jenkins prior to the case.

THE COURT: Did you correspond with him before you came to Greenville with reference to taking this case that you were going to set up?

THE WITNESS: Oh, I beg your pardon. May I correct that? You asked me did I know Mr. Jenkins before I came to Greenville.

THE COURT: Yes.

THE WITNESS: Well, you are assuming . . .

THE COURT: No, I am not assuming anything; I am asking you questions.

THE WITNESS: Well, no, I didn't know Mr. Jenkins, and I hadn't corresponded with him before I came to Greenville for the Air Force.

THE COURT: You did correspond with him before you came down to Greenville the first time?

THE WITNESS: No, it was before I came to Greenville for the case today, and I suppose I came to Columbia . . .

THE COURT: Well, suppose you listen to the questions and we'll get along better.

THE WITNESS: All right, sir. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: And let's answer the question I ask instead of another one.

Timmerman's decision in the case, issued on 19 October 1960, went squarely for the state. He ruled that even "giving [Henry's] affidavit the most favorable consideration it falls short of indicating any necessity for a preliminary injunction to protect any legitimate right the plaintiff has." Timmerman interpreted the words of the manager of the airport, who said that "we have a waiting room for colored folks over there," completely differently from the way Henry had: to Timmerman, the words hardly constituted an order to leave the white waiting room. Timmerman

invoked the separate-but-equal spirit of *Plessy v. Ferguson* (1896) well:

From whom was he segregated? . . . Was he segregated from his friends, acquaintances or associates, from those who desired his company and he theirs? There is nothing in the affidavit to indicate such is true. . . . [S]uppose he was segregated from people who did not care for his company or association, What civil right of his was thereby invaded? If he was trying to invade the civil rights of others, an injunction might be more properly invoked against him to protect their civil rights.³³

Timmerman went on to accept the defense's motion to strike key jurisdictional elements of the complaint and to grant the defense's motion to dismiss the complaint. Segregation at the Greenville Airport, despite state sanctioning of the Airport Commission, was not something that took place under color of state law. Furthermore, Henry "did not go the waiting room in quest of waiting room facilities, but solely as a volunteer for the purpose of instigating litigation. . . . The Court does not and should not look with favor on volunteer trouble makers or volunteer instigators of strife or litigation."³⁴

On appeal, the Fourth Circuit reversed Timmerman's harsh and patently incorrect ruling and directed him to rehear the case and to grant an injunction against the Airport Commission. Defensively, Timmerman wrote that the Fourth Circuit had created a "new rule of deductive evidence" by deciding that "from the allegation that [Henry] was directed to a separate waiting room maintained for colored people, it is fairly inferable that other negroes had been similarly treated." The Circuit Court's decision, as far as Timmerman was concerned, had "the appearance of a groping after a plausible excuse for accordng preferential treatment to some class." He reluctantly issued the injunction.³⁵

Timmerman had clearly come from a different time, but nevertheless he represented a fair portion of white opinion in the state, even as the civil rights movement began to move to a more confrontational stage. Black activists, many of them youths in college and high school—and sometimes younger—carried the civil rights movement to the point of direct action against segregated institutions. When confronted by the white power structure, however, they very often resorted to the courts as a tool for asserting their rights. Thus, even as the civil rights movement began to move to new strategies, the old strategy of court action had not outlived its usefulness.

On 18 February 1961, the same day that Timmerman filed his reluctant injunction in the Greenville Airport case, several youths in Greenville tried to use the

skating rink at the city's Cleveland Park and were refused entry. Someone called the police, who arrived soon thereafter and arrested the youths. In June, they filed suit in the western district federal court asking for temporary and permanent injunctions against the skating rink and the city for operating a segregated institution. The defendants, who included the city manager, the director of parks and recreation for the city, the chief of police, and the chief of detectives, countered that, rather than being "clean, orderly [and] dignified," the plaintiffs were engaged "in an effort to stir up strife and trouble and not truly seeking recreation."³⁶

A regional convention of the NAACP was in progress, and a group of eleven young men and women met on 18 February, a Saturday, at Springfield Baptist Church and decided to go to the park. When they arrived, the attendant told them that they had to have a permit to skate, which they did not. Nor did they need one, according to the testimony of J. Roy Gibson, the supervisor who was on duty that day. Only the purchase of a ticket was required for entry into the rink. After about ten minutes, a voice over the loudspeaker announced that the rink was closed and that everyone had to leave. (The rink reopened later that evening at around 7:15.) The police arrived a few minutes later and ordered the would-be skaters to leave. Since it was raining, they decided to stay on the porch, but the police told them they were violating a code (possible loitering). When one of the activists, Mary Elizabeth Norris, demanded to see the code, the police said they would have to go downtown to see it. They rode down to police headquarters, were read the ordinance, and promptly booked. They had never been informed that they were under arrest before that point in time. James Carter testified that he had tried to change his mind about getting in the police cars to go downtown and was told "no, you can't turn back now, get in the car." When they arrived at the station, the officer read "something . . . kind of fast," and when Carter asked to see the code, the officer "flashed it in [his] face and shut the book; and then he said, 'book 'em'."³⁷

In preparing his defense for the civil trial, Greenville city attorney W. H. Arnold deposed four of the seven plaintiffs. All of them had been active in protests before, either in Greenville or in Columbia. Classie Rae Walker had been involved in the march on the state house grounds; James Carter, Mary Norris, and Horace Nash had participated in protests in Columbia and Greenville, including sit-ins at the Greenville Kress store. All were members of the NAACP. Arnold's desire to place this information in the record followed the typical strategy of attorneys for the state and localities involved in suits in which the NAACP, or its members, was a party. Each deponent in the case, as usual, was asked whether they were paying for their representation (they were not). While not clearly relevant to the issues at hand, the

information that Arnold and his counterparts in other cases managed to get into the record established the involvement of the NAACP in prosecuting desegregation suits. Donald Sampson, the Greenville-based lead attorney for the plaintiffs, had a bit of fun with Arnold's strategy during his cross-examination of Mary Norris in this exchange with the witness:

Q. Are you proud to be a member of the NAACP?

A. I am.

Q. You intend to stay a member?

A. Yes.

Q. You're not a member of the John Birch Society, are you?

A. No.³⁸

The trial, held on 20 August before Judge C. C. Wyche, consisted of the testimony of City Manager Gerald W. Shaw, Director of Parks and Recreation Carl Hust, and James Gibson, the manager of the skating rink and swimming pool at Cleveland park. As in locations throughout the Jim Crow South, there was not a city ordinance requiring segregation in the city's parks. Rather, Cleveland Park and other parks in the city were segregated by custom. Gibson therefore had the discretion, at least technically, as to whom he would sell tickets. There were only a few rules, none of them specifically designed to segregate the rink. He testified that he would not sell a ticket to a black skater on the day of the trial, just as he had not sold any on 18 February.

Before Judge Wyche could rule on the case, however, the City of Greenville closed both skating rinks operated by the city. Both rinks had been "abandoned and permanently closed." Wyche had no alternative but to dismiss the case, but not before noting that the city had the right "to preserve the peace and assure a peaceful enjoyment of skating rinks to all races, regardless of which group of citizens, Negro or White, causes disturbances. The plaintiffs' constitutional rights to use and enjoy the skating rinks on an equal basis with White citizens in the community does not encompass a right to cause a disturbance."³⁹ Citing *Clark v. Flory*, the judge noted the right of the plaintiffs to the injunction, if the situation that warranted the injunction still existed. Sampson and Perry tried to reopen the case with a new trial, arguing that the controversy was still alive. Since the city continued to operate a segregated park system, closing the skating rinks only avoided the real issue—the perpetuation of segregation.

Cases dealing with the desegregation of public facilities exemplify two ideals: the determination of African Americans to achieve integration, and the equally fierce

devotion to segregation that continued at the official state level well into the 1960s. Even as South Carolina was integrating its colleges for the first time as a result of a case fought with the same vigor as the Brown case,⁴⁰ state officials believed it was right to close the state park system. The state was hailed for achieving “integration with dignity” as Harvey Gantt became the first black student at Clemson College,⁴¹ but he still could not enjoy his lunch at a state park near the college. Only in 1966 did the state legislature pass a law requiring the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism to “open any State park to public use for . . . normal recreational, educational and forestry purposes and uses. . . .”⁴² Ultimately, one can look back at the cases and events of the early 1960s and note that the state was beginning, however slowly, to turn the corner.⁴³ Nevertheless, despite important victories like the Gantt case or the state parks case, African Americans continued to have to rely on the courts for access to previously white institutions until the 1970s. As white South Carolina began, grudgingly, to allow African Americans into their parks, restaurants, and even colleges, elementary and secondary schools throughout the state continued to maintain their discriminatory past.

ENDNOTES

1. *Flemming v. South Carolina Electric & Gas Company*, 128 F. Supp. 469, 470.
2. “South Carolina,” *Southern School News*, 1:8 (April 7, 1955): 13.
3. Testimony for Plaintiffs at Trial, 6 February 1956, 5–6; 7; Exhibit P-1. Donald B. Cooler to Mrs. Etta Clark, 21 May 1955; Amended Complaint, 22 July 1955, 2. *Clark v. Flory*, Civil Action Number 5802, Eastern District of South Carolina, Charleston Division, Record Group 21, Records of the District Courts of the United States, National Archives-Southeast Region, East Point, Georgia. Hereafter, *Clark v. Flory*, C/A No. 5802.
4. Defendants Answer, 17 August 1955, 3–4. *Clark v. Flory*, C/A No. 5802.
5. In *Wrighten v. Board of Trustees of the University of South Carolina*, 72 F. Supp. 948 (1947). Wrighten had, to the disappointment of some, settled for the creation of a nominally equal law school at South Carolina State College, the state’s historically black public college.
6. Transcript of Hearing, 23 August 1955, 34–35; 37–38. *Clark v. Flory*, C/A No. 5802.
7. Testimony for Plaintiffs at Trial, 6 February 1956, 10. *Clark v. Flory*, C/A No. 5802.
8. Testimony for Plaintiffs at Trial, 6 February 1956, 10. *Clark v. Flory*, C/A No. 5802.
9. Testimony for Plaintiffs at Trial, 6 February 1956, 22, 24 ff. *Clark v. Flory*, C/A No. 5802.
10. Testimony for Plaintiffs at Trial, 6 February 1956, 35. *Clark v. Flory*, C/A No. 5802.
11. Testimony for Plaintiffs at Trial, 6 February 1956, 40–49. *Clark v. Flory*, C/A No. 5802.
12. “Edisto Park Stays Closed but Accessible,” *Columbia State*, 10 February 1956, 1-D.

13. Ashton H. Williams to John H. Wrighten, W. Newton Pough, T. C. Callison, and James S. Verner, 2 March 1956; Wrighten to Williams, 5 March 1956. *Clark v. Flory*, C/A No. 5802.
14. Transcript of Hearing, 21 March 1956, 30–31. *Clark v. Flory*, C/A No. 5802.
15. “Edisto Park Case Action is Deferred Indefinitely,” *Columbia State*, 22 March 1956, 6-D.
16. Nelson to Perry, 15 September 1960 and Norris et al. to Perry, 16 June 1961. *Brown v. State Forestry Commission*, Civil Action Number AC-774, Eastern District of South Carolina, Columbia Division, Record Group 21, Records of the District Courts of the United States, National Archives-Southeast Region, East Point, Georgia. Hereafter, *Brown v. State Forestry Commission*, C/A No. AC-774.
17. Depositions, Deposition of Harold White, 54–58. *Brown v. State Forestry Commission*, C/A No. AC-774.
18. Depositions. Deposition of Jerrivoch C. Jefferson, 76–83. Quotation on 82; Deposition of Sam Leverette, 84–90. *Brown v. State Forestry Commission*, C/A No. AC-774.
19. South Carolina Council on Human Relations (SCCHR), “Public Parks and Recreational Facilities: A Study in Transition,” 1963 2. Records of the South Carolina Council on Human Relations, Folder 842, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia.
20. Depositions, Deposition of J. Arthur Brown, 8. *Brown v. State Forestry Commission*, C/A No. AC-774.
21. Deposition of J. Arthur Brown, 8; Answer of South Carolina State Forestry Commission, of Charles H. Flory, State Forester, and of C. West Jacocks, State Park Director, 14 December 1962, 4. *Brown v. State Forestry Commission*, C/A No. AC-774.
22. *Watson v. City of Memphis*, 373 U.S. 526 (1963).
23. Eugene B. Sloan, “State Parks Ordered Integrated,” *Columbia State*, 11 July 1963, 1-A; *Brown v. South Carolina State Forestry Commission*, 226 F. Supp. 646 (1963), 650.
24. SCCHR, “Public Parks,” 3, 7.
25. Motion hearing, 14 September 1960, 15–16. *Henry v. Greenville Airport Commission*, Civil Action Number 2491, Western District of South Carolina, Greenville Division, Record Group 21, Records of the District Courts of the United States, National Archives-Southeast Region, East Point, Georgia. Hereafter *Henry v. Greenville Airport Commission*, C/A No. 2491.
26. Trial transcript, 20 July 1959, 3–6. *Henry v. Greenville Airport Commission*, C/A No. 2491.
27. Trial transcript, 20 July 1959, 8–11. *Henry v. Greenville Airport Commission*, C/A No. 2491.
28. For example, *Williams v. Howard Johnson*, in which a three-judge panel of the Fourth Circuit admitted that the customs of the people of a state do not constitute state action.
29. Proceedings of Hearing, 39. *Henry v. Greenville Airport Commission*, C/A No. 2491.
30. “Negroes Ask Reassignment In Clarendon’s Schools,” *Southern School News* 6:3 (September 1959): 10.
31. Motion hearing, 14 September 1960, testimony of Reverend J. S. Hall, 44–52. *Henry v. Greenville Airport Commission*, C/A No. 2491.
32. Motion hearing, 14 September 1960, 23–26. *Henry v. Greenville Airport Commission*, C/A

No. 2491.

33. *Henry v. Greenville Airport Commission*, 175 F. Supp. 343 (1960), 347.

34. *Henry v. Greenville Airport Commission*, 175 F. Supp. 343 (1960), 349–51.

35. *Henry v. Greenville Airport Commission*, 191 F. Supp. 146 (1961). Quotation from Circuit Court's opinion from *Henry v. Greenville Airport Commission*, 279 F. 2nd 751, 752, emphasis added by Timmerman.

36. Complaint and Answer. Quotations from 5 and 2, respectively. *Walker v. Shaw*, Civil Action Number 2983, Western District of South Carolina, Greenville Division, Record Group 21, Records of the District Courts of the United States, National Archives-Southeast Region, East Point, Georgia. Hereafter, *Walker v. Shaw*, C/A No. 2983.

37. Transcript of Motion Hearing. Testimony of J. Roy Gibson, 21, 17; Depositions. Testimony of Classic Rae Walker. 2–16; Depositions. Testimony of James Allen Carter, 26–27. *Walker v. Shaw*, C/A No. 2983.

38. Depositions. Testimony of Mary Elizabeth Norris, 31. *Walker v. Shaw*, C/A No. 2983.

39. Opinion and Order, October 17, 1962. 3. *Walker v. Shaw*, C/A No. 2983.

40. *Gantt v. Clemson*, 213 F. Supp 103 (1962).

41. George McMillan, "Integration with Dignity," *Saturday Evening Post*, March 16, 1963, 15–21.

42. 11 *Race Relations Law Reporter* 1578, 1579; *South Carolina Code of Laws*, 1966, Section 51, Article 2.5.

43. Of course, it was a very gradual and grudging change. In the early 1960s, young African Americans became very active in the sit-in movement that originated in Greensboro, North Carolina. Many were prosecuted in municipal court, and the state Supreme Court routinely upheld convictions for trespass (though occasionally it would overturn a conviction for a collateral offence, such as in the case of *Mitchell v. Charleston*, in which the Court ruled that black students who had cooperated with police when placed under arrest could not be convicted of the city statute barring interference with a police officer just because they did not leave when instructed by the police chief). A number of these cases were appealed from the South Carolina Supreme Court to the U.S. Supreme Court. There, in *Peterson v. Greenville* (373 U.S. 244 [1963]), the Court ruled that the city's segregation ordinance effectively removed private

The Search for National Identity: The U.S. in the Modern World An Interdisciplinary Approach

M. Ron Cox, Jr. and Wayne L. Chilcote

USC-Salkehatchie is a campus of the University of South Carolina (USC) that offers the associate degree in arts and science and provides the first two years of course work leading to a baccalaureate degree. Because Salkehatchie's usual enrollment is about one thousand students, its faculty is organized into three academic divisions: Humanities and Social Science, Mathematics and Science, and Professional Studies. Since some professors teach in more than one academic area, faculty from any of these divisions know faculty from the others quite well. There are professors teaching combinations such as art history and public speaking, history and speech, and geography and English. At USC-Salkehatchie, then, there are several members of the faculty who have interdisciplinary interests.

When informed in 1993 that a Title III grant won by the campus included funds for innovative teaching projects, several faculty believed that circumstances on our campus might make it possible to develop interdisciplinary courses. For the fall and spring semesters 1993–94, three professors designed and submitted for approval by both the university and Title III, an interdisciplinary course called "Searching For Identity in the 1990s," to address the cultural history of the United States since 1945. The disciplines represented were history, psychology and geography.

The course focused on selected topics such as urbanization, trends in child development and education, and political patterns in the United States across the second half of the twentieth century. Texts used for the course were: *A History of the US from 1945 to Present*, Donald Meinig's *Interpretation of Ordinary Landscape*, and Douglas Coupland's *Generation X*. At the end of 1994, the Title III grant had been completed. Funds for continuing this course were no longer available, and USC Salkehatchie did not offer an interdisciplinary course again until the fall of 1998.

For many years, USC's College of Applied Professions has offered a degree program called the Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies (BAIS). This program has been used extensively by students on the university's five regional campuses. According to USC's undergraduate catalog, it is geared toward motivated students who have unique educational goals such as adult students who are already employed and students who hold associate degrees from an accredited institution. The program of study is individualized, based on the needs of each applicant.

In 1998, Larry West, an economics and business professor, indicated that there was a growing concern for broader training in the humanities for business majors, the proposed major for a significant portion of our students at USC-Salkehatchie. Along with our campus's emphasis on writing skills, critical thinking skills, and the BAIS degree program offered on the regional campuses of USC. Professor West's information led to a new interdisciplinary course at the Salkehatchie campus.

In the fall semester of 1998, we offered an interdisciplinary course, one which focused on the question of American national identity in the twentieth century—a century that has produced profound changes in the American landscape—economically, geographically, politically, and socially. These changes have had a significant impact on the way Americans view themselves and their role in the world community of nations. In this class, students would use the perspective of economics, geography, and history to examine the forces that have shaped American national identity, both individually and collectively.

The proposal for the course, which focused on interdisciplinary relationships for the study of any given event, was made to the university's administration during the spring semester of 1998. Students tend to view academic disciplines as operating in a vacuum, failing to see how the courses they take relate to one another. Unfortunately, professors often contribute to this view. As a result, events studied in history classes are seldom emphasized when students open their economics textbooks, and the cultural landscape is seldom discussed in classes other than those immediately addressing human and cultural geography.

Many among the forty students enrolled in the BAIS program at USC-Salkehatchie in 1998 found that interdisciplinary courses fitted their programs of study quite well. For the fall semester of 1998, professors Wayne Chilcote, Larry West, and Ron Cox proposed to team-teach a course that would incorporate a "three-camera" approach to the issue of American national identity. That is, each professor would offer a picture of the American identity based on his discipline's view of the twentieth-century American landscape. An overlay of these three pictures would produce a composite picture of our identity as Americans in the twentieth century. Our purpose was not only to determine what this identity is—or even if there is any such thing—but also to get the students to realize the complex relationships between certain academic disciplines. For this first interdisciplinary course offered in five years and only the second ever at Salkehatchie, we decided that the fields of economics, geography, and history would be the best set of cameras.

USC-Salkehatchie's associate dean for academic affairs approved our proposal. Because of its interdisciplinary nature, it was listed on the fall schedule separately as

Business Administration (BADM) 399, Geography (GEOG) 399, and History (HIST) 399. The 399 number in the USC system indicates an independent study course, but an exception was granted in this case. Students who enrolled in the course had the option of receiving elective credit in BADM, GEOG, or HIST, depending on their programs of study. Eighteen students enrolled in the course.

The professors met several times during the summer of 1998 to discuss the format and structure of the course. We discovered that while some colleges and universities do offer interdisciplinary courses, the format for such courses often involved only one professor being in class at a time. As our purpose was to demonstrate the interrelationship of our disciplines, we determined that it was imperative that all three of us be present at every class session.

Our next task was to determine the scope of the course. Our topic, the search for national identity, posed certain problems. Each of us had biases about what this search would need to encompass. From our geographer's perspective, the study should begin by considering the effects of English colonization on the American cultural landscape. Our historian reasoned that the focus could be narrowed by focusing only on the period since 1763. The end of the French and Indian War, he argued, was the point at which profound differences between the thirteen British colonies of North America and their Mother Country—and thus, the beginning of American national “identity”—began to be openly debated. Our economist pointed out that this was a one-semester course, and that any hope of addressing American identity in the modern world rested on strictly limiting the scope of the course. From his view, the pivotal event for modern American identity was the Great Depression.¹

After considerable debate, we agreed that we would focus on the concept of the modern American identity, beginning approximately with the Great Depression and carrying our study through the present day. In doing so, we would limit ourselves essentially to two basic questions: 1) What did it mean to say, “I am an American” at any point during the twentieth century in process? and 2) What does it mean today to say “I am an American” at the end of the twentieth century? With these questions as a starting point, we hoped to explore the various economic, geographical, and historical forces that had worked together to shape this “national identity.”

Once the scope was set, we divided it into periods of approximately fifteen years each subdivided into topics which we believed most instrumental in shaping American national identity. We produced the following course outline that became the basis for the course syllabus.²

Part I: Depression, New Deal, and World War (1929–1945)

Class 1: Background to the U.S. in 1929

Class 2: Wall Street Lays an Egg—The Crash and the Great Depression

- Class 3: Nothing to Fear But Fear Itself—The First New Deal
- Class 4: From Recovery to Reform—The Second New Deal
- Class 5: The End of Blissful Isolation—U.S. Foreign Policy in the 30s
- Class 6: Making the World Safe . . . for What?—The U.S. and World War II

Part II: The American Age (1945–1960)

- Class 7: My Bomb's Bigger Than Your Bomb—The Cold War in Europe
- Class 8: Other Fronts of the Cold War—Central America, Africa, and Asia
- Class 9: The American Boom—From Babies to Buicks
- Class 10: Boob Tubes and Bomb Shelters—American Society in the 1950s
- Class 11: A Little Dog Named Checkers—American Politics in the 1950s
- Class 12: Separate but Unequal—The Early Civil Rights Movement

Part III: Brother, Can You Spare a War? (1960–1975)

- Class 13: Big Guns, Bigger Money—The Military-Industrial Complex
- Class 14: Commies Near and Far—Khrushchev, Castro, Mao, and Ho
- Class 15: “Hey, Hey, LBJ . . .”—Vietnam and the American Experience
- Class 16: LBJ's Other War—The Great Society
- Class 17: We Shall Overcome—The Civil Rights Movement in the 60s
- Class 18: Extremism in the Defense of Liberty—The New Conservatism
- Class 19: From Cold Warrior to World Statesman—Nixon and American Identity
- Class 20: “I Am Not a Crook”—Watergate

Part IV: Searching For An American Identity (1975–1998)

- Class 21: No Gas Today—The Economic Crises of the 70s
- Class 22: A Helpless Giant?—The Iranian Hostage Crisis
- Class 23: Voo-Doo Economics—Supply-Side Theory and Reaganomics
- Class 24: The Triumph of the New Conservatism—Politics in the 80s
- Class 25: Where Did All the Bad Guys Go?—The End of the Cold War
- Class 26: The Clinton Presidency—A Bridge to . . . Where?

Having established this outline for the course, we discovered that there was no single textbook that sufficiently addressed the issues in the manner we wished. We decided that selected readings would be assigned. Although all three professors would be present at each class session, we designed a primary presenter for each session. This professor would be responsible for assigning the readings and would begin the class meeting with a twenty-minute introductory lecture to provide background for discussion of the day's topic. The remainder of the class would be used for discussion of the readings and lecture material. Each professor was given the same number of classes in which to serve as the primary presenter—approximately eight each. The assigned readings would address the day's subject from the perspective of

that professor's discipline. A sample of these assigned readings included:

Robert F. Stauffer, "The Bank Failures of 1930–31," *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking*, Vol. XIII, No. 1 (February, 1981): 109–13.

Thomas Mayer, "Consumption in the Great Depression," *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 86 (1978): 139–43

Barton J. Bernstein, "The New Deal: The Conservative Achievements of Liberal Reform," Bernstein and Matusow, eds. *Twentieth-Century America: Recent Interpretations*, 2d. ed. (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, Inc., 1972): 242–64.

Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., "Origins of the Cold War," *Foreign Affairs*, Vol. XLVI (October, 1967): 22–52.

David Halberstam, *The Fifties* (New York: Williard Books, 1993): selected chapters.

J. Dennis Lord, "Temporal and Spatial Aspects of School Desegregation," *Spatial Perspectives on School Desegregation and Busing*, No. 77-3 (Washington, DC: Resource Papers for College Geography, 1977): 2–16.

Irving L. Janis, "The Cuban Missile Crisis," *Groupthink*, 2d ed. (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1982): 132–58.

Earl and Merle Black, "The White Revolt in the Deep South," *The Vital South: How Presidents Are Elected* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992): 141–75.

Haynes Johnson, "The Capital," *Sleepwalking Through History: America in the Reagan Years* (New York: Anchor Books, 1991),: 19–23.

Dan T. Carter, "The Politics of Symbols," *From George Wallace to Newt Gingrich: Race in the Conservative Counterrevolution, 1963–1994* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996): 55–86.

*Coupland, Douglas. *Generation X* (New York: St. Martins Press, 1991).

Meinig, Donald, ed. *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscape* (New York: Oxford Press, 1979).

Students were required to read all assignments and to participate in class discussions. At the end of each class session, students were required to write a short—one to two paragraph—commentary, in which they addressed what they believed they had contributed to the class discussion (self-evaluation) and also to comment on which other student they thought contributed most to the class (peer evaluation). Copies were made of these commentaries and were distributed to each professor. The professors offered comments and returned these papers to the students. These

commentaries and the in-class participation counted 20 percent of the student's final grade.

Students were also required to write three longer commentaries—three to five pages, typed and double-spaced. These were due one week after completing each of the first three parts of the course. Rather than traditional objective analyses, students were encouraged to offer some of their own insight regarding the topics and how historical, geographic, and economic forces combined to shape American identity during that time period. Each professor received a copy of these commentaries and marked them separately. We then met and discussed the papers before a grade was assigned. In the case of a severe disagreement regarding a grade, we agreed to a majority rule: if two of the three professors agreed upon a grade, that would be the grade recorded for the student.³ The three commentaries counted 15 percent each toward a student's final grade in the course. The class sessions ran for seventy-five minutes, with the first twenty to thirty minutes being used for the introductory lecture by the day's primary presenter. Students were allowed to ask questions during the presentation but were encouraged to save most of their comments for class discussion time.⁴ Following the lecture by the primary presenter, students offered comments and observations regarding the readings.

As we moved into the topic of post-World War II America, we noted that students expressed special enthusiasm and interest in the effects of the Cold War on American national identity. Several expressed amazement when shown a 1950s-era world map, which had the then Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, and China all colored in the same bright red. We discussed what influence this may have had on the thinking of schoolchildren who studied such a map. The tendency of Americans to make a homogenous monolithic entity out of godless atheistic communists—"them"—and to define "us" in terms of goodness and righteousness might even be among the more lasting images from childhood school work. Some of our non-traditional students offered their personal insight about growing up in that time period, noting the real sense of urgency and fear that gripped the United States in the early years of the Cold War.⁵ In several of their commentaries, students remarked that although they had lived through the very end of the Cold War, they never really understood the impact the ideological struggle between the Eastern and Western worlds had on them until now. Their commentaries on this topic indicated that they understood better the American mind-set of the 1950s and 1960s that produced and kept alive the Cold War.

At the end of the semester, students were required to submit an eight to twelve page paper that examined some aspect of American national identity based on the

various historical, economic, and geographical forces that affected it. The paper would also offer some projection regarding how this particular aspect might continue to affect American identity in the twenty-first century. As one might expect, the focus for these papers varied, but what was rather surprising to us was that almost every student in some way addressed the issues of civil and human rights.

One student, for example, focused her attention on the labels such as “liberal” and “conservative” that Americans give themselves and others. Her paper first discussed the various meanings of these terms within a historical and economic context, noting that the meanings had changed greatly over time and even within the last seventy years. She then examined the various sections of the nation to which these labels are most often attached—the conservative South and the liberal Northeast, for example—and discussed geographic and social factors that might account for them. In the end, however, she decided that such labels had little meaning for her personal identity as an American, noting that the shifting meanings of the words had left them with little true value as labels.

Another student reached the conclusion that American national identity was little more than an illusion, a term used to denote people who live within the borders of the United States but have little else as a common bond on which to base that identity. In his view, each American decides for himself what it means to be American in the late-twentieth century, and he based his conclusion on historical, economic, geographic, and demographic trends. Arguing that the United States was basically the last multi-ethnic empire in the world, his paper and class presentation ended on a rather pessimistic projection that the United States would probably experience a “Balkanization” during the next century. The melting pot, he concluded, was a myth. Rather, he said, the United States was a tossed salad of so many ingredients that had never truly blended and would eventually separate again into isolated components.

Not all students, however, were so pessimistic about the future. Several students looked at the gains made over the last few decades in the area of civil rights and expressed the hope that we, as a nation, were still moving towards the realization of the ideals of 1776 and 1789, although they noted that we still have far to go. From the professors’ perspectives, perhaps the most encouraging note was made by several students who now realized that as educated people it was their duty to work to help change old attitudes and prejudices, one person at a time if necessary.

This was the first time we offered this particular class at USC-Salkehatchie, and we clearly did some things that we would not try to do again. As noted earlier, for example, we would reduce the number of topics examined and would spend more

time on each one. We also noted a tendency for class discussion to be dominated by the same three or four students. While this is often the case in so-called “regular” classes, we realized we need to come up with some system to encourage greater participation by a wider group of students. One possible method would be to assign each student to assist in the background presentation on a particular topic, thus making that student responsible for being the “expert”—with assistance from the instructors. The student’s preparation, demonstration of knowledge and understanding of the topic, and leadership in the class discussion could easily be factored in as a component for the final course grade. This would serve to draw more students—perhaps kicking and screaming—into the discussions. We would also hope that when such interdisciplinary classes are offered in the future, they would include a wider and more varied range of academic disciplines, such as mathematics, the sciences, art, and music, to name just a few.

In the end, however, the experience of this class seems to have been a good one, even though the students—and the professors, too—ended the semester with more questions than answers about what it means to be an American in the late 1990s. There may be no set answers to that question. Still, the generally positive evaluations of the course indicated the students believed the class was a valuable one for them.

ENDNOTES

1. In his opening remarks to the class, Professor West (economics) could not resist backing up a few years to 1913 and the Federal Reserve Act as a prelude to the 1929 stock market crash.
2. A copy of the course syllabus may be obtained by contacting either Wayne Chilcote, waynelc@yahoo.com, or Ron Cox roncox@gwm.sc.edu.
3. It was never necessary to debate grades at any length or to resort to majority rule to assign a grade to written work, class participation, or a final grade. Seldom did the grades we gave to any assignments vary more than a half letter grade among us.
4. Early in the course, we discovered that twenty to thirty minutes was insufficient time to introduce a topic to students, most of whom had limited background on which to draw. Indeed, we began to expand our presentations until they ran forty-five minutes or so. This, of course, took time from the class discussions. We decided that when teaching the course in the future, we will use fewer topics, perhaps no more than one per week. We could then devote the first class of the week to the introductory lecture and the second class of the week for discussion and comment on the lecture and readings.
5. Just as there was a wide range of ages among the students, there was a wide range of age among the professors who were born eleven years apart (1945, 1956, and 1967). Discussion during classes often involved the recollections of each of us to an event or events based on our age at the time the event occurred. The students seemed to enjoy this as much as we did. We also cannot resist noting an interesting coincidence in regard to our ages. We were born eleven years apart on September 10, 11, and 12.

Creating a ‘Nazi Style’: The German Fashion Institute and State Efforts to Influence Fashion in the 1930s

Kenneth McDonald

The term *Gleichschaltung*—loosely translatable as “coordination”—was coined by the Nazis to describe the melding of state, party, and public life in the Third Reich. *Gleichschaltung* operated on multiple levels, including the coordination of politics through the gradual banning of all parties other than the NSDAP,¹ the Nazi-fication of all public and private associations and organizations, and the Aryanization of the bureaucracy, industry, and cultural institutions.

The concept of cultural totalitarianism is fading as a viable description of what the Nazis were able to accomplish through the process of *Gleichschaltung*.² Certainly the Nazis were largely successful at stamping out overt resistance to their political program while compelling the population to participate in a ritualized Nazi version of public life. There were limits to the process of *Gleichschaltung*, however, particularly in the cultural sphere. The first limit was the inability—or unwillingness—of the Nazi hierarchy to establish clearly defined jurisdictions over cultural expression and cultural institutions. As in the entire Nazi state, the cultural hierarchy involved aggressive struggles for power and influence among the various party leaders and bureaucracies. These included, but were not limited to, Joseph Goebbels and the Propaganda Ministry and the Reich Chambers of Culture, Alfred Rosenberg and the Militant League for German Culture, Robert Ley and the German Labor Front, and Hermann Göring as interior minister of Prussia and director of the Four Year Plan. At the top of this pyramid of competing power groups stood Hitler, who had a significant interest in the field of culture and who proved the ultimate arbiter in questions of culture.

The second limit to the process of *Gleichschaltung* was the absence of concrete goals or clearly defined objectives. The Nazi state, driven by an ideology that often lacked coherency or internal logic other than the machinations of power, was far better at defining negatives than in creating positive objectives. Thus while it was clear that “Jewish,” “liberal,” or “democratic” elements had to be purged—although defining what those terms meant was often more complicated—it wasn’t always clear exactly what should replace them.

These problems were especially pronounced in the field of fashion. Fashion was an area of German culture that contained both potent cultural and economic

significance. The clothing and textile industry was one of Germany's largest in the 1930s, and fashion was a field with enormous economic potential, especially with the economic recovery of the late thirties. This drew attention from various branches of the Nazi state, each wanting to claim a share of that potential for themselves. In addition to this practical consideration, the fashion industry in the 1930s was already a significantly international industry, with Paris as a powerhouse of both women's and men's styles, and London and New York as competing centers of influence. Thus the creation of a "German fashion" was a matter of profound import for the Nazis, beyond the simple question of ensuring that Germans wore German-made clothing. It was also a question of international prestige and evidence that the fascist state could produce a culture that could compete with and even outshine that of the decadent democratic west.³

This paper will address these questions and examine both the language of this debate and the practical steps that were taken to ensure that the *Gleichschaltung* of fashion would be successfully carried out. It is difficult to gauge the success of this effort; as in other fields the coordination of fashion was only partially successful. Still, an examination of the rhetoric on the question of "German fashion," the emergence of institutions designed to influence the creation of this new fashion, and Nazi actions vis-à-vis the schools and fashion shows where it was to have its genesis will clarify this question of "fascist fashion" and what it meant.

Concern about the state of the German fashion industry predates the establishment of the Nazi state. Irene Guenther has explored the connection between fashion and nationalism and found that during the First World War, both sides of the conflict used the language of dress to critique their enemy's fashion sense or lack thereof. French wartime propaganda described German women as fat, inelegant, and lacking in taste, while German authors in return pointed a hostile finger at the "insolent" and "lascivious" fashions worn by French hussies. Guenther cites a 1915 tract that "suggested that it was treasonous for German women to continue wearing French-inspired skirts and high heels while their brothers and fathers were paying for this betrayal on the western front."⁴

The postwar years saw a radical transformation in fashion, particularly for women. The phenomenon of the "New Woman" of the 1920s cannot be discussed in detail here; it is evident, however, that the emergence of new fashions that followed World War I was inescapably connected to the social changes and new opportunities for women that developed in both Europe and the United States. These changes provoked hostile responses from those who felt threatened by the attitude and appearance of the "New Woman." Critics in Europe and the United States denounced

women's fashions of the 1920s as immoral and dangerous to the social fabric; several American states actually passed legislation to regulate things like the hemlines on women's dresses and skirts during this period. Similar attacks could be found in the German press, where the new female ideal was criticized as "tubercular," "underdeveloped," and "starvation personified." The nationalist implications of the new fashion remained significant as well; the fact that Paris—and to a lesser degree, London—was where the new styles originated was not forgotten and would become a major preoccupation of Nazi leaders involved in questions of fashion and dress.⁵

Nazi arguments for the creation of a new German fashion were thus both a reaction to the changes of the 1920s and a continuation of existing critiques of modern and foreign styles. But the arguments adopted by Nazi spokesmen became suffused with Nazi ideology and deserve to be examined in some detail. These arguments were defined by four goals: the reduction of foreign influence on German fashion; full realization of the economic potential of fashion for the German economy—utilizing the language of self-sufficiency that characterized much of the Nazi economic program; the emphasis on fashion both as a craft and an art and the encouragement of it as a career choice; and finally the development of a closer relationship between fashion and industry. These arguments also integrated the fundamental Nazi emphasis on anti-Semitism, couching the above points in attacks on "Jewish" fashion and criticizing the Jewish dominance in the international clothing industry. Although defining what was meant by "Jewish" fashion is difficult given the omnipresent contradictions in National Socialist ideology and rhetoric, a few concepts were clear: this fashion was international, modern—in the fully negative, "corrupt," or "degenerate" sense of the word—and decidedly un-German.⁶

One of the biggest concerns of both Nazi leaders interested in the question of fashion and the heads of the German fashion industry was the dominance of foreign, and particularly French, fashion in the international clothing market in the 1930s. This was viewed as an unacceptable state of affairs for the new German National Socialist *Volk*, who should not have their style, form, and material of clothing dictated by foreigners. It was a requirement of the cultural and artistic independence of Germany that the creative impulse come from within, not from outside. This argument was also contextualized in the confrontation of democratic and fascist values; the international fashion of the day was guided by the liberal democratic principles of "freedom and equality"—though it was never quite explained exactly what that meant—and the new German fashion would reflect the fascist principles of authority, order, and hierarchy.⁷

Secondly, the arguments in favor of German fashion also cited the economic

power and importance of this issue. According to the arguments of Berlin's Modeschule Dillenz—which, admittedly, had a certain stake in the outcome of the debate—the textile and fashion industries represented one-eighth of German manufacturing production in the mid-1930s, three times as great as the coal mining industry and two and a half times that of machine production. The economic importance of exporting German textiles and finished clothing was of significant importance to the new regime, especially as the balance of payments began to shift away from Germany's favor with the economic boom of the mid- to late-1930s. The fascination of the German elites and upper middle class with foreign fashion only exacerbated this problem, contributing to the drain of German currency abroad. Much as the Four Year Plan, begun in 1936, sought to create autarky in industrial raw materials, so too the creation of a German fashion would create self-sufficiency in both ordinary dress and haute couture.⁸

Thirdly, the arguments in favor of a new German fashion sought to emphasize the importance of fashion as both a craft and an art and encourage the field as an important career choice. This could work both on the level of culture-creation and basic practicality; one school for dressmakers in 1933 encouraged women to study fashion and the manufacture of clothes not to begin careers but “for life.” A woman so trained, the school argued, “could always buy bread.” But the fashion industry went beyond simply parroting Nazi rhetoric about the ideal German hausfrau; the new German fashion needed also a first-class group of trained experts who could contribute to the improvement of the entire *Volk* through the elevation of German *Kleidkultur*. Modeschule Dillenz called for making fashion a full art (*vollwertige Kunst*), a career choice with an artistic, cultural, and social significance on a par with architecture. Only this would enable German fashion to compete successfully against that of other countries.⁹

Finally, these arguments suggest a closer relationship between industry and fashion. This connection will be examined further in my comments on the German Fashion Institute below; what is interesting is the degree to which *Gleichschaltung* was actually a cooperative process in the fashion sector, with industry and government working together.

The above arguments were merged with the other core element of Nazi *Gleichschaltung*: the removal of Jews from German public life. Perhaps the strongest denunciation of the “Jewish connection” to fashion and the clothing industry came from Otto Jung, a certified businessman and political economist who served as the head managing director of the Economic Group (*Wirtschaftsgruppe*, abbreviated as WSG) Clothing Industry and was a member of the managing board of the German

Fashion Institute. Jung was clearly a convinced anti-Semite; his attacks on what he saw as the perversion and control of German fashion by Jews were both angry and powerful. He argued that as late as 1938 75 percent of German women who bought ready-made clothing were clothed by Jews and demanded that German clothes be made by Germans, that is Aryans. He recognized the domination of international fashion by Paris but equated this with Jewish control; the Jew, he claimed, copied only ugly foreign models for his internationalist fashion, and the “flash and show” of this fashion was designed to stimulate fads and sales—crazes that not only wasted materials but plundered the prosperity of their customers and hindered the improvement of the standard of living of the working masses. This was an issue of cultural and economic importance to Jung, who claimed that the cost of models from Paris, because of the domineering influence of Jews in women’s outer-clothing, was some eight hundred thousand to one million Reichsmarks annually (roughly a quarter of a million American dollars in the 1930s).¹⁰

The creation of a central organization to oversee the fashion industry and coordinate these steps towards a “German fashion” was a gradual process. The original “Institute for German Fashion” was a part of the Modeschule Dillenz in Berlin, which was given official sanction in August 1933 when the Propaganda Ministry appointed its head, Richard Dillenz, to the board of the newly created Deutsche Modeamt. Though not a state institution, the Modeamt gained semi-celebrity status when Magda Goebbels, the wife of the propaganda minister and self-appointed fashion expert, became honorary president of the new organization—over her husband’s opposition—with the desire to “make the German woman more beautiful.” The Institute was praised as “a laboratory of German fashion” and a research institution that could improve the economic, cultural, and political conditions for the creation of fashion. These objectives were congruent with the objectives of the fashion industry itself, which was seeking to improve its economic and cultural position vis-à-vis the international fashion industry.¹¹

In early 1937, however, an official institution was set up to coordinate the various branches of the fashion and clothing industries and to support the efforts toward strengthening German fashion at home and abroad. This new body, the German Fashion Institute (Deutsches Mode-Institut, or DMI), was created under the auspices of the Propaganda Ministry but also maintained close connections with the Economics Ministry, the Ministry for Science and Education, and industrial leaders in fashion, clothing, and textiles. Goebbels appointed Herbert Tengelmann, the head of the Economic Group Clothing Industry and the vice president of the Berlin Chamber of Industry and Trades, to head the new organization. In April the Ministry

of Science and Education expressed its willingness to contribute to the DMI advisory board, commenting to Tengelmann that “in this area great tasks lay before us, that can only be managed with joined strength,” and choosing Ministerialrat Dipl.-Ing. Federle as its representative. The ultimate composition of the DMI board reflected the diverse interests involved in the creation of fashion, including representatives not only from several government ministries and departments but also from I. G. Farben (chemistry and color dye works), Ullstein (book publisher), Universum-Film AG (or UFA, the leading German movie studio and distributor), the Reichsstand des deutschen Handwerks (a national guild union for artisans), and the producers of silk and rayon.¹²

The goals of the DMI were essentially to further the *Gleichschaltung* of the fashion industry. This would include not only bringing together the diverse interests connected with fashion but collecting information, promoting German fashion and its development, and supporting German efforts to export their fashion to the world. The DMI emphasized that its goal was not to impose a particular model on German fashion; its role was to support and to give, not to demand or to force. Serving as a place for consultation and advice, the DMI could assist in both the cultural and economic success of the industry.

Still, the organization of the DMI and the activities of its committees indicate more than simply a passive role in the fashion industry. The six primary committees were all staffed by “experts” in fashion—generally, members of the government supervisory apparatus or representatives of the industries concerned. The first two “connection committees” (*Verbindungsausschussen*), chaired by Tengelmann, oversaw cooperation between industry and the DMI. Both included representatives from WSG Clothing Industry and WSG Textile Industry and subsidiary organizations. The first of the two committees was created to encourage closer cooperation among the different branches of the clothing, fashion, and textile industry; the second dealt specifically with “Haute Couture” and the development of talent and vigor within German haute couture to the betterment of the general “clothing culture” (*Kleidkultur*).¹³

A school committee, chaired by Ministerialrat Federle, was created to oversee fashion schools and academies and to ensure that new talent be properly channeled into the fashion industry. The DMI organizational plan (*organisatorischer Aufbau*) recommended filling the examination committees of fashion schools with DMI “experts” and proposed the eventual construction of a national fashion academy where young talent could be instilled with a sense of responsibility for German taste and fashion. The onset of war would ensure that these plans would not come to fruition, but they offer insight into the ultimate goals of the DMI leadership in terms of the

further centralization of German fashion creation.¹⁴

The relationship between the National Socialist government and professional schools dealing with fashion and textiles demonstrates again the conflicting forces of integration and fragmentation involved in the process of *Gleichschaltung*. Although nominally under the supervision of the Ministry for Science and Education, which demanded surveys and reports on school faculty, curriculum, and programs offered, other branches of the hierarchy tried to involve themselves in the oversight of the network of professional schools. For example, the German Labor Front's Office for Professional Education published a brochure stating its desire to influence the training of seamstresses in the interest of reducing the foreign influence on German fashion. This document was roundly criticized by the office of the Stadtpräsident of Berlin's division for vocational and technical schools, which called it "false, insufficient, and dilettantish." The Labor Front also dabbled in overseeing particular training institutions such as the Europäische Moden-Akademie in Dresden, which trained male tailors and cutters. The Dresden academy boasted of its emphasis on the production of uniforms and uniform pieces for the army, air force, police, firefighters, and members of the Labor Service; in 1938 the Labor Front argued that more German tailors should be educated at *Fachschulen* (trade schools) under its aegis.¹⁵

Similar disputes arose over the content of what these schools were producing. In 1937, for example, the Meisterschule für Mode in Munich produced a fall/winter catalog of models for 1937/38, which created a mini-scandal as the catalog passed through the Nazi oversight apparatus. The catalog included diagrams of dress designs and fabric samples and suggested both furthering the links between the makers of fashion and the textile industry and concerns about the procurement of raw materials for both in the future. The designs themselves were not especially distinctive, appearing virtually identical to styles common in Britain and the United States in the 1930s—a testament to the persistent international character of women's fashion even this late in National Socialist Germany—but much can be said about the comments that various officials had about the catalog.¹⁶

The office for Berufs- und Fachschulwesen of the Berlin Stadtpräsident, sent a copy of the catalog by Federle, criticized the models as uncreative and mediocre, at best at the level of an average workshop in a small city. The descriptions of the models were also labeled as poor. The Reich's Association of Women's Tailoring Crafts also criticized the drawings, calling for technically instructive material that did not touch on "degenerate art." The Association apparently felt that the Munich models were too "foreign," in nature, calling for the rejection of non-German influences in fashion just as foreignness had already been rejected in architecture, music,

and art. Federle himself echoed these criticisms, noting that the designs were not instructive enough and failed to conform to the “design-will” (*Gestaltungswillen*) of the day. He also critiqued the models depicted in the drawings, who were universally tall and slender with tiny waists. According to Federle, “It cannot be the mission of a school to provide as a model for a representative fashion such anatomically impossible women.”¹⁷ This case offers an interesting parallel to high fashion today, which holds the emaciated female figure as a high ideal, but also demonstrates the conflict between contemporary perceptions of beauty in the fashion world in the 1930s and the idealized female in Nazi ideology, which was very different. Apparently, despite the best efforts of the Nazis, the “New Woman” of the 1920s lived on in the minds of fashion’s creators, and they must have expected that these designs would continue to appeal to German women. The Association’s reference to “degenerate art” in the context of the Munich catalog makes more sense with this contrast in mind.¹⁸

In addition to overseeing the professional schools connected with fashion, the DMI maintained specialized committees to oversee men’s and women’s fashions. These “expert committees” collected information and published guidelines for the promotion of men’s and women’s fashions. The committee on women’s fashion sought closer cooperation between the textile and clothing industry and fashion houses, published color-cards, and emphasized integrating Vienna’s fashion-circles into German fashion. Although according to the DMI organizational plan the goal of collecting and sorting information concerning the development of women’s fashion—including study of fashion developments outside of Germany—was primarily to aid the creators of German fashion—again, without imposing styles or trends—the DMI meeting of 3 September 1937 indicated that its role wasn’t limited to passive assistance. The DMI’s expert committee on women’s fashion reported that its first goal was to provide fashion guidelines for the coming season and that other objectives included the publication of guidelines for printed cloth, wool, embroidered materials, and linen-ware. These guidelines were not intended to be merely coercive but to work “in the interest of manufacturers and trade.”¹⁹

The objective of the men’s fashion committee of the DMI was to provide guidelines for suits, colors, and patterns in cooperation with those groups involved in the production of men’s clothing. The committee itself consisted of “experts” in the manufacturing and wholesale trade, and in both publications and reports of meetings, it emphasized, even more than the committee on women’s fashion, the promotion of men’s fashion. It argued that the DMI should make a stronger effort in the press, film, and radio in this promotional effort because “the male world does not take a strong enough interest in fashion.”²⁰

The DMI continued to grow in 1938 with the assimilation of the *Arbeitsgemeinschaft Deutscher Textilstoffe* (Syndicate of German Textiles, ADT) into the DMI's administrative structure. The ADT became a department of the DMI, with separate business managers for DMI and ADT business. A further reorientation of the DMI in the direction of incorporating textile production came in December 1938 with the replacement of Tengelmann as president by Hans Croon, the head of the WSG Textile Industry. Tengelmann himself in an 8 January 1938 report to the DMI membership stressed the importance of including the textile industry in the DMI's work, and Croon's name had come up as early as April to take over the institute.²¹

With the coming of war in 1939, the activities of the institute were curtailed, but Croon continued to advocate the significance of fashion both during the war and in its aftermath. In a DMI meeting of 2 October 1939, he argued that it was critical to continue to train talented newcomers (*Nachwuchs*) intensively for the fashion industry, once again stressing the importance of this industry for export. Croon warned against the overestimation of the technical and industrial aspects of textile manufacturing at the expense of crafts (*Handwerk*) and stressed the importance of design talent for the next generation of fashion creators. To this end, he pushed for continuing to supply textile and fashion schools with raw materials, with the DMI conducting a survey as to the consumption of these materials. In fact, with the National Socialist emphasis on its war effort not interfering with civilian production, these schools remained open until very late in the war.²²

With the expansion of the war, it soon became clear, however, that the work of the DMI would have to be suspended, at least for a time. In July 1941, the DMI board met one last time to liquidate the organization. Ultimately the war did more to influence German fashion than all of the efforts of the DMI and its subsidiary organizations. As early as November 1939 the government issued a clothing ration card, the first of a series of *kleiderkarte*, that severely handicapped the development of high fashion. By 1942, coupons for new clothes were only issued to bombing victims as the bulk of the clothing industry's output was directed toward the needs of the military. In women's fashion, for example, the hat was increasingly hailed as an important expression of one's fashion sense as entire new outfits became impossible to secure, and this in turn was replaced by the cloth turban, which both saved material and was easy to create and accessorize. Various emphases on conserving and reusing old clothes replaced exhortations in women's fashion literature to buy the latest styles. Men's fashion was even simpler, as more and more German males were drafted into the military and the uniform became the ubiquitous symbol of male dress in the wartime Reich.²³

In an effort to stimulate exports, the Propaganda Ministry carried out a short-lived effort to conduct fashion shows abroad to highlight the new German fashion, but ultimately the only countries who proved willing customers—occupied territories or Nazi satellite states—lacked the economic clout to make a significant impact. In 1942, the Propaganda Ministry even created an office of the Commissioner for German Fashion, again dedicated to the promotion of German styles for export, but this office, too, quickly fell prey to the demands of the mobilization for total war and was suspended in May 1943.²⁴

The brief history of the DMI is significant not in fostering a radical redirection of German fashion—like many Nazi programs, this did not happen in the limited period of its existence—but rather in demonstrating both the limitations and objectives of the Nazi process of *Gleichschaltung*. The DMI incorporated the Nazi, as well as pre-Nazi, principles behind the creation of a “German fashion,” but it was also a practical organization influenced by the German fashion industry whose objective was to improve the cultural and economic position of that industry both at home and abroad. The DMI must be judged in the context of the conflicting jurisdictions, mixed messages, and limited control that was characteristic of *Gleichschaltung* in all spheres of German economic and cultural life. This was due, in part, to the haphazard and competing nature of the Nazi state and its supervisory apparatus and, in part, to the lack of a coherent set of objectives in terms of what the “German fashion” was supposed to represent. In this sense, much like in art, culture, and even its goals for the German *Volk*, the National Socialist regime proved better at angry but vague denunciation of what it did not like than in providing a concrete program for positive change. This more than anything else prevented a radical transformation of the nature of German fashion in the 1930s.

ENDNOTES

1. *NSDAP: National sozialistische deutsche Arbeiterpartei* (National Socialist German Workers' Party), or “Nazi” party, founded in 1919.
2. For an introduction to the historiography of Nazi culture, see Detlev Peukert, *Inside Nazi Germany* (New Haven: Yale, 1987); Alan Steinweis, *Art, Ideology, and Economics in Nazi Germany* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993); Peter Adam, *Art of the Third Reich* (New York: Abrams, 1992).
3. For commentary on the significance of the fashion industry in Germany see Irene V. Guenther, “Nazi ‘Chic’? German Politics and Women’s Fashions, 1915–1945,” *Fashion Theory* 1 (March 1997): 29–58.
4. *Ibid.*, 30–31.

5. For an introduction to the changes in men and women's fashion in the first few decades of the twentieth century and a discussion of the phenomenon of the "New Woman," see Blanche Payne, Geitel Winaker, and Jane Farrell-Beck, *The History of Costume* (New York: Harper Collins, 1992), 543–91; James Laver, *The Concise History of Costume and Fashion* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1969), 213–51, discusses reactions to the new female fashions of the 1920s; for a brief discussion of German responses to the "new androgynous woman," see Guenther, 31–32. Detlev Peukert examines the significance of the "New Woman" in the context of Weimar Germany, including the backlash against her, in *The Weimar Republic: The Crisis of Classical Modernity* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1987), 95–106. Gordon Craig comments on the implications of the German Revolution and the changes within the Weimar constitution for German women in *The Germans* (New York: Meridian, 1991), 161–64, and *Germany: 1866–1945* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 476–79. See also Nancy Reagin, *A German Women's Movement: Class and Gender in Hanover, 1880–1933* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 203–247, for a discussion of the strains between feminist and conservative women in Weimar Germany.

6. Part of the problem, of course, is the tendency for dedicated Nazis to define everything seen as bad or harmful as "Jewish"; this makes it difficult to separate ideological conviction from overblown rhetoric (if they can be separated at all). Still, this question is central to the goal of creating a "German fashion," and examples of the Nazi association with international fashion with Jewish predominance, backed by "logical" arguments, will be discussed later in the paper.

7. Modeschule Dillenz," (hereinafter "Modeschule Dillenz" pamphlet) and "Reichsinstitut für Deutsche Mode," pamphlets, March 1936, Reichsanstalt für Arbeitsvermittlung und Arbeitslosenversicherung R3903.149.42; "Bedeutsame modische Zutaten," *Vereinigte Textil- und Bekleidungs Zeitschrift*, 27 May 1939, Reichsministerium für Wissenschaft, Erziehung, und Volksbildung (RMWE&V) R4901.9756. All of the documents cited in this paper were taken from the German Federal Archives in Potsdam during the summer and fall of 1996.

8. "Modeschule Dillenz" pamphlet.

9. Letter from the Näh- und Zuschneideschule J. Reisser, Aachen, to the Präsidenten des Landesarbeitamtes Brandenburg, 26 August 1933, Reichsanstalt für Arbeitsvermittlung und Arbeitslosenversicherung, R3903.149.42; "Modeschule Dillenz."

10. Letter from Otto Jung to State Secretary Dr. Posse, 2 February 1938, Reichswirtschaftsministerium 3101.9158.

11. "Reichsinstitut für Deutsche Mode" pamphlet; announcement in *Textil-Zeitung*, 190 (10 August 1933), Reichsanstalt für Arbeitsvermittlung und Arbeitslosenversicherung R3903.54.1–4. See also Guenther, 37; Ralf Georg Reuth, *Goebbels* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1993), 186.

12. The governmental groups represented were the Economics Ministry, the Propaganda Ministry, Economic Group Clothing Industry (Jung), National Radio, and the Ministry for Science and Education (Federle), with Tengelmann as president. "Das Deutsche Modeinstitut erhält einen Sachverständigen-Ausschuss für Herrenmode," *Herrenjournal* 15 September 1937, 19–20; letter from Herbert Tengelmann to Professor Heering, 5 April 1937; letter from Heering to Tengelmann, 12 April 1937, letter from Tengelmann to Heering, 23 April 1937; notes of DMI meeting of 3 September 1937, RMWE&V R4901.9756.

13. Letter from Tengelmann to Federle, 22 May 1937; notes of meeting of 3 September 1937, RMWE&V R4901.9756.
14. *Ibid.*; DMI Organisatorischer Aufbau (no date), 4; "The Objective of a Reich Fashion Academy," Maria May Studio, Berlin, 26 May 1937, RMWE&V R4901.9756.
15. *Fragebogen* (questionnaire) from Deutsche Meisterschule München, 7 September 1939, RMWE&V R4901.9988; letter from Federle to the Reichsstatthalter Hamburg, 21 August 1941, RMWE&V R4901.10100; "Modisches Zeichnen: Unterricht für Damenschneiderinnen," DAF Amt für Berufserziehung und Betriebsführung (no date), RMWE&V R4901.9988; "Europäische Moden-Akademie Dresden," DAF pamphlet, 1938, Reichsanstalt für Arbeitsvermittlung und Arbeitslosenversicherung R3903.149.42; letter from the Stadtpräsident der Reichshauptstadt Berlin, Abteilung für Berufs- und Fachschulwesen, to the Reichsminister für Wissenschaft, Erziehung, und Volksbildung, 5 July 1938, RMWE&V R4901.9988.
16. "Modelle der Meisterschule," Deutsche Meisterschule für Mode München (no date), RMWE&V R4901.9988.
17. Letter from Federle to Stadtschulrat Bauer, Munich, 26 November 1938, RMWE&V R4901.9988.
18. *Ibid.*; letter from Federle to the Stadtpräsidenten der Reichshauptstadt Berlin, Abt. Berufs- und Fachschulwesen, 10 May 1938; letter from the Stadtpräsidenten der Reichshauptstadt Berlin, Abt. Berufs- und Fachschulwesen to the Reichsminister für Wissenschaft, Erziehung, und Volksbildung, 5 July 1938; letter from the Reichsinnungsverband des Damenschneiderhandwerks to the Reichsminister für Wissenschaft, Erziehung, und Volksbildung, 14 November 1938, RMWE&V R4901.9988.
19. Notes of the DMI meeting of 3 September 1937, 4; DMI Aufbau 5–6.
20. Notes of the DMI meeting of 3 September 1937, 5.
21. "Bericht für Beiratsmitglieder," 8 January 1938, 1–2; letter from the Reichswirtschaftsminister to the Reichsminister für Wissenschaft, Erziehung, und Volksbildung, 2 September 1938; letter from Keller (Geschäftsführer DMI) to Federle, 15 December 1938; letter from Keller to Federle, 19 December 1938, RMWE&V R4901.9756.
22. Letter from Croon to Federle, 27 September 1939; notes of DMI meeting of 2 October 1939, RMWE&V R4901.9756.
23. Letter from Keller to DMI Verwaltungsausschuss- und Beiratsmitglieder, 25 June 1941, RMWE&V R4901.9756; Guenther, 43–50.
24. The history of the Propaganda Ministry's fashion shows abroad and of the Commissioner of

South Carolina Historical Association member roster

The following is a member roster of the SCHA assembled from the data listed on membership applications (1996-99). Each entry includes: Name/title - most recent membership year paid; professional affiliation; address (usually professional, but home address, if given as preferred, with business address added); phone, FAX, e-mail (if available); areas of interest/expertise.

Dr. R. K. Ackerman - 1999
Wesleyan College - retired president
185 Windsor Park Dr., Lexington, SC 29072
(803) 808-3639; *bobmayack@aol.com*

Dr. Randy Akers - 1999
Executive director - SC Humanities Council
115 Salusbury Lane, Columbia, SC 29229-8527
(803) 691-4100; FAX (803) 691-0809;
rlakers@aol.com
SC history & culture, church history, archaeology

Mr. Robert J. Alderson, Jr. - 1999
USC graduate student
3600 Carriage House Rd., Columbia, SC 29206
(803) 254-2067; *bankassn@netside.com*

Dr. Patricia Ali - 1999 - Morris College
134 Henrietta Drive, Sumter, SC 29150-5558

(803) 773-5719; *bios@sumter.net*

Dr. Louise A. Allen 1999
The Citadel, Dept of Education
Charleston, SC 29409
(843) 953-7086; *louiseallen@Citadel.edu*
Progressive Era education; SC new women

Prof. John R. Arnold - 1997
USC-Lancaster
USCL, P.O. Box 889, Lancaster SC 29721

Ms. Cindy Austin - 1996 - student
47B Bull Street, Charleston SC 29401

Col. Frank K. Babbitt, Jr. -1999
P.O. Box 250, Liberty Hill, SC 29074
(803) 273-9500; *FKBabbitt@aol.com*
SC & colonial US history
USCaroliniana Soc/USC adjunct instructor
Dept of Education

Dr. Stephanie L. Barczewski - 1997
Clemson University, Dept. of History
102 Hardin Hall, Box 341507
Clemson, SC 29634-1507
(864) 656-7570
British

Dr. Ross H. Bayard - 1999
Wofford College
260 E. Park Drive, Spartanburg, SC 29302-3235
(864) 585-4780 H; (864) 597-4550 W
bayardrh@wofford.edu
Europe 19th & 20th century
Russia since Peter the Great
Sub-Saharan Africa since 1870

Ms. Mary Ann Bayer - 1998 - student - USC
P.O. Box 137, Saluda, SC 29138
(864) 445-2381

Mr. Harold J. Bayerl - 1998
Principal Cardinal Newman High School
(803) 782-2814
European history (Middle Ages)

Mr. Don Beagle - 1996
Charleston County Library
1249 Old Ivy Way, Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464
(803) 727-6734

Dr. Edward Beardsley - 1996
USC Department of History
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Peter W. Becker - 1999
USC - retired
1718 Madison Rd., #202, Columbia, SC 29204
Peter-Becker@sc.edu

Ms. Brittnee Benesch - 1998
Converse College, 580 E. Main Street
Spartanburg, SC 29302

Prof. Jane Bishop - 1998
MSC 109, The Citadel, Charleston, SC 29409

(803) 953-5054; *bishopj@citadel.edu*
Greek, Roman, Byzantine, medieval Italy,
papacy

Dr. Carol K. Bleser - 1999 - Clemson
102 Dogwood Drive, Clemson, SC 29631
(803) 656-5362
Southern/South Carolina women

Dr. Tyler Blethen - 1999
Mountain Heritage Ctr., Cullowhee, NC 28723

Dr. Richard Bodek - 1996
College of Charleston
671 Pawley Rd., Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464

Dr. Jackie R. Booker - 1999
S.C. State University
SCSU, Box 7281, Orangeburg, SC 29118

Ms. Carol E. Borchert - 1997, curator of
education
Historic Charleston Foundation
HCF, 51 Meeting Street, Charleston, SC 29401
(803) 724-8481

Dr. Raymond M. Bost - 1997
Newberry College Station Box #820
Newberry, SC 29108-2197
(803) 321-2542 FAX (803) 321-9123
Bostrm70@aol.com
Religion in the South

Prof. Kenneth Bradley - 1996
Humanities Dept., Greenville Technical
College
Greenville, SC 29606-5616
(803) 250-8362 *Bradleh@gvltec.edu*

Mr. P. J. Brennan- 1999
Piedmont Tec./PO Drawer 1467
Greenwood, SC 29648
(803) 941-8458 FAX (803) 941-8555
brennan@ped.tec.sc.us

Dr. William S. Brockington, Jr. - 1999
USCA Department of History
Aiken SC 29801
(803) 641-3223 FAX (803) 641-3461
billb@usca.usa.sc.edu
British, Celtic (Scots/Irish/Scotch-Irish),
southern

Bart Brodowoki - 1999
USC Dept. of History (grad)
2505 Bentley Court, Columbia, SC 29210

Dr. James W. Brown - 1999
Dept. of History
USC-Spartanburg, Spartanburg, SC 29303
j.brown@sc.edu

Ms. Veronica Bruce - 1998 USC grad
USC Dept. of History, Box 13
Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 782-5079
American diplomatic, British, US,
modern Europe, Latin America

Mr. Rick Burkhart - 1998 SS dept. chair
North Charleston High School
1087 E. Montague Ave
North Charleston, SC 29405
(803) 745-7140

Dr. Vernon Burton - 2001 - Illinois
605 West Washington, Urbana IL 61801
Southern

- Dr. Amy Turner Bushnell - 1999
College of Charleston
College of Charleston, History Dept.
66 George Street, Charleston, SC 29424
(803) 556-9705 *bushnella@cofc.edu*
Native American/early southeast, colonial
Latin America, colonial British America
- Dr. Katherine D. Cann - 1999
Spartanburg Methodist College
509 Watford Avenue, Greenwood, SC 29649
(864) 587-4217 Sp Meth
cannkd@smcsc.edu
South, S.C., post-Civil War US
- Dr. Marvin L. Cann - 1999
Lander University
509 Watford Avenue, Greenwood SC 29649
(864) 388-8304 W (864)
mcann@lander.edu
South, S.C., post-Civil War US
- Ms. O. Catherine Cannon,
Social Studies chair - 1998
Eau Claire High School
1309 Fairview Drive, Columbia SC, 29205-
1212
(803) 254-1578 H (803) 735-7600 W
Colonial America, AP US history
- Ms. Penelope Cansler - 1998
Stow SC Historical Room
Greenville County Library, 300 College St.
Greenville, SC 29601
(864) 242-5000 ext. 269 FAX (864) 235-
8375
- Mr. Chris Carbaugh - 1998
Christ Church Episcopal School
17 Woodharbor Drive, Taylors, SC 29687
SC history education
- Dr. Dan T. Carter - 1996
Dept Hist. Emory University, Atlanta GA
30322
Southern
- Ms. Sherry Cashwell - 1999
Soc. Studies chair
200 Summit Parkway Drive, Columbia, SC
29229
(803) 699-3580; *shcashwell@aol.com*
US/SC history of pre-Civil War
- Dr. Allan D. Charles - 1999
History Department, USC Union,
Drawer 729, Union, SC 29379
(864) 427-3681
History of science/med/tech., S. C. history
- Dr. David R. Chesnutt - 1999
USC Dept. of History, Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 777-6525 FAX (803) 777-4494 *Da-
vid.Chesnutt@sc.edu*
U. S. colonial revolution
- Dr. Wayne L. Chilcote - 1999
1956 Pebble Creek St., Charleston, SC 29414
- Ms. Peggy Clark - 1998 student - USC
Dept. of History, USC, Columbia, SC 29205
(803) 777-4491 FAX (803) 777-4494 *clark@
garnet.cla.sc.edu*
- Dr. Joel Cleland - 1996
Lander University
123 W. Laurel Ave., Greenwood, SC 29649
(803) 229-2520
Latin America
- Dr. Kendrick A. Clements - 1999
USC Dept. of History, Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 777-2679 *clements@garnet.cla.sc.edu*
US diplomatic, environmental, 20th-cen-
tury political
- Mr. Philip C. Cockrell - 1999
617 Parlock Road
Irmo, SC 29063
- Mr. Casey M. Connell - 1999
181 Redcliffe Rd., Beech Island, SC 19842

- Ms. Roberta VH. Copp - 1999
 South Caroliniana Library
 3410 Wheat Street, Columbia SC 29205
 (803) 252-6584 H (803) 777-1345 W
rcopp@tcl.sc.edu
- Dr. Maxie M. (Ron) Cox - 1999
 USC-Salkehatchie
 110 Huntington Dr., Barnwell, SC 29812
 (803) 541-0705 H (803) 584-3446 W
roncox@vm.sc.edu
 SC history, southern history, southern politics
- Dr. John Crangle - 1999
 Common Cause & Midlands Tech
 P. O. Box 2694, Columbia SC 29202
 (803) 799-0706
 Europe
- Mr. James Edward Cross
 Thurmond Archivist - 1999
 Clemson U. Libraries - Special Collections
 200 Country Club Lane, Apt. 16E
 Anderson, SC 29625
 (864) 656-5182 FAX (864) 656-0233
jcross@clemson.edu
 Archives, American history, military history
- Mr. Willie Dasinger 1998
 1800 Pearly Lane, Charleston, SC 29405
- Mr. Clarence E. Davis Jr., adjunct instructor - 1996
 College of Charleston
 1209 Springhill Road, Charleston, SC 29406
 (803) 953-5711
- Ms. Vennie Deas-Moore 1999
 500 Harbison Blvd. , Apt. 1109
 Columbia, SC 29212
- Dept. Hist./Bob Jones University - 1999
 Attn: Dr. Linda K. Hayner
 1700 Wade Hampton Blvd.
 Greenville, SC 29614
- Dept. Hist./Clemson University - 1997
 Attn: Dr. Roger Grant
 102 Hardin Hall, Box 341507
 Clemson, SC 29301
- Dept. Hist./Coastal Carolina - 1999
 Attn: Dr. Roy Talbert, chair, Dept. of History
 P.O. Box 261954, Conway, SC 29528
- Dept. Hist./College of Charleston 1999
 Attn: Dr. George W. Hopkins
 66 George Street, Charleston, SC 29424
- Dept. Hist./Columbia College - 1999
 Attn: Dr. Belinda Gergel
 1301 Columbia College Dr. Columbia, SC 29203
- Dept. Hist./Erskine College - 1998
 Attn: Sandra L. Chaney
 Two Washington Street, Due West, SC 29639
- Dept. Hist./Lander University - 1999
 Attn: Dr. Robert C. Figuera
 Box 6026, Greenwood, SC 29649
- Dept. Hist./Presbyterian - 1998
 Attn: Dr. David C. Needham
 S. Broad Street, Clinton, SC 29325
- Dept. Hist./The Citadel - 1999
 Attn: Col. David H. White, Jr.
 171 Moultrie Street, Charleston, SC 29409
- Dept. Hist./USC - 1997
 Attn: Dr. Patrick Maney, chair
 Dept. History, Columbia, SC 29208
- Dept. Hist./USC-Aiken - 1999
 Attn: Dr. Valdis O. Lumans
 471 University Parkway, Aiken, SC 29801
- Dept. Hist./USC Spartanburg - 1999
 Attn: Dr. James B. Griffis
 800 University Way, Spartanburg, SC 29303
- Dept. Hist./Winthrop University - 1999
 Attn: Dr. Michael L. Kennedy, chair
 Dept. of History
 Rock Hill, SC 29730

Dept. Hist./Wofford College - 1999
 Attn: Dr. Joseph H. Killian
 P. O. Box 53
 Spartanburg, SC 29303-3663

Ms. Susan E. Dick - 1998
 Modern Political Collections,
 South Caroliniana Library, USC
 720 College St., Columbia SC 29208
 (803) 777-0578 FAX (803) 777-0582
sedick@tcl.sc.edu
 SC lowcountry

Mr. Thomas M. Downey - 1999
 USC graduate student
 502 Churchill Circle, Aiken, SC 29803
 (803) 649-5843 *tdowney@univscm.csd.
 sc.edu*
 U. S. history, 19th-century business & labor,
 antebellum South

Dr. Andy Doyle-1998
 Dept. of History, Winthrop University
 Rock Hill, SC 29733

Ms. Etrulia Pressley Dozier - 1998
 Whittemore Park Middle - Conway
 1915 Racepath Avenue, Conway, SC 29526
 (803) 248-2233 ext. 24

Mr. Sonny DuBose - 1999
 American Spirit Foundation
 3600 Chateau Dr. #111, Columbia, SC
 29204
 (803) 790-5919

Ms. Meaghan N. Duff - 1998 student
 College of Wm. and Mary
 16 Dove Street, Providence, RI 02906
 (757) 481-4143 *mnduff@mail.wm.edu*
 Colonial

Mr. W. Marvin Dulaney, director - 1998
 Avery Research Center
 125 Bull Street, Charleston, SC 29424
 (803) 727-2009 *DulaneyW@COFC.EDU*
 African American history

Dr. Dixon K. Durham - 1999
 4100 Claremont Drive, Columbia, SC 29205
durhamd@mtc.mid.tec.sc.us

Dr. Walter B. Edgar, director - 1999
 Southern Studies, USC-Columbia
 Columbia, SC 29208
 (803) 777-2340 *w.edgar@worldnet.att.net*
 South Carolina, southern

Dr. John C. Ellen - Life Member Emeritus,
 E.C.U.
 202 Jamestown Road, Greenville, NC 27858
 Old South

Eric W. Emerson -1999
 SC Historical Association
 100 Meeting Street
 Charleston, SC 29401

Ms. Nancy L. Erickson - 1997
 Erskine College
 PO Box 335, Due West, SC 29639
 (864) 379-8806 *nde@erskine.edu*
 American history - colonial, intellectual,
 Renaissance, Reformation

Mr. N. David Evans - 1999
 16 Brentwood Drive, Greenville, SC 29609
 (864) 233-7701
 U. S. history

Prof. M. Foster Farley - Life Member
 Retired, Newberry College
 P.O. Box 364, Newberry SC 29108

Dr. James O. Farmer - 1999
 USCA Department of History, Aiken SC
 29801
 (803) 648-6851 FAX (803) 641-3461
jimf@aiken.sc.edu
 South Carolina, southern

Sean Farrell-1998
 Dept. History
 Winthrop University
 Rock Hill, SC 29733

Dr. Robert C. Figueira - 1999
Lander University, Box 6026
Greenwood, SC 29649
(864) 388-8218 *figueira@lander.edu*
Medieval Europe

Dr. Lacy K. Ford Jr. - 1999
USC Department of History
Columbia SC 29208
(803) 777-7774 *ford@garnet.cla.sc.edu*
SC, southern

Dr. Constance Anne Fournier - 1998
97 Park Street, Livermore Falls, ME 04254
fournier@coastal.edu
19th-century maritime culture, women's

Dr. Kari Frederickson - 1999
Department of History
Univ. of Central Florida, Orlando FL 32816
20th-century political, African American

Ms. Laura Reynolds Fry-1999
101 Old Park
Columbia, SC 29229

Dr. Mary Gallant - 1997
University of Florida
1703 N.W. 6th Ave., Gainesville, FL 32603
(352) 372-6529 *margall@nervm.nerdc.ufl.edu*

Dr. Thomas W. Gallant - 1997
University of Florida, Dept. of History
PO Box 117320, Gainesville, FL
32611-7320 (352) 392-0271 *twg133@nervm.nerdc.ufl.edu*

Mr. Chetter M. Galloway - 1996
York County Historical Commission
212 E. Jefferson St., York, SC 29745
(803) 684-1866 *HCYorkSC@sunbelt.net*
African American history, southern history

Mr. Kevin M. Gannon - 1997
Student - USC
100 Riverbend Dr., Apt. G5
W. Columbia, SC 29169
(803) 939-7209 *jobu3@ix.netcom.com*

Ms. Tonia B. Garbutt -2000
Graduate student
10831 Paces Brook Ave., Columbia, SC
29212
(803) 732-3411 *tgarbut@vm.sc.edu*

Dr. Belinda F. Gergel - 1999
History Department, Columbia College
1301 Columbia College Dr.
Columbia, SC 29203
(803) 786-3786

Dr. Jim Gettys - 1999
P.O. Box 354, Due West, SC 29639
(864) 379-8806 *gettys@erskine.edu*

Dr. Ishita Ghosh - 1997
Winthrop University, Dept. of History
Rock Hill, SC 29733
(803) 323-4676 *ghoshi@winthrop.edu*
British

Dr. Larry Glickman - 1997
USC Dept. of History, Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 777-2905
glickman@garnet.cla.sc.edu
US labor, cultural

Dr. Richard Golden, chair - 1995
History Department
University of North Texas, PO Box 13735
Denton TX 76203-2989
(817) 565-2288 FAX (817) 369-8838
rmg@unt.edu

Mr. Rickie Good - 1999 student - LSC
522 Lexington Ave., Cayce, SC 29033
(803) 794-5978 *rgood87880@aol.com*

Dr. Cole Blease Graham Jr. - 1997
USC GINT/dean of criminal justice program
421 Barnwell Street, Columbia SC 29205
(803) 777-7097 *deancrg@gwm.sc.edu*
SC history & politics

- Dr. Katherine Haldane Grenier - 1998
Dept. of History, The Citadel
Charleston SC 29409
(803) 953-5073 *grenierk@citadel.edu*
British, European
- Tracy Dale Griffin - 1996
Greenville Technical College, P. O. Box 5616
Greenville, SC 29606-5616
- Mr. Larry Grubbs - 1999 student
2808 Ashton Street, Columbia, SC 29204
(803) 787-9136 USC-Columbia
Dept. of History Ph.D. candidate *lbgrubb@vn.sc.edu*
- Anita Gustafson-1999
Presbyterian College
503 S. Broad Street, Clinton, SC 29325
- Dr. James W. Hagy - 1998
Retired-College of Charleston
645 Buckinon Dr., Oviedo, FL 32765-8113
Ygahj@aol.com
- Dr. Fritz Hamer, curator of history - 1999
S.C. State Museum
PO Box 100107, Columbia SC 29205
(803) 737-4921 FAX (803) 737-4969 *hamerf@museum.state.sc.us*
WWII era, Civil War, colonial period, African
- Dr. Tommy T. Hamm - 1998
2144 Windsor Hills Dr., Columbia, SC 29204
(803) 787-6463 *hammusc@aol.com*
African history/slave trade
- Ms. Gay Harmon-Marshall - 1997
McCormick High School
113 Heathwood Dr., Greenwood, SC 29649
(864) 465-2032
- Mr. Dale F. Harter - 1996
University of South Carolina
3320 Brookwood Court, Columbia, SC 29204
(803) 738-1806 *T400404@univscum.csd.scarolina.edu*
- Ms. Joan W. Hartley - 2000
Safety Kleen Engineering
1301 Gervais St., Suite 300, Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 532-2871 *jhart62@aol.com*
- Mr. Herbert J. Hartsook - 1999 curator
Modern Political Collections
South Caroliniana Library
112 Silver Lake Circle, Columbia, SC 29212
Herb@gum.sc.edu
Post WWII American history & government
- Dr. Linda K. Hayner, chair - 1999
Bob Jones University, Box 34575
1700 Wade Hampton Blvd.
Greenville, SC 29614
(864) 242-5100 Ext. 2626 - 381
lhayner@bju.edu
Tudor Stuart Britain, Puritanism old & New England
- Dr. Hugh C. (Toby) Haynesworth - 1997
Winthrop University
766 Wofford St., Rock Hill, SC 29730
(803) 323-2186 FAX (803) 323-3960
haynesworthh@winthrop.edu
Military history, Vietnam War
- Col. Barton M. Hayward-1999
1212 Pinehurt Drive
Camden, SC 29020
- Mr. Randy Headley - 1999 Ben Lippen School
P.O. Box 3999, Columbia SC 29230
r.headley@juno.com
- David C.R. Heisser - 1999
MSC 7, The Citadel
Charleston, SC 29409
- Ms. Alexia Jones Helsley,
director education - 1999
S.C. Dept. of Archives & History
1 Northpine Court, Columbia, SC 29212
(803) 896-6189 W FAX (803) 896-6198
helsley@history.scdah.sc.edu
S.C. history & records, Roman Britian

Mr. Terry L. Helsley - 1999 Psychological Corp.
1 Northpine Court, Columbia, SC 29212
(803) 781-9967 W *thelsley@scsn.net*
20th-century American intellectual,
modern America

Dr. Alice Henderson - 1996
USCS Department of History
Spartanburg, SC 29303
(864) 503-5731

Dr. Carlanna L. Hendrick - 1999
SC Governors School for Science & Math
514 Iris Drive, Florence SC 29501
(803) 383-3908 FAX (803) 383-3903
chendrick@scgssm.coker.edu
20th-century American history, late 19th-
century S. C. history

Ms. Molly Hennen - 1997
USC graduate student
10 Gibbes Court, Columbia, SC 29201
hennen-molly@sc.edu
19th century, social history, museums

Dr. Robert Herzstein - 1997
USC Department of History
510 N. Trenholm, Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 777-6266 *n30044@univscvm.csd.scaro-
lina.edu*

Dr. David L. Hess - 1999 USC-Spartanburg
320 Lawson Street, Greenwood, SC 29649-2037
(803) 223-0300
Asian

Mr. Albert C. Hester - 1997
6660 Poinsett Park Rd., Edgefield, SC 29168
(803) 494-3561 *ahester@vm.sc.edu*

Prof. Shirley Hickson - 1998
North Greenville College
9 Hillington Place, Greer, SC 29651
(864) 977-7063

Dr. William C. Hine - 1999
S.C. State University, Box 7207, Orangeburg
SC 29117
(803) 536-8673 *whine@scsu.edu*

Mr. Stephen Hoffius - 1998 SCHS
100 Meeting St., Charleston, SC 29401
(803) 723-3225 FAX (803) 723-8584

Ms. Marie F. Hollings - 1996
Charleston County Records Center, 3879
Leeds Ave., Charleston SC 29407

Dr. Daniel W. Hollis - Life Member Emeritus
Professor of history, USC-Columbia
15 Heathwood Cir., Columbia, SC 29205-1956
South Carolina

Dr. Paul A. Horne, Jr. - 1999
Richland District #1
4838 Carter Hill Drive, Columbia, SC 29206
(803) 787-1170
Legal & constitutional history, colonial
America

Mr. Ben F. Hornsby, Jr. - 1999 SC Archives
1801 Beltline Blvd., Columbia, SC 29206
(803) 734-8595

Mr. Tom Howell - 1999
725-D Montague Rd., Columbia, SC 29209

Dr. Janet Hudson - 1999
205 King Charles Rd., Columbia, SC 29209
(803) 695-5122 *JHudson@UNIVCM.CSD.SCA-
ROLINA.EDU*
American history 20th century/19th century
southern history, race relations, politics

Dr. A. V. Huff, Jr. - 1999
VP for Academic Affairs & dean
Department of History, Furman University
3300 Poinsett Highway, Greenville, SC 29613
(864) 294-2200 FAX (864) 294-3939
huff-av@furman@furman.edu

Ms. Elizabeth C. Hutson - 1999
334 Indigo Road, Barnwell, SC 29812

Ms. Gail B. Ingram - 1999
SS dept. head, Cheraw High School
406 Elizabeth Drive, Greenville, SC 29615
(803) 537-4384 H (803) 921-1000 W FAX
(803) 921-1006 *ptidixie@infoave.net*

- Dr. Jean R. James - 1999
406 Elizabeth Drive, Greenville, SC 29615
(864) 977-7064
Antebellum S.C. and southern, women's
- Jeffrey L. Jarrell - 1998
2391 Foster Road, Inman, SC 29349
- Ms. Joan Marie Johnson - 1999
UCLA Doctoral Candidate
3159 Lookout Circle, Cincinnati, OH 45208
(513) 533-3382 *johnso43@muohio.edu*
Southern women, black & white clubwomen
in the Progressive Era
- Dr. Lloyd Johnson - 1999
Dept. of Gov't and History, Campbell Uni-
versity
PO Box 356, Buies Creek, NC 27506
(910) 893-1489 FAX (910) 893-1424
tcollins@intrstar.net
Colonial South, colonial S. C., Civil War,
modern U. S., African American
- Mr. Talmadge S. W. Johnson, student - 1998
108 Henrywoods Dr., Chester, SC 29706
- Ms. Joyce Johnston - 1996
52 Briar Circle, Fayetteville NC
- Ms. Cherisse R. Jones - 1999 - student
Ohio State University
101 Curl Drive #191, Columbus, OH 43210
(614) 6888-9788 *Cherisse:Jones@gte.net*
Women, Africa, African American
- Mr. Clif Jones - 1997
PO Box 956, Hollywood, SC 29449-0956
(803) 889-3686
- Dr. Lewis P. Jones - Life Member
Wofford College
325 Rivermont Drive, Spartanburg SC 29302
South Carolina
- Ms. Melina H. Jones - 1999
1003-J Bent Treet Land
Columbia, SC 29210
- Mr. Bruce W. Jordan - 1998
Christ Church Episcopal School
245 Cavalier Drive, Greenville SC 29607
(864) 299-1522 FAX (864) 299-8861
US history, environmental history,
technological history
- Dr. L. W. Jordan - 1998
Dept. of History, College of Charleston,
66 George St., Charleston, SC 29424
- Dr. Charles Joyner - 1999
Endowed Chair, Coastal Carolina U
7607 Driftwood Drive, Myrtle Beach SC
29572
(803) 449-5656
Southern, folklore
- Ms. Tracy Keefer - 1999, student
Dept. of History, USC, Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 254-6867 *tdkeefe@vm.sc.edu*
Ancient, medieval
- Ms. Kathy Keitt - 1999
812 Patriot Parkway #304
Rock Hill, SC 29730
- Ms. Kim Kellison - 1998 USC
801 King St., Unit I, Columbia, SC 29205
(803) 777-5195 *kelison@vm.sc.edu*
- Dr. Joseph H. Killian - 1999
Dept. of History, Wofford College,
PO Box 53, Spartanburg, SC 29303-3663
(864) 597-4551 *killianjh@wofford.edu* or
killianjh@aol.com
Post-Civil-War US
- Ms. Deborah C. King - 1998
USC graduate student
100 Riverbend Drive/Apt. I-26
West Columbia, SC 29169
(803) 939-7108 *dcking0@vm.sc.edu*
Applied history, 20th-century US, civil
rights/African American
- Dr. G. Wayne King - 1999
1165 Aiken Drive, Apt. A-1, Florence, SC
29501

Ms. Susan L. King - 1999
Archivist - Diocese of Charleston
PO Box 818, Charleston, SC 29402
(803) 766-8372 H (803) 724-6387 W

Dr. Joanne Klein - 1996 - USC-Sumter
200 Miller Rd., Sumter, SC 29150
(803) 775-6341 *joanne.klein@sc.edu*
Europe-modern

Dr. Keith Knapp - 1998
Hist. Dept./The Citadel
171 Moultrie St., Charleston, SC 29409

Mr. Michael Knutson - 1996
The Citadel/College of Charleston
2901 E. Waters Edge, Beaufort, SC 29902
(803) 525-1873

Dr. Michael Kohl - 1999 Clemson Univ. Library
201 Cottonwood Lane, Clemson, SC 29631
(864) 656-5176 FAX (864) 656-0233 *ohl@clemson.edu*
History of West, vertebrate paleontology

George Kovatchev - 1999
5600 Dorchester Road #1305
North Charleston, SC 29418

Ms. Lili Hirsch Krakowski - 1996
College of Charleston
1 King St. #506, Charleston, SC 29401

Dr. Diane N. Kremm - 2000
Department of History
University of Central Oklahoma,
Edmond, OK 73034
(405) 341-2980 Ext. 5451 FAX (405) 330-3823
Dkremm@aixl.ucok.edu
19th-century U. S., Civil War, Old South

Jason R. Kreutner - 1999
183 Tradd Street, Charleston, SC 29401-1820

Ms. Karin Kuczynski - 1999
New York University Press
70 Washington Sq. S., Second Floor
New York City, NY 10012-1091

Mr. John E. Kuykendall - 1999 USC
1844 Tall Pines Cir., Columbia, SC 29205
(803) 787-5541 *jekuyk@aol.com*
Modern Europe

Dr. Elaine Lacy - 1999
Dept. Hist USC-A
471 Univ Pkwy, Aiken SC 29801
(803) 641-3551 FAX (803) 641-3461 *elalacy@vm.sc.edu*
Hispanics in US, women's, Latin American

Dr. Robert S. Lambert - Life Member
Clemson University (retired)
P.O. Box 1091, Clemson, SC 29633
(864) 654-5921
U. S. early national, American Revolution

Dr. Alan K. Lamm - 1997
Trident Technical College
7000 Rivers Ave., Charleston, SC 29423-8067
(803) 569-6647
Military, religious

Dr. James L. Lancaster - 1997
Midlands Technical College
4103 Devine St., Apt A-6, Columbia SC
29205
(803) 738-7674
Civil War & Reconstruction

Prof. E. M. Lander Jr. - Life Member
Clemson University (retired)
217 Riggs Drive, Clemson SC 29631-1427

Dr. Rachel C. Larson - 1999
115-B White Oak Drive
Greenville, SC 29607-1217

Dr. Gloria C. Lebbly - 1999
2502 East Main Street, Barnwell, SC 29812
(803) 259-1997

Ms. Laura Gayle Ledford - 1997
Student - Lander
PO Box 34, Montmorenci, SC 29839
(803) 266-3659 *ledford@lab.lander.edu*

Dr. J. Edward Lee - 1999
Winthrop University
202 West Madison Street, York, SC 29745
(803) 323-2173
U.S. since 1876, Russia/Eastern Europe,
colonial America, African American, South
Carolina

Ms. Mary Lehman - 1998
Student - USC
1017 Laurens St., Apt. 1, Columbia, SC
29201
(803) 254-5934 *mlehman@vm.sc.edu*
Urban colonial, historical preservation,
textiles

Mr. Henry H. Lesesne - 1999
159 S. Bull St., Columbia, SC 29205
(803) 251-1795 *hlesesne@sc.edu*

Dr. Joe Lesesne - 1998 - Wofford
148 Wofford Campus, Spartanburg, SC
29303
(864) 583-3659

Dr. Charles H. Lesser - 1999
S.C. Department of Archives & History
309 Fulton St., Columbia, SC 29205
(803) 799-5635 *lesser@history.scdah.sc.edu*
South Carolina, colonial & revolutionary
U.S.

Dr. Lori Loeb - 1996
History Department, USC-Columbia
USC Dept. of History, Columbia, SC 29208
British social history

Dr. Paul S. Lofton - 1999
Spartanburg Methodist College
404 E. Park Drive, Spartanburg, SC 29302
(864) 583-0553 *loftonps@smcsc.edu*

Dr. Stephen Lowe - 1999
23 Sadler Way, Greenville, SC 29607

Jacqueline Lukich - 1999
1920 Paces Landing #1933, Rock Hill, SC
29732

Dr. Valdis O. Lumans - 1999
USCA Department of History, Aiken SC
29801
(803) 648-6851 FAX (803) 641-3461
vall@aiken.sc.edu
German, Russian, Eastern Europe, western
civ.

Ms. Iva Jean Maddox - 1998
Historical Center of York County
17 Smith St., York, SC 29745
(803) 684-7262 W

Dr. Nathaniel F. Magruder - Life Member
Professor Emeritus, Converse College
155 S. Fairview Ave., Spartanburg, SC 29302
(803) 583-1339
U.S., southern, African American

Dr. William J. Mathias - 1999
College of Criminal Justice, USC
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Ralph W. Mathisen - 1997
USC Dept. of History, Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 777-6068 *ralph.w.mathisen@sc.edu*
Ancient

Mr. T. D. Mauro - 1996
Citadel/College of Charleston
801G Runaway Bay Drive
Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464

Dr. Amy Thompson McCandless - 1999
College of Charleston, Dept. of History
66 George St., Charleston, SC 29424
(803) 953-8025 FAX (803) 953-6349
mccandlessa@cofc.edu
Tudor/Stuart British, women & gender in
US/Europe, SC

Dr. Peter McCandless - 1999
College of Charleston, Dept. of History,
66 George St., Charleston, SC 29424
(803) 953-8032 FAX (803) 953-6349
mccandlessp@cofc.edu
Georgian & Victorian British, medieval

Dr. Howard G. McClain - Life Member
1925 Madison Rd., Columbia, SC 29204

Mr. Robert McConnell - 1997
Soldier Support Institute
4427 Blossom St., Apt. A-7. Columbia, SC
29205
(803) 751-8114 mconner@emh1.army.com

Dr. Tandy McConnell - 1998
2119 Bedford Way, Columbia, SC 29209

Mr. Michael R. McCormick - 1998
Morris College
686 Pringle Dr., Sumter, SC 29150

Dr. Kenneth McDonald - 1999
USCA Dept. of History, 471 University Park-
way
Aiken, SC 29801

Mr. J. P. McGuire- 1996
Greenville Technical College
17 E. Main Street, Taylors SC 29867
(864) 268-5596

Dr. Don McKale - 1996
Box 341507, History Dept., 102 Hardin Hall,
Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634-
1507

Ms. Margaret P. Miller - 1998
Social Studies coordinator
Georgetown County Schools
12527 Pleasant Hill Dr., Hemingway, SC
29554
(803) 546-2561 FAX (803) 546-5812 dis.miller@gcsd.k12.sc.us

Ms. Sandra Corley Mitchell - 1999
USC-Columbia Development Office
3302 Wilmot Ave., Columbia, SC 29205-
2752
(803) 777-9703 FAX (803) 777-9708 sandra@dev.admin.sc.edu
Modern American, southern

Dr. Michael Montgomery - 1998
Dept. of English, USC, Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 777-2300 FAX (803) 777-9064
n270053@vm.sc.edu

Scots/Irish in South Carolina, colonial
South Carolina, linguistics

Dr. John Hammond Moore - 1999
Independent researcher/formerly USC
115 Harden Street, Columbia, SC 29205
The world

Dr. Robert J. Moore - 1999
3517 Verner St., Columbia, SC 29204
(803) 786-3626 FAX (803) 786-3789
bmoore@colacoll.edu
US, SC, South, civil rights

Dr. Winfrid B. "Bo" Moore - 1999
930 Law Lane, Mt. Pleasant, SC 29419
(803) 953-5073 bomoore@citadel.edu
New South, SC

Mr. Curtis F. Morgan - 1999 - student - USC
180 Twisted Hill Rd., Irmo, SC 29063
(803) 749-4618 cmorgan879@aol.com

Dr. Michael Morris - 1999
USC-Aiken
573 Whiteoak Road NE, Thomson, GA 30824
(706) 541-1852 H (803) 648-6851 W
mikaelos@augusta.net
Colonial America, American Indian

Mr. C. Rex Morrow Jr. - 1999
Trident Technical College
PO Box 4749, Pinopolis, SC 29469
(803) 569-6467

Dr. J. Ashby Morton - 1999
Benedict College, Social Science Dept.
3219 Heyward St., Columbia, SC 29205
(803) 253-5209
Modern Europe, U.S. military

Dr. Ken MuFuka - 1998 - Lander University
114 Oxford Rd, Greenwood, SC 29649
(803) 229-1204 kmufuka@lander.edu

Dr. Patrick P. Mulligan - 1998
Anderson College
309 Myrtle Avenue, Belton, SC 29627
(864) 231-2093 FAX (864) 231-2004
mulligan@anderson-college.edu

Dr. Andrew H. Myers - 2000
USC Spartanburg, Dept. of History
Spartanburg, SC 29303
864) 503-5833 *ameyers@gw.uscs.edu*
US/African American in the military

Dr. David C. Needham - 1999
Presbyterian College
106 Pinehurst Drive, Clinton, SC 29325
(803) 833-3048 H (803) 833-8376
dneedham@csi.presby.edu

Prof. Marilyn Nelson - 1999
Greenville Technical College
205 Tindal Ave., Greenville, SC 29605
(864) 233-0882 *nelsonmmn@algotec.edu*
Latin America, colonial America, early US

Dr. John Newell - 1996
History Department, College of Charleston
66 George St., Charleston, SC 29424
(803) 953-5937 *newellj@cofc.edu*
Medieval

Mr. Christopher Newton - 1998 - student - USC
100 Riverbend Dr., Apt. J-55
W. Columbia, SC 29169
(803) 739-8348 *godfish@hotmail.com*

Dr. Elaine Nichols, curator - 1999
African American Culture & History
SC State Museum
PO Box 3536, Columbia, SC 29230
(803) 737-4921 FAX (803) 737-4969
Museums, African American

Ms. Karen Nickless - 1997 - graduate student
University of South Carolina
2329 Lincoln St, Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 771-4640 *nickless@mindspring.com*
Antebellum America, women's history

Dr. Robert D. Ochs - Life Member
Professor Emeritus, University of South
Carolina
100 Sunset Blvd. #401, W. Columbia, SC
29169
(803) 796-9928
US, westward expansion

Dr. Edward Opper - 1999
Humanities Dept., Greenville Tech. College,
Box 5616, Greenville, SC 29606-5616
(864) 250-8023 ext. 33 *oppered@goltec.edu*

Dr. Susan Ouellette - 1997 - Lander Univer-
sity
375C Cornell Learning Center
Greenwood, SC 29649
(864) 543-3128 *souillet@lander.edu*

Mrs. Betty E. Owens - 1998
Greenville Tech. College
417 Elizabeth Dr., Greenville, SC 29615
ownesb@goltec.edu

Prof. Rameth Owens - 1999
Clemson University, Dept. of History
102 Hardin Hall, Box 341507
Clemson, SC 29634
(864) 656-5370 *rrowens@clemson.edu*
Appalachian South

Dr. Jean Paquette - 1995
Lander University, Greenwood, SC 29649

Dr. Denis G. Paz - 1997
University of North Texas, Dept. of History
Denton, TX 76203-6735
(817) 565-2288 FAX (817) 369-8838
dpaz@terrell.unt.edu
Modern Britain

Dr. Nat Pendleton - 1999
Curator of history and technology
1041 Marion St. Apt. 11-G, Columbia, SC
29201
(803) 898-4940 FAX (803) 898-4969
Communication and transportation,
20th-century US, Europe

Dr. David O. Percy - 1998 - SC Historical Society
100 Meeting St., Charleston, SC 29401-2299
(803) 723-3225 FAX (803) 723-8584
dopercy@aol.com
American colonial, agriculture

Dr. Kenneth E. Peters - 1999 - USC Columbia Applied Professional Sciences
921 Sugar Mill Road, Chapin, SC 29036
(803) 345-1688 H (803) 777-3335 W *pe-
ters@gum.sc.edu*
US, SC (1888 earthquake), constitutional & social

Mr. Sigmund B. Pickus - 1997
205 Foxcross Rd., Spartanburg, SC 29301
(864) 574-0958

Mr. James A. Polk, Headmaster - 1996
1111 Hollybrooke Drive
Moncks Corner SC 29461

J. Tracy Power - 1999
2823 Wilmot Avenue, Columbia, SC 29205

Dr. Bernard E. Powers Jr. - 1999
Dept. of History, College of Charleston
66 George Street, Charleston, SC 29424-0001
(803) 953-5711 FAX (803) 953-6349

Dr. Thomas L. Powers - 1999 - USC-Sumter
200 Miller Road, Sumter, SC 29150
(803) 775-6341 ext. 3276 *tpowers@uscsumter.
uscsu.sc.edu*
Civil War & Reconstruction, military history, South, history education

Dr. Eldred E. Prince Jr. - 1999
Hist. Dept., College of Charleston
290 Carolina Dr., Loris, SC 29569
Prince@coastal.edu
Agriculture - SC, South

Ms. Jill S. Quattlebaum-Altman - 1997
Graduate student, USC
403 E. Butler Ave. Saluda, SC 29138
(803) 256-7478 H (803) 777-8170 W
quattle@sc.edu
Archaeology, medieval Europe

Dr. Philip N. Racine, chair - 1997
Wofford College, Dept. of History
429 N. Church St., Spartanburg SC 29303
(864) 597-4531 FAX (864) 597-4549
racinepn@wofford.edu

Ms. Frances M. Racine - 1997
Spartanburg High School
200 Pineville Rd., Spartanburg, SC 29307
(864) 582-4342 W
AP history

Dr. Norman Raiford - 1999
Humanities Dept., Greenville Tech. College
Greenville, SC 29606-5616
raiforngr@gvltec.edu

Mr. Ed Reed - 1997
PO Box 16587, Surfside Beach, SC 29587
(803) 357-1896

Dr. Eric Reisenauer - 1997 - USC Sumter
200 Miller Rd., Sumter, SC 29150
(803) 775-6341 ext. 3362 *ericr@uscsumter.
uscsu.sc.edu*
Modern Europe/modern Britain/British Empire/East Asia

Lynn Reisenauer - 1998
228 Church St. #3, Sumter, SC 29150

Michael Reynolds - 1999
1840 Carriage Lane E-177 Charleston, SC 29407

Dr. Miles S. Richards - 1997
3232 Whitehall Rd., Columbia, SC 29204
(803) 782-8255

Ms. Regina A. Richey - 1997 - student
112 Dalewood St., Hodges, SC 29653
(864) 388-9258

Ms. Sheila Riley - 1998
South Carolina State Museum
P.O. Box 100107, Columbia, SC 29202
(803) 898-4945

Dr. David Rison - 1998
Dept. of History, Charleston Southern Uni-
versity
PO Box 118087, Charleston SC 29423
Modern South

Ms. Kate Ritchie - 1998 - Sea Island Academy
2413 Sylvan Shores Dr., Charleston, SC
29414
(803) 559-6170 H (803) 5596172 W
zuaber100@aol.com

Mr. Walter Roberts - 1997 student - USC
441 Deerwood St., Apt. 2, Columbia, SC
29205
Late Roman Empire

Ms. Susan H. Robinson - 1999
Ashley Hall School
1721 Mulmar St., Charleston, SC 29407
(803) 722-4088

Mr. Donald L. Roper - 1999
403 S. Piedmont Highway, Piedmont, SC
29673
(864) 845-7260 H (864) 845-3341
Local, textiles, sports (SC)

Dr. Louis H. Roper - 1997
SUNY-New Paltz, Dept. of History
75 South Manheim Blvd., New Paltz, NY
12561
ropert@matrix.newpaltz.edu

Dr. Gerald R. Roys - 1999 - Benedict College
8107 Greenbrook Road, Columbia SC 29223
(803) 788-1963

Mr. Bryant Sapp - 1999 student - USC
1914 Senate St., Apt. C, Columbia, SC
29201
Southern, military

Dr. Alan Schaffer - 1999 Clemson University
122 S. Spring St., Central, SC 29630
(864) 656-5374 FAX (864) 656-1015
alans@clemson.edu

Ms. Brenda Thompson Schoolfield - 1997
Bob Jones University
10 Lander St., Greenville, SC 29607
(864) 242-5100 *bschoolf@bju.edu*
US, Asia

Dr. Constance Schulz - 1999
USC Department of History
Columbia SC 29208
(803) 777-4854 FAX (803) 777-4494
schulz@garnet.cla.sc.edu
Applied history, archives, religion in the US,
US early national, photographs

Dr. Jesse L. Scott - 1999 - Newberry College
2224 Gadsden Street, Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 276-5010 H *jscott@newberry.edu*

Dr. Jutta K. Scott - 1998
Dept. of History, S.C. State University Or-
angeburg, SC 29117
(803) 536-8915 *jscott@scsn.net*

Ms. Rachel A. Segars - 1998
Converse College, 580 E. Main St.
Spartanburg, SC 29302

Ms. Laurel Sharp - 1997
SC State Museum Foundation
4824 Shadow Lawn Rd., Columbia, SC
29206
(803) 737-4935

Mr. John M. Sherrer, III - 1998 student - USC
1017 Laurens St., Apt. 1, Columbia, SC 29201
jmsherr@vm.sc.edu
10th-c America, architecture

Ms. Elizabeth A. Shuffler - 1998

Graduate student
4443 Bethel Church Rd. #17
Columbia, SC 29206
(803) 738-3799 H (803) 734-7914 W
shuffler@scsn.net

Mr. Chris Skoland - 1998 - student
827 Keegan Dr., Walterboro, SC 29488

(803) 538-3970/4481
dskoland@lowcountry.com
US, Norwegian

Mr. Sam Slagle - 1997
3941 Charleston Hwy. #40
W. Columbia, SC 29172
zoubek@sprynet.com

Ms. Spring Slagle - 1997
3941 Charleston Hwy. #40
W. Columbia, SC 29172
zoubek@sprynet.com

Ms. Julia L. Sloan - 1996 - The Citadel
363 King St., Apt. B, Charleston, SC 29401
(803) 722-6356 FAX (803) 953-5073
sloanj@citadel.edu
Latin America

Prof. Arthur B. Smith - 1999
Greenville Tech. College
105 Hollybrook Way
Simsponville, SC 29681-5319
(864) 250-8776 W
smithabs@gvltec.edu

Cdr. & Mrs. E. Thomas Smith - 1999
3305 Pine Belt Rd., Columbia, SC 29204-3126

Dr. Roger V. Smith - 1998
History Dept., Presbyterian College
Clinton, SC 29325

Dr. Selden K. Smith - 1999 Columbia College
617 Glenthorne Rd., Columbia, SC 29203
(803) 786-3627 FAX (803) 786-3789 *sel-smith@colacoll.edu*
20th-century southern, politics, civil rights,
Holocaust studies (20th century)

Dr. W. Calvin Smith - 1999

USCA Department of History, Aiken, SC
29801
(803) 648-6851 FAX (803) 641-3461
calwins@aiken.sc.edu
Early American history, history of religion
in US, American Revolution era, Gregg &
Graniteville

SC Governor's School for Science and Math
- 1999
306 E. Home Avenue, Hartsville, SC 29550

SC Historical Society - 1999
100 Meeting Street, Charleston, SC 29401

South Caroliniana - 1999
Attn: Dr. Allen Stokes
USC-Columbia, Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. John G. Sproat - Life Member
Professor Emeritus, USC
USC Southern Studies, Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 777-4477 FAX (803) 777-4477
sproatj@garnet.cla.sc.edu

Dr. Jane W. Squires - 1999 USC
106 Rutledge Dr., Eutawville, SC 29048
(803) 777-7660 *jane@psc.sc.edu*

Dr. Lisa Steffen - 1999
151 Fernwood Drive #159
Spartanburg, SC 29307

Dr. William F. Steirer, Jr. - 1996
Department of History, Clemson University
Clemson, SC 29634-1507
(864) 656-5375

Mrs. Mary Ann Stepp - Life Member
1210 Roe Ford Road, Greenville, SC 29617
(864) 246-1318 H

Dr. A. H. Stokes Jr., director - 1999
South Caroliniana Library, USC, Columbia
SC 29208 (803) 777-3131 FAX (803) 777-
5747 *stokesa@tcl.sc.edu*
S. C. history

Mr. R. Phillip Stone - 1999
 Graduate student, USC (803) 544-1770
 255 Woodside Court, Spartanburg, SC
 29301
 (864) 439-8936 *rpstone@vm.sc.edu*
 South Carolina, New South, recent vs political

Dr. Rodger E. Stroup, director - 1999
 SC Dept. of Archives and History
 8301 Parklane Rd., Columbia, SC 29223
 (803) 734-8577 FAX (803) 734-8820
stroup@history.scdah.sc.edu

Ms. Courtney R. Stukes - 1999
 1025 Woodstone Drive, Florence SC 29501

Dr. Joseph T. Stukes - Life Member
 Francis Marion, retired
 1025 Woodstone Drive, Florence SC 29501
joestukes@webtv.net

Mr. Richard N. Sykes - 1997
 Aiken Tech. College
 778 Vincent St. NE, Aiken, SC 29801-4114
 (803) 593-9231 ext. 1347 W (803) 641-9930
 H
 Church history, colonial American history,
 British history

Dr. Marcia G. Synnott - 1999 USC
 Dept. of History, Columbia, SC 29208
 (803) 777-2585 *synnott@garnet.cla.sc.edu*
 US 20th century, women, civil rights

Mr. Wendell Tate - 1997 - student - USC
 925 Laurens St., Columbia, SC 29201
 (803) 748-7869 *T330069@vm.sc.edu*

Dr. D. A. Jeremy Telman - 1996 - student
 College of Charleston
 143 Broad St. Apt. A., Charleston, SC 29401
 (803) 953-8102 *telmand@cofc.edu*
 German history, intellectual history

Mr. Sam Thomas - 1999 - asst. curator of
 history
 Cultural and Heritage Commission of York
 City
 212 E. Jefferson St., York, SC 29745
 (803) 684-1189 *sathomas@infoave.net*
 Southern, military, Civil War, Revolutionary
 War, Irish, Carolina backcountry

Dr. T. V. Thoroughman - 1996
 Box 114, Wofford College
 Spartanburg, SC 29302

Dr. Bertrand Van Ruymbeke - 1997
 College of Charleston, Dept. of History
 66 George St., Charleston, SC 29424
 (803) 953-1354 *vanruymbeke@cofc.edu*
 Colonial SC, Atlantic, Huguenot, British
 North America

Dr. Birdsall S. Viault - 1999 Life Member
 2186 Wentworth Dr., Rock Hill, SC 29732
 (803) 323-4678 *viaultb@winthrop.edu*
 Modern Europe

Dr. Keith E. Wagner - 1999
 History Department, Newberry College
 Newberry, SC 29108
 (803) 321-5205

Dr. Melissa Walker - 1999
 Dept. of History & Politics, Converse Col-
 lege Spartanburg, SC 29302
 (864) 596-9104 *melissa.walker@converse.edu*
 Southern, women's

Dr. Edna Ward - 1998
 655 Greenbriar Ave., Rock Hill, SC 29730

Ms. Wylma Wates - Life Member
 1730 College Street, Columbia, SC 29201
 (803) 799-2346

Dr. Robert M. Weir - 1999
 USC Dept. of History, Columbia SC 29208
 (803) 777-5988 *robert-weir@sc.edu*
 America colonial & Revolution

Ms. Dolly Wells - 1999
SC Dept. of Archives & History
PO Box 11669, Columbia, SC 29201
(803) 734-8577

Dr. Katherine Wells - 1999
800 Kipling Dr., Columbia, SC 29205
(803) 738-9374

Dr. Robert R. Weyeneth - 1997
USC Dept. of History, Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 777-5195 *weyenth@sc.edu*

Dr. Marilyn A. Wheeler - 1997
Military History Office, SSI, Ft. Jackson
37 Misty Morning Dr., Columbia, SC 29229
(803) 865-9456 H (803) 751-8013 W *wheel-
erma@aol.com*

Dr. Virginia Williams - 1999
823¹/₂ Milton Ave., Apt. B
Rock Hill, SC 29730
(803) 223-4680
Latin America

Dr. G. G. Williamson - 1999
Winthrop University
206 New Brookland. Pl.
West Columbia, SC 29169
(803) 323-4689 or 323-2173
US/Western Europe survey, US 1877-1945,
southern/SC (post 1865), US economics &
business

Dr. Jeffrey Willis - 1999
2150 Washington Rd.
Spartanburg, SC 29302-4139
(864) 596-9102 W (864) 583-6775 H
jeff.willis@converse.edu
British history

Dr. John Scott Wilson - 1997
USC Dept. of History, Columbia, SC 29208
(803) 777-6107

Mr. Dean W. Wood - 1998
1341 Topsail Court, Mt. Pleasant, SC 29464
(803) 884-4478 H (803) 556-0654 W
DWW99@yahoo.com
History of events

Dr. Joyce Wood - 1999 - Anderson College
Box 1134
316 Boulevard,
Anderson, SC 29621
(864) 231-2095 FAX (864) 231-2004 *jo-
wood@anderson-college.edu*
Modern Europe, world, Middle East,
Eastern Europe, historic preservation

Ms. Molly M. Wood - 1996
Graduate student
University of South Carolina
8755 Kilpeck Ct.
Richmond VA 23294
mollymw@univscvm.csd.scarolina.edu
US 20th century, US diplomatic, Latin
American history

Mr. Doug Young - 1997
2426 Monroe St.
Columbia, SC 29205-3152
(803) 799-0797
Latin America, Methodist camp
meetings in SC

Constitution

I. The name of this organization shall be the South Carolina Historical Association.

II. The objects of this Association shall be to promote historical studies in the state of South Carolina, to bring about a closer relationship among persons living in this state who are interested in history, and to encourage the preservation of historical records.

III. Membership shall be open to anyone interested in the objectives of the Association. Annual dues shall be determined by the Executive Committee.

After having been a member of the Association for ten years and upon reaching the age of sixty-five, any member may be designated an emeritus member by the secretary. Emeritus members have all the rights and privileges of membership without being required to pay the annual dues.

Student members shall pay annual dues at half-rates.

IV. The officers shall be president, vice-president, secretary, and treasurer; these shall be elected at each annual meeting. The Executive Committee shall normally nominate one person for each office. The vice-president shall be the automatic nominee for president. Nomination from the floor may be made for any office.

Officers shall have the duties and perform the functions customarily attached to their respective offices with such others as may from time to time be prescribed.

V. The Executive Committee shall be composed of the officers, the editor of *The Proceedings*, and three other members elected for a term of three years. The duties of the Executive Committee shall be to fix the date and place of the annual meeting, to attend to the publication of *The Proceedings*, to prepare a program for the annual meeting, to prepare a list of nominations for the officers of the Association as provided in Article IV, to supervise the expenditures of the Association's funds, and such other duties as may from time to time be assigned to them by the Association. There shall be such other committees as the president may appoint, or be instructed to appoint, by resolutions of the Association.

VI. There shall be an annual meeting of the Association at the time and place appointed by the Executive Committee.

VII. A. The Association shall publish annually its proceedings to be known as *The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association*. It shall contain the minutes of the annual meeting together with such papers and documents selected by the Executive Committee. Each fifth year, *The Proceedings* shall include a copy of the constitution of the Association. At least every five years, *The Proceedings* shall include a current list of the membership.

B. All papers read at the annual meeting shall become the property of the Association except as otherwise may be approved by the Executive Committee.

C. The Executive Committee shall annually elect an editor of *The Proceedings* who shall have authority to appoint an associate editor and shall be a member of the Executive Committee.

VIII. In the event of dissolution, the remaining assets of the Association, if any, shall be donated by the Executive Committee to another organization which shares the objects and aims of the Association.

IX. The Publication Endowment Fund exists to supplement the income available for the publication of *The Proceedings*. Contributions may be made by anyone, and they will be acknowledged in writing.

The Fund will be administered by three trustees: the president, the treasurer, and the editor of *The Proceedings*. The trustees shall invest the Fund so as to obtain a secure and steady income and report annually to the membership the status of the Fund.

The trustees may designate annually a sum no greater than 80 percent of the earnings of the Fund to defray the cost of printing *The Proceedings* and add the surplus of earnings each year to the principal.

Should the Executive Committee determine that the Fund is no longer necessary for the purpose for which it was established, they shall recommend that this Article be removed from the constitution. If the Fund is liquidated, the Executive Committee shall make an unrestricted gift of the principal to the endowment fund of the University of South Carolina or similar historical repository in South Carolina and transfer the balance of the earnings to the treasury of the Association.

X. The constitution may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the members present at the annual meeting.

A Notice to Contributors Concerning Style

The editorial committee invites submission of manuscripts from authors of papers presented at the annual meeting. On the recommendation of reviewers, manuscripts may be published in *The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association*.

In general, manuscripts should not exceed 4500 words, about eighteen pages including endnotes. As soon as possible after the annual meeting, authors should submit two hard copies of their paper to the editor for review. If accepted for publication, a final corrected copy must be submitted in two formats: one hard copy and one electronic copy. The hard copy must be marked up for style—i.e. showing quote marks, italics, and the like. The electronic copy must be on an IBM-compatible disk and saved without formatting, using “save as text only,” in Word Perfect 5.1 or Microsoft Word. Please include your name, article title, and software version on the disk label. Be sure to mail the disk to the editor in a protective envelope. The electronic copy should use 12 point type in Times New Roman font.

Do not include a title page. Put the title of your paper and your name at the top of the first page. Number the pages of your paper *only* on the hard copy.

Please use margins of one inch throughout your paper. Text should be single spaced, flush left, and double spaced between paragraphs. Space only once between a period and the next word and indent quotations of five or more lines without quotation marks.

Documentation should be provided in endnotes, not at the foot of each page. At the end of the text of your paper, double space then type the word “endnotes.” Underneath, begin the first note with the Arabic numeral followed by a period and then the text of the endnote. Endnotes should be flush left and single spaced. Endnote numerals should be on the margin, not raised. If your word processing system demands the raised footnote numeral, it will be acceptable.

Foreign words and titles of publications should be italicized.

The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association adheres to the most recent edition of the Chicago Manual of Style for punctuation, endnotes, and general usage. Please avoid the use of gender titles—Mr., Mrs., Miss, etc. Refer to women by their last names and designate US citizens of African descent as “African Americans” (not hyphenated) as frequently as possible. Do not capitalize black or white when used as a reference to race. Do not apply terms that are gender specific to mixed

groups, and avoid the awkward construction of “he/she.” When compiling endnotes, do not use “p.” before the page number, and follow Section 8.67 of the *Manual* for citations to inclusive pages.

The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association prefers ‘lowercase’ usage in capitalization. For example, titles such as president, general, ambassador, etc., should appear in lowercase except when followed by a proper name.

Minutes of the sixty-eighth annual meeting of the SCHA March 6, 1999

The sixty-ninth annual meeting of the South Carolina Historical Association convened at the South Carolina Archives and History Center in Columbia, South Carolina, on Saturday, March 6, 1999. Registration began at 8:30 AM in Proprietor's Hall. More than 100 members and guests registered for the meeting on a pleasant, mild March day and visited briefly over coffee and pastries during registration. The first presentation sessions of the program assembled by Katherine Cann began at 9:00 AM.

Session 1A, **Men in Uniform**, featured papers by Jackie Booker of SC State University on "Black Men in Gray Uniforms: Africans in the South Carolina Confederacy" and William J. Mathias of USC-Columbia on "The South Carolina Highway Patrol: The First Half Century, 1930–1980." The scheduled moderator could not be present and a substitution was made with scheduled commentator, Thomas Powers, serving.

Session 1B, **Civil Rights in South Carolina**, included papers on "Laura Bragg's Intellectual Revolution: Bridging the Color Line at the Charleston Museum" by Louise Allen of The Citadel and "Grass Roots and Marble Columns: Civil Rights, Public Accommodations and South Carolina Federal Courts" by Stephen Lowe of Lander University. Independent scholar, Janet Hudson, served as moderator and gave comments on the papers.

Session 1C, **Late Antiquity Gaul**, was moderated by Marvin Cann of Lander University and saw presentations by Tracy Keefer, "His locis ministrent presbyteri': City Bishops and Country Priests in Late Antique Gaul" and Laura Fry, "The Codex Euricanus: Its Origin and Transmission." Both presenters are of USC-Columbia.

At 10:00 to 10:15, a break in the sessions occurred in order for members to have coffee and visit briefly before reconvening in the second group of sessions for the day. Those sessions got underway at 10:15.

Session 2A, **The Road to Brown**, was a panel discussion by panelists personally involved in the case, *Briggs v. Elliott*. Briggs was one of four cases lumped together in the Supreme Court case familiarly known as *Brown v. Board of Education*. The five panelists, B. B. Delaine, Jessie Patterson, Cecil J. Williams, Julia Phynese Witherspoon, and Annie Gibson, related their experiences in Clarendon County, South Carolina in

the late 1940s as well as their roles in the court cases that preceded the Brown decision. Independent scholar, William H. (Sonny) Dubose, moderated the session.

Session 2B, **Romans, Barbarians, and Transition During Late Antiquity**, was moderated by Ralph W. Mathisen, USC-Columbia, who also provided comments. The session had three papers. Christopher Newton, USC-Columbia, presented “The Danubian Provinces in Late Antiquity: A Roman Artifact?”; Bart Brodowski, USC-Columbia, enlightened with “Barbarian Ethnography in Central Europe During Late Antiquity;” and George Kovatchen of the History Museum in Sliven, Bulgaria presented “Road Communication in Northeast Thracia.”

Session 2C was a roundtable discussion on **Teaching Methods and Materials for College Level History Courses**. It featured presentations by Tandy McConnell of Columbia College on “Internet Teaching Resources;” Molly Wood of USC-Columbia on “Reading and Writing Material in the Classroom;” and Phillip Cockrell of Newberry College on “Presentation of Course Material in the Classroom.” Molly Wood served as moderator and comments were provided by the audience.

Session 2D, **SC Biography**, had Paul S. Lofton, Jr. of Spartanburg Methodist College as moderator and Randy Akers of the South Carolina Humanities Council as commentator. The papers of the session dealt with interesting figures in South Carolina History. “Robert Barnwell Rhett and the Formation of the Confederate Government: A Reappraisal” was the topic of Michael S. Reynolds, The Citadel and the University of Charleston; “Albert Smith Rowell: A Southern Yankee:” was presented by Don Roper, independent scholar; and Amy T. McCandless of the College of Charleston presented “South Carolina Advocates for Equal Rights: The Pollitzer Sisters of Charleston.”

At 11:30, the second coffee break of the morning took place in Proprietor’s Hall after which the third and final morning sessions began at 11:45.

Session 3A, entitled **The Nazi Era**, featured a paper by Kenneth McDonald of USC-Aiken on “Creating a ‘Nazi Style’: The German Fashion Institute and State Efforts to Influence Fashion in the 1930s.” David Hess of USC-Aiken and Spartanburg served as moderator and gave comments.

Session 3B, **A South Carolina Miscellany**, featured “God in the Upstate: The Second Great Awakening in South Carolina, 1802–1805” by Dale Johnson of Southern Wesleyan University and “ ‘The G.I. is the Finest Thing That Could Have Happened’: The Veterans, The University of South Carolina and Higher Education Reform in Post World War II South Carolina” by Henry Lesesne of USC-Columbia. Norman Raiford of Greenville Technical College moderated and Melissa Walker of Converse College provided comments.

Session 3C was a **Panel Discussion** on the topic “The Search for a National Identity: The United States Since 1929.” The panel discussed an interdisciplinary course from historical, economic and geographical perspectives. Maxie M. (Ron) Cox of USC-Salkehatchie moderated the panel and served as a discussant along with Wayne Chilcote, also of USC-Salkehatchie.

Following the morning sessions, members and guests gathered at 1:00 PM for luncheon, speaker and business meeting. J. Edward (Eddie) Lee presided over the meetings. As lunch concluded, President Lee introduced the speaker, Tracy Power of the South Carolina Archives and History Center and author of the acclaimed *Lee’s Miserables*. Dr. Power spoke on “‘Oh When Will This War Be Over, No One Can Tell:’ From Charleston to Virginia and Back with the Greer Brothers of the 25th South Carolina Infantry.” His talk described the personal experiences of the Greers in Lee’s army.

Following the speaker, President Lee recognized Vice-President Katherine Cann who thanked the participants in the program and the host for a successful meeting thus far. Lee then called upon the secretary, Calvin Smith, who reported on the “Newsletter” and called attention to the SCHA web site. The secretary pled for members to send in information on jobs, publications, promotions, grants, summer travel, and other items of interest for the “Newsletter.” Treasurer Bill Brockington gave the next report. He noted that the treasury was in good shape as seen in the printed report in the February “Newsletter.” He pointed out that the Association currently has 11 departmental members and 175 regular and student members. Over 100 members were reported in attendance for this annual meeting. Brockington also reminded members to preregister each year for the annual meeting since this helps the host institution plan for meals and refreshments. President Lee then complimented *Proceedings* editor, Marvin Cann for the timely preparation of *The Proceedings* and called upon the editor for comments. Editor Cann requested that all paper presenters furnish hard copies of papers to him right away to send to readers for review.

President Lee next called upon the chairs of the SCHA Prize Awards Committees, Amy McCandless and Terry Helsley, who announced the winners of prizes for the best articles in *The Proceedings* during the two-year period, 1997–1998. Joan Johnson won the prize for the best article by a graduate student for “Sisters of the South: Louisa and Mary Poppenheim and the Formation of the Southern White Clubwoman.” The prize for the best article by a professional member of the Association went to Calvin Smith for “Demonstrating Historical Versatility: David Duncan Wallace and the Graniteville Centennial Pageant.” Both articles appeared in the 1997 issue of *The Proceedings*.

After these presentations, Lee announced the slate of officers and executive board members for 1999–2000 recommended by the executive board:

President: Katherine Cann, Spartanburg Methodist College

Vice-President: Fritz Hamer, State Museum

Secretary: Calvin Smith, USC-Aiken

Treasurer: Bill Brockington, USC-Aiken

Continuing Executive Board Member: Katherine Grenier, The Citadel

New Executive Board Member: Linda Hayner, Bob Jones University

New Executive Board Member: J. Tracy Power, Archives and History Center

Editor, The Proceedings: Marvin Cann, Lander University

There were no nominations from the floor and the slate was moved and accepted by acclamation.

President Lee then presented the gavel to incoming President Cann. The new president recognized Norman Raiford of Greenville Technical College. Professor Raiford invited the SCHA to Greenville Technical College for its meeting on March 11, 2000. He took note that this was the second Saturday in March, a departure from our traditional first Saturday date.

President Cann next recognized Rodger Stroup of the Archives and History Center who announced meeting places for the afternoon tours and reception. She then called attention to the afternoon panel session and adjourned the business meeting.

Session 4 began at 2:30 and featured a **Roundtable** on “Doing South Carolina History: A Look Back.” Walter Edgar, USC-Columbia, and author of a recent, noteworthy history text, moderated this delightful session which featured distinguished emeriti faculty and archivists who have written texts, books, and articles on South Carolina history. The roundtable panelists included: Daniel W. Hollis, Professor Emeritus, USC-Columbia; Robert Lambert, Professor Emeritus, Clemson University; Ernest M. Lander, Professor Emeritus, Clemson University; Charles Lee, retired, SC Archives Director; and Louise Pettus, Professor Emerita, Winthrop University.

At 3:30 staff members of the South Carolina Archives and History Center conducted tours of this new facility. At 4:00 PM, members gathered for a reception in Proprietor’s Hall to conclude the day.

The sixty-ninth annual meeting then adjourned until the next meeting at Greenville Technical College on March 11, 2000.

Respectfully submitted,

Calvin Smith, Secretary