THE PROCEEDINGS

of

The South Carolina Historical Association

2008

Officers of the Association

President: Joyce Wood, Anderson University
Vice President: Andrew Myers, University of South Carolina Upstate
Secretary: Lars Seiler, Spring Valley High School
Treasurer: Rodger Stroup, South Carolina Department of Archives and History

Executive and Editorial Board Members
E.E. "Wink" Prince, Jr., Coastal Carolina University (2008)
Tracy Power, South Carolina Department of Archives and History (2009)
Kevin Witherspoon, Lander University (2010)
Robert C. Figueira, Lander University, editor
Stephen Lowe, University of South Carolina Extended Campus, editor

THE PROCEEDINGS

of

The South Carolina
Historical Association

2008

Robert Figueira and Stephen Lowe

Editors

The South Carolina Historical Association
South Carolina Department of Archives and History
Columbia, South Carolina
www.palmettohistory.org/scha/scha.htm

Editors' Notes

The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association is a refereed journal containing selected papers presented at the annual meeting. The editors and the other members of the Executive Board serve as the editorial committee, which is assisted by external reviewers chosen for their expertise. The opinions expressed in this journal represent the views only of the individual contributors; they do not reflect the views of the editors, other members of the editorial committee, or the South Carolina Historical Association.

The editors are especially indebted to those colleagues who reviewed papers for publication. Their comments and suggestions have greatly improved the quality of the papers presented here. Reviewers for the 2008 volume were:

David W. Damrel, University of South Carolina Upstate
Carmen V. Harris, University of South Carolina Upstate
Peter Hobbie, Presbyterian College
Carol Loar, University of South Carolina Upstate
H. Paul Thompson, Jr., North Greenville University
Kevin Witherspoon, Lander University
Lizabeth Zack, University of South Carolina Upstate

The editors wish to thank the authors whose papers are published here for their cooperation in revising their oral presentations and their written submissions. As has been the case often in the past, the assistance of Rodger Stroup and the South Carolina Department of Archives and History has been crucial in the production of this volume. Finally, very special thanks must be accorded to Judy Andrews for copy preparation and copyediting. Her speedy, careful, and judicious work in this capacity has again greatly enhanced this volume.

Contents

The African American Museum Movement: New Strategies in the Battle for Equality in the Twentieth Century

Mary Jo Fairchild

African American Culture has the power and complexity needed to illuminate all the dark corners of American life and the power to illuminate all the ambiguities of American life.
Lonnie Bunch, director of the National African American Museum of Culture and History

In the second half of the twentieth century, the establishment of African American museums and cultural centers became a new strategy in the battle for equality in America. For almost three centuries, the descendants of the African diaspora living in America have struggled with issues of identity, cultural distinction, and, above all, racial equality. What has come to be known as the civil rights movement in America is the best example of the fight for equality because of the dynamic social mobilization and the events that took place. The methods of this movement included non-violent acts of resistance such as sit-ins, freedom rides, boycotts, and mass marches.

An often overlooked method of "resistance" is the African American museum movement. The events and tumult generated by the civil rights movement gave activists the chance to recognize the power of an established museum or cultural center for bringing ahead the movement advocating the advancement of equal rights. Long after the civil rights movement of the 1960s ended, African American museums continue to assert the cultural importance of African American heritage through exhibits, communal outreach, lectures, and education. They have become ambassadors for a movement based on equal rights and the recognition of African American contributions on a national level where previously they have been neglected. A testament to the strength of this movement is the fact that there are almost one hundred and forty museums dedicated to African American life, culture, and art in the United States today.[1]

How have African American museums and cultural centers contributed to the movement for equal rights and recognition of black heritage? Investigation into some of the struggles they have mounted in the last decades of the twentieth century reveals how museums dedicated to African American history and culture have affected communities, identities, and attitudes. In a 1988 survey, several "intra-cultural

factors" were cited for the emergence of African American museums in the wake of the civil rights era. Recognition that cultural awareness is a method for combating racism developed; those involved saw museums as a new strategy for expressing "a new cultural consciousness that arose from the civil rights movement." In addition, museums became the locations for black people to secure their places in American culture and history.[2] Consequently, in the context of mobilization and cultural social movement theory, the process of conceptualizing, funding, building, and maintaining museums in America dedicated to African American history and culture constitutes a legitimate social movement.[3]

Examination of primary source materials from polls, surveys, accounts of museum professionals, and magazine articles, as well as in-depth analysis of available secondary scholarship on African American museums yields a clear picture of how African American museums can be classified as a new social movement. Analysis of factors such as preliminary attempts to open museums, their use of education, and their dedication to communities provides evidence for the eventual acceptance and legitimization of African American museums in the United States.

History and Background

Before any museums or cultural centers were dedicated to African Americans and before the widespread incorporation of scholarly analysis of the contributions of African Americans to American culture as a whole, the responsibility for maintaining the unique cultural identity brought from Africa fell upon the shoulders of griots, older members of slave communities that taught and exhibited traditions by example to future generations.[4] These future generations established important black institutions such as churches and schools to assume the responsibility of proliferating black culture. The Baltimore A.M.E Church was one of the first, with the creation in 1849 of a "Literary Artistic Demonstration for the Encouragement of Literature and the Fine Arts Among the Colored Population."[5]

It was not until the first decades of the twentieth century that museums and school curricula began to bring more attention to black history in America. The little funding that black universities and schools received went towards establishing tributes to important figures and artifacts, but these had little influence on society in general. Even so, Howard University in Atlanta, Fisk University in Tennessee, Lincoln University in Pennsylvania, Bennett College in North Carolina, and the Tuskegee Institute all managed to commit themselves and their funds to black history because administrators recognized that it was up to them to provide students with knowledge about their own unique background in America.[6]

In the wake of Jim Crow, lynchings, and extreme acts of segregation, which worsened during the depression and war years, the desire for freedom and equality grew even stronger. During the civil rights era, the discipline of African American history and its representation in museums gained even more momentum. Museums launched at this time took shape in response to the ineffectiveness of Supreme Court decisions that failed to desegregate populations, mainly in the South. By disseminating the cultural and historical splendor of African Americans, museums served as one aspect of the multi-faceted movement to achieve equality.

The first official African American museum to be established in the twentieth century was Chicago's DuSable Museum of African American History in 1961. Next came the Afro-American Museum in Detroit in 1965, followed by the Anacostia Museum in Washington, D.C. two years later.[7] In the 1970s, the trend of expansion continued. First, African Americans asserted the importance of representing their history and culture in the nation's general museums by protesting at the annual conference of the American Association of Museums (AAM). As a result, the AAM agreed to increase minority involvement within member museum communities and their staff through internships and volunteer programs.[8] During that same decade, distinctly African American museums run by blacks continued to open. These included the National Afro-American Museum and Cultural Center in Wilberforce, Ohio, in 1972; the Afro-American Historical and Cultural Museum in Philadelphia in 1976; and the California Afro-American Museum in 1977.[9]

By 1978, the staff and members of African American museums around the country came together and officially chartered the Association of African American Museums (AAAM). The mission of this alliance was, and still is, to "strengthen and advocate for the interests and institutions and individuals committed to the preservation of African-derived cultures."[10]

The Anacostia Museum and the Communal Basis of African American Museums

One of the earliest official museums to be established during the Civil Rights era, the Anacostia Community Museum in southwestern Washington, D.C., provides a dynamic case study for the demonstration of the importance of community for black museums. From its inception, the neighborhood of Anacostia had African Americans not only as its residents, but also as its leaders. Anacostia came into official being through the efforts of Benjamin Banneker, an African American with superb mathematical skills. He was commissioned by the city planners for Washington, D.C., to divide the small area into separate boroughs. Later, Frederick Douglas lived there during the last eighteen years of his life and became a powerful community advocate,

eventually known as the "Sage" of Anacostia. When he died in 1895, the entire district of Anacostia attended his funeral, closing schools and all businesses.[11]

In the twentieth century, the demographic composition of the Anacostia district became increasingly African American as a result of the Great Northern Migration, which occurred in the years before and after *Brown v. Board of Education* and the fight for civil rights. Between 1950 and 1967, the population of Anacostia grew by 50 percent.[12] Figures from a Gallup Poll taken in 1963 suggest that as more blacks moved to the neighborhood, many of the white residents relocated.[13] In this poll, white people were asked "If colored people came to live next door would you move?" Within the northeastern section, 39 percent of respondents answered affirmatively.[14] Along with this explosive growth, the urge for culturally rich elements within the community grew stronger. Recognizing this need, the initiators of the Anacostia museum sought to create a place that would positively influence the lives, self-images, and self-respect of the people who called Anacostia home.

In 1965, the Smithsonian created Greater Anacostia Peoples, Inc. to work toward establishing a museum dedicated to black history in general, and to that of the Anacostia residents in particular.[15] The original goal of this undertaking was to "enliven the community and enlighten the people it serves."[16] On 15 September 1967, the community-based museum opened in the Carver Theater, an old cinema house in the center of the district. [17] This was a most tumultuous and conflicted period of the civil rights movement characterized by frustration and increasing unrest. Residents faced escalating problems symptomatic of overpopulation such as overcrowded schools, inadequate access to healthcare, unemployment, and displacement because of the construction of new highways. All these frustrations culminated in 1968 with rioting that erupted in the aftermath of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s assassination in Memphis. Despite the civil disorder, the museum achieved great success through its experimental exhibition of current themes related to the neighborhood as well as to wider historical issues. In its first year, under the direction of John Kinard, the museum attracted over eighty thousand visitors from Washington D.C. The first six exhibits on display attested to the eclectic character of the museum and the way it sought to attract citizens of all ages and backgrounds. They included a full-scale reproduction of an 1890 neighborhood store, a small zoo, a model of the Mercury space capsule, objects of natural science, skeletons, and a small theater for viewing closed circuit television programs.[18]

The Anacostia Museum continued its mission to invigorate the community and was soon publishing catalogues of its exhibits to reach an even wider audience. Peggy Cooper, a teacher—and also a jurist for the 1974–1975 season exhibit, which contained the work of African American artists of all kinds—commented that the

Anacostia Museum "has revitalized the spirit of thousands of ignored people in our most ignored community."[19]

In the foreword to the catalogue of the 1974–1975 season, Kinard wrote "I am confidant that those who see this exhibition will be energized and inspired to accomplish more, to trust in the possibility of a better future and to devote themselves to the service of mankind."[20] Kinard was a passionate director, dedicated to the achievement of equality and the recognition of the contributions of African Americans to the nation as a whole. Referring to the exhibition of the treasured Barnett-Aden Collection in 1974, Kinard stated that "the Collection does not exist without meaning, nor are we who have viewed it . . . existing as meaningless objects set in motion with a breath of air. There is much for us to do."[21] Kinard and many others believed that by making African American art and culture available to the general public, they could encourage further expression and the destruction of the "false notion" that African American art is "childlike, not good art, or of poor quality."[22]

The Anacostia Community Museum is now highly developed and has shown exhibits on such varied topics as "Separate is not Equal: *Brown v. Board of Education,*" and "Still Cookin' By the Fireside: African Americans in the Food Service."[23] All were made possible by an expanded space for exhibition. In 1989, the museum celebrated its relocation from the small movie house to Fort Stanton Park, an official segment of the historic district. At this time, an exhibit showcasing four local, contemporary artists opened.[24] The inclusion of recent work reinforces the museum's ability to influence and exert powerful influence on the everyday lives of people in the community.

The Anacostia Museum's power as a social movement is fueled by the public influence it exerts. Edmond Barry Gaither, director and curator of the National Center of Afro-American Artists in Boston since 1969, asserted that "the community gives us our legitimacy . . . [our] presence informs and reforms [our] neighborhoods. . . . We are building our institutions in the black community, and they belong to that community."[25] African American museums serve as "cultural touchstones" for the people and places they influence and inhabit as well as "traditional" gathering places for art, cultural artifacts and knowledge about the past.[26] In addition, many museums host monthly and annual events such as festivals, open houses, and fine arts performances for locals to attend. These events give people the opportunity to socialize, to spread news and share ideas, and to network with citizens who have similar interests. The Anacostia Museum is a perfect example of the communal nature of African American museums.

The National Civil Rights Museum and the Power of the Exhibit

Another museum exemplifying the force of African American heritage in the United

States is the National Civil Rights Museum in Memphis, Tennessee, where the spirit of the movement is still alive within its collections and outreach programs. By the late 1970s, the Lorraine Motel, site of the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. by James Earl Ray on 4 April 1968, was in a state of disrepair. In 1982, owner Walter Lane Bailey was forced to declare bankruptcy after being in business for over forty years. In December, the property was scheduled to be auctioned off to the highest bidder. Distraught at the thought of this historic location being demolished by a wrecking ball, a group of concerned Memphis citizens, led by members of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial Foundation, began an aggressive grassroots campaign to raise funds to purchase the small motel. A local radio station's broadcast of a fundraiser led to piecemeal contributions that added up to significant amounts of money. This commitment gave locals further incentive to support the foundation and its cause, even if all they could give was five or ten dollars each.

The incredible cooperation of the Memphis chapter of the NAACP and several African American-owned local businesses, and the last minute contributions of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees—the organization that King had come to Memphis to help—resulted in the sale of the Lorraine Motel to people who would do the site the justice it deserved.[27] These events serve to demonstrate how a movement to preserve and disseminate the values of African American heritage and equality can so powerfully assert action in the face of great obstacles. But the battle had just begun.

Although the property was purchased on 13 December 1982, it was not officially dedicated as the National Civil Rights Museum (NCRM) until 4 July 1991. It took nearly a decade to raise enough money to support the estimated $8.8 million it would cost to renovate the deteriorating Lorraine Motel and build exhibition space. To obtain further support, the museum instituted all sorts of educational and outreach programs in addition to the exhibits themselves, which already provoked thought and action. In 1991, the NCRM established its annual National and International Freedom Awards, which are given to individuals who have advanced the quality of people's lives in the United States and worldwide. With this annual event, the museum gains publicity and continues the efforts of civil rights leaders and movement participants. Past recipients include James Farmer (1991), Desmond Tutu (1992) and John Lewis (2004).[28] Other educational initiatives and programs of outreach at the NCRM include opportunities for youth volunteers, exploration camps, and an annual poster contest designed for the participation of all Memphis students.[29]

According to Beverly Robertson, director of the NCRM in 1992, the mission of the museum involves "turning a tragedy into a triumph" and teaching future genera-

tions the "lessons of the civil rights movement and its impact and influence on human rights worldwide".[30] The exhibits at the museum are designed to have great impact and provoke thought about the movement and King's ideals. Upon their arrival at the museum, people are asked, "Did the dream die in Memphis?" This gives them the opportunity to use the exhibits to form their own conclusions. The final exhibit, for example, consists of Rooms 306 and 307 of the old motel, and at the balcony on which King was shot, there is a plaque engraved with a very powerful excerpt from Genesis 37:19–20 reading: "Behold, this dreamer cometh. Come now therefore and let us slay him . . . and we shall see what will become of his dream."

The NCRM is an example of the very real influence museums have on the identity and beliefs of patrons. Exhibit reviewer Amy Wilson stated in 1996 that "the [NCRM] is a complicated place—it is a landmark, a historical panorama and a political statement. Most strikingly it is a partisan effort to persuade visitors to act."[31]

Museums, including the NCRM, are powerful sites of memory. Not only do they contain and protect tangible objects that evoke a specific time, place, event, or person, they also have the power to shape and influence perceptions of the past by giving visitors the chance to take an active role in understanding and absorbing exhibit materials. Museums have the ability to "tell about the movement and the past in order to make sense of and mobilize the present."[32] According to Juanita Moore, who assumed the role of director in 1995, the museum, in addition to shaping people's perceptions of the civil rights movement and its power, affects the community by helping "people put present problems in context because people understand how it got to be how it is . . . it helps people come up with solutions."[33] In 1996, the NCRM revised its educational policies, saying it was to be "guided by the principles to allow young people to construct their own meanings of the history and legacy of the civil rights movement" from their experience at the museum. The museum hoped, said the new policies, that visitors would take unique and individually significant teachings from the experience.[34] The National Civil Rights Museum's contribution is the construction of a continuum between the past and the present—a continuum that will shape a holistic future informed by historical context as well as current circumstance.

African American museums serve to keep the voices and struggles of their constituents alive and are evidence that triumphs over intolerance, neglect, and oppression are still being celebrated. According to Lonnie G. Bunch, director of the Smithsonian's National Museum of African American History and Culture, it is the responsibility of African American museums to teach people about America by highlighting events that had largely been forgotten, whether purposefully or unintentionally. African American museums across the country have gone to great

lengths to "project" their heritage and culture into society by "plac[ing] new images of [African American identity] before . . . the general public" and among its chief constituents, employing various methods of stimulation to educate visitors and engage the communities of which they are a part.[35]

Recognizing that they have the extraordinary capacity to induce learning through a multi-sensory experience, museum curators have used many avenues for the dissemination of knowledge. Museums provide visual stimulation in the form of pictures and films while fostering kinesthetic learning through walking tours. Recordings of great speeches, readings of poems, and performances of pieces of music offer auditory stimulation. The everyday objects museums hold in their collections are the source of concrete, recognizable experiences. In them resides tangible evidence of the past.

The way museums represent the past can have enormous implications and consequences. For African American museums, the importance of recognizing African American history and culture and deciding how to exhibit it is central to promoting to all Americans the values of equality, agency, and knowledge.

NOTES

1. Amina Dickerson and Bridget Cooks, "Museums," In *Encyclopedia of African-American Culture and History*, Colin Palmer, ed., vol. 4. 2d ed. (Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2006), 1511.

2. "Profile of Black Museums: A Survey Commissioned by the African American Museums Association," (Washington, D.C.: The African American Museums Association, 1988), 3.

3. See "Profile of Black Museums: A Survey Commissioned by the African American Museums Association," (Washington, D.C.: The African American Museums Association, 1988)

4. John E. Fleming, "African American Museums, History and the American Ideal," *The Journal of American History,* 81:3 (Dec., 1994): 1020.

5. Bettye Collier-Thomas, "An Historical Overview of Black Museums and Institutions With Museum Functions 1800–1980," *Negro History Bulletin* 44:3 (July/Sept.,1981): 56.

6. Amina Dickerson, "African American Museums: A Past Filled With Pride, A Future Filled With Challenges," *Journal of Arts Management and Law,* 18:2 (Summer, 1998): 37; James Oliver Horton and Spencer R. Crew, "Afro-Americans and Museums: Towards a Policy for Inclusion," in *History Museums in the United States: A Critical Assessment,* ed. Warren Leon and Roy Rosenzweig, 215–36 (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1989), 219.

7. Dickerson and Cooks, 1512.

8. Horton and Crew, 221.

9. Horton and Crew, 223. The museum in Philadelphia was the first to receive funding from the federal government in the form of allotted bicentennial funds for the year of 1976.

10. www.blackmuseums.org/about/history. 11/24/06. htm.

11. Ibid., 111–17.

12. Louise Daniel Hutchinson, *The Anacostia Story: 1608–1930 (*Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1977), xiii.

13. www.anacostia.si.edu/anacostia_history/brief_history.htm. 11/24/06.

14. The Gallup Poll, vol. 3, 1959–1971 (New York, Random House, 1972), *Gallup Poll,* Interview Dates 5/23–28, 1963, *Gallup Poll*, 1824.

15. Horton and Crew, "Americans and Museums: Towards a Policy for Inclusion," 220.

16. Hutchinson, *The Anacostia Story:* 1608–1930, xi; Dickerson, "African American Museums: A Past Filled With Pride, A Future Filled With Challenges," 39.

17. James Conaway, *The Smithsonian:* 150 *Years of Adventure, Discovery, and Wonder (*Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Books, 1995), 332.

18. Conaway, 346.

19. Ibid.

20. "Exhibition 1974–1975: Anacostia Neighborhood Museum" (Washington D.C., Smithsonian Institution Press), foreword.

21. The Barnett-Aden Collection: A Catalogue of the Exhibit at the Anacostia Community Museum" (Washington D.C., Smithsonian Institution Press, 1974), 9.

22. Ibid.

23. www.anacostia.si.edu/anacostia.si.edu./exhibits/exhibits.htm. 11/24/06.

24. Anacostia House Warming," *American Visions,* 2:3 (June, 1987): 17.

25. Amina J. Dickerson, "African American Museums: A Past Filled With Pride, A Future Filled With Challenges,"40. Taken from an interview by J.F. Austin published in *Museum News* 60(1):31.

26. Jocelyn Robinson-Hubbuch, "African-American Museums and the National Conversation on American Pluralism and Identity," *The Public Historian,* 19:1 (winter, 1997): 29.

27. Douglas B. Chambers, "The Dreamer Cometh: The National Civil Rights Museum," *American Visions* 14:5 (October/November, 1999): 40–42. Also of import are the issues raised by Jacqueline Smith, a poverty rights activist and former resident of the Lorraine Motel until evicted by those planning the new museum. Since 1988, Smith has kept a daily vigil outside the NCRM. Her presence has drawn attention to the importance of recognizing Martin Luther King, Jr.'s extra-civil rights movement advocacies that the museum does not emphasize such as the Poor People's Campaign, a cause to which he was deeply dedicated at the time of his assassination. The article cited above published in *American Visions* mentions Smith but nothing of her reasons for protest. To be sure, this deliberate exclusion is the result of the hegemonic agenda of some of the museum's constituents. For details see Owen J. Dwyer, "Interpreting the civil rights movement: Contradiction, Confirmation, and the Cultural Landscape," in Renee C. Romano and Leigh Raiford, eds., *The Civil Rights Movement in American Memory* (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2006), 15–16; Bernard J. Armada, "Memorial Argon: An Interpretive Tour of the National Civil Rights Museum," *Southern Communication Journal*, 63(1998), 235–43; Eileen Loh-Harrist, "Vigil of a Lifetime: Jacqueline Smith's Views are as Concrete as the Sidewalk before the Civil Rights Museum," *Memphis Flyer*, 19–25 November 1998, 14–17.

28. www.civilrightsmuseum.org/freedom/freedomaward.asp. 11/25/06; Chambers, "The Dreamer Cometh: The National Civil Rights Museum," 41.

29. Chambers, "The Dreamer Cometh: The National Civil Rights Museum," 42.

30. Ibid.

31. Amy Wilson. Review: "The National Civil Rights Museum," *The Journal of American History,* 83:3 (December 1996), 971.

32. Renee C. Romano and Leigh Raiford, eds., *The Civil Rights Movement in American Memory (*Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2006), *xiv.*

33. Michael Honey, "Doing Public History at the National Civil Rights Museum," *The Public Historian*, 17:1 (winter, 1995), 81.

34. Chambers, "The Dreamer Cometh: The National Civil Rights Museum," 42.

35. Richard M. Merelman, *Representing Black Culture: Racial Conflict and Cultural Politics in the United States* (New York: Routledge, 1995), 3.

"May We Pray that We be Given Strength and Faith to Stand Together": Conflict, Change, and the Charleston, South Carolina YWCA, 1940s–1960s

Cherisse Jones-Branch

In 1963, the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association (YWCA) issued an "Urgent Memo on Civil Rights," which outlined the new policies and goals for local YWCA facilities throughout the country. These included support for civil rights legislation, sponsorship of the 1963 March on Washington, and acceleration of desegregation of community YWCAs. In Charleston, South Carolina, many white members of the Charleston YWCA vigorously objected to these goals. This opposition later led to its disaffiliation from the National YWCA. Virginia Prouty, executive director of the Charleston YWCA, did not support desegregation or civil rights activism. Nevertheless, invoking the Christian principles upon which the YWCA was founded, she urged members in the local and national organization to "pray" for "strength and faith" as they were caught in the middle of this controversy.[1]

After authorizing in 1940 a commission to study interracial policies and practices in community YWCAs, the National YWCA passed an Interracial Charter in 1946, in effect mandating that the "implications of the YWCA's purpose be recognized as involving the inclusion of Negro women and girls in the mainstream of Association life, and that such inclusion be adopted as a conscious goal."[2] Consequently, black women began to demand the end of second-class status in local YWCAs. The National YWCA went on record against separate chapters for white and black women and pledged to integrate the latter into the full program of the Association.[3] The Charleston YWCA was a microcosm for the possibilities and limits of racial and interracial activism in South Carolina from the 1940s through the 1960s, a period wherein women from different social, economic, racial, and ethnic backgrounds were drawn to community YWCAs.

The Charleston YWCA was founded in 1903 and initially served as a women's aid society. At different times, it helped white women develop marketable skills, find housing, and attend night school.[4] White women formed YWCA chapters at will, but when black women approached the National YWCA to organize branches, it determined that black branches in southern cities had to be supervised by an existing "Central" YWCA. "Central" clearly meant "white." If the Central YWCA in a locality agreed to

start a black YWCA, it would appoint a management committee of three white women and two black women to oversee the latter.[5] In Charleston, the predominately-black Coming Street YWCA was actually formed by the Women's Auxiliary of the Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) in 1907 because black women in Charleston felt that while the YMCA was helping black men save black boys, no one was helping black girls. Thus, they formed the YWCA to "look out for the future mothers of the race."[6] The organization was initially housed in the home of a physician.

During World War II, the Charleston YWCA paid scant attention to southern racial problems and instead focused on supporting the war effort. Racial tensions, however, existed between black and white YWCA members, particularly surrounding civil rights issues such as suffrage for African Americans. Because blacks made up such a large portion of the population in Charleston, whites there were even more committed to maintaining the racial status quo than they were in other parts of South Carolina.

When Belle Ingels of the National YWCA visited Charleston in 1944, she noted the slow progress in race relations, and reported that when the issue of blacks gaining the right to vote came up, it was disregarded as "a straw in the wind."[7] During her visit to the Coming Street YWCA, Ingels discovered that its leaders were suspicious of white co-members because they felt that the latter kept black women in ignorance about YWCA affairs.[8] When Mamie E. Davis, another visitor from the National YWCA, issued an evaluation report on the Coming Street YWCA in 1946, she noted the hostility between black and white women. For example, when the branch chair and acting secretary of the Coming Street YWCA asked the Charleston Central YWCA about the status of their building, they were told that the Central YWCA was the landlord and the Coming Street branch was the tenant. That is, Central's white leaders could enter the Coming Street building at anytime without the branch officers' knowledge and do as they so chose.[9] Such demeaning attitudes continually poisoned the relationship between Charleston's black and white YWCA members in the decades to follow.

In the 1950s, President Truman's stand on civil rights stirred some white liberals to an activism that often unintentionally increased racial tensions in southern cities like Charleston. Elizabeth Waring's speech in January 1950 at the Coming Street YWCA is such an example. The second wife of Federal District Judge J. Waties Waring of Charleston, Waring chastised in her address the racial psychosis of white southerners, describing them as "sick, confused and decadent people . . . full of pride and complacency, introverted, morally weak and low." Black southerners, on the other hand, were "building and creating."[10] She acknowledged the risk to black women who had invited her to speak at the Coming Street YWCA. Waring also recognized the social

ostracism she and her husband faced because they had supported black civil rights activism. She further pointed out that fear was what drove the white supremacists in South Carolina, and she even invoked Cold War terminology when referring to her and her husband's views.

> We to them are like the atom bomb which they are afraid we will use to destroy their selfish white supremacy way of life. And they are quite correct. That is exactly what the judge and I are doing, and they know it and see the writing on the wall. But you know and we know and they should know that there is another use of atomic energy, and that is for building and healing and restoring a civilized way of life. That is what the judge is trying to do for the good of the white people down here as well as the Negro.[11]

Waring's speech set off a tidal wave of resentment, endless harassment, and an impeachment drive against her husband. Charleston's Central YWCA drafted a statement repudiating Waring's speech and requesting that local activist Septima P. Clark, chair of the board of the Coming Street YWCA, sign it. Despite pressure and threats, Clark refused.[12]

Unfortunately, Elizabeth Waring's incendiary speech brought to a screeching halt any further interracial activism in the Charleston YWCA. When Kathleen Carpenter of the National YWCA visited the city in March 1950, she reported that the Charleston Association "feels very strongly now that further progress interracially will have to wait a period of time until the Waring incident has blown over."[13]

Only in 1954 did the Charleston YWCA again show some interest in examining racial tensions in South Carolina when it invited Mrs. F.P. Byrd to lead a discussion on "Creating a Climate for Good Human Relations through the YWCA." The importance that members of the Coming Street YWCA gave to integrated meetings was evident in their minutes, which meticulously reported whether or not YWCA events were integrated. After the previously mentioned discussion, the Coming Street secretary noted that there were "black and white women in attendance."[14] Although many of the Charleston YWCA's events were not integrated, black members planned events with white members in mind. In 1955, for example, while planning a flower show for September or October, the chair of the Hospitality Committee for the Coming Street YWCA expressed the hope that white members would attend.[15]

Nonetheless, in the wake of *Brown v. Board of Education,* relations between black and white members of the Charleston YWCA became increasingly contentious.[16] In 1955, Carrie Lou Ritchie, executive director of the Charleston YWCA, invited Virginia Prouty

to speak to the Central Board of Directors and membership about its annual World Fellowship Observance. Prouty was a Charleston native, a member of the Charleston YWCA, and at this time also part of the national staff. She noted the anxiety among many southern whites after the Supreme Court decision:

> The tension which is felt by the board and staff members is understandable and very real. Having been away from Charleston for some time, I was shocked when I saw and heard the "tumult and shouting" due to the Supreme Court decision. I feel that Miss Ritchie needs all the support that we as a National staff can give. She is desirous to do all that she can to move the Association ahead, and I am sure she will succeed in her efforts eventually.[17]

For the Charleston YWCA, however, even the slightest progress in interracial relationships decreased after the *Brown* decision. In the same year, for example, the fear of integrated attendance at the World Fellowship Observance reached crisis proportions. In previous years, the World Fellowship Observance had been held at the Greek Orthodox Church in Charleston and had been planned jointly by the Central and Coming Street YWCAs. After the *Brown* decision, many white members on the World Fellowship Committee suddenly decided that they could not participate in an integrated meeting and consequently resigned, fearing negative publicity from conservative local papers like Charleston's *News and Courier.*[18]

Representatives from the National YWCA were aware that some local southern associations were extremely reluctant to embrace change. When Hattie Droll of the National YWCA visited Charleston in 1956, she noticed that most of the members of the Central YWCA Board took great pride in "keeping alive the historical atmosphere of Charleston," that is, in maintaining the racial status quo. Yet, she noted that younger people had grown bored with the preservation of Charleston's traditions and wanted to "emphasize the present rather than the past."[19] When she returned in 1957, Droll noted that there was only token representation of blacks on Central's administrative committees and that the few integrated affairs like the YWCA's World Fellowship Observance were held with as little publicity as possible. Droll also noted the extent to which white Charlestonians had reacted to the *Brown* decision and the damage done to already fragile interracial relations in the Charleston YWCA when she reported that the "subject of desegregation is almost unmentionable in Charleston and the Citizens Councils have become more active there as it [sic!] has in all South Carolina." Further, she categorized the YWCA's reaction to recent events: "Interracial gatherings are more conspicuous. Fear is greater. The Board of the YWCA follows the community trends and attitudes."[20]

The Charleston YWCA's limited attempts at interracial cooperation evaporated in the 1960s as the National YWCA pushed its civil rights initiatives. When the sit-ins began throughout the South in the early 1960s, the National YWCA was one of the first organizations to lend its public support by offering funds and legal aid, endorsing the 1963 March on Washington, and participating in the National Women's Committee for Civil Rights.[21]

As desegregation in South Carolina became reality, white and black South Carolinians found themselves questioning how they would deal with a society where separation of the races was no longer the law, and where local activists had increased efforts to gain equal citizenship for all. Although desegregation was an explosive issue for whites throughout the South and often resulted in mob violence, most white South Carolinians had no stomach for such activities in the 1960s and rejected them as they had the Ku Klux Klan's violence in the 1920s.[22]

This, unfortunately, did not preclude turmoil within the Charleston YWCA. The Coming Street YWCA had been a branch of the Central YWCA since the 1920s, but when the YWCA National Board began to challenge local mores and encourage associations to integrate, the Central YWCA regarded this move as an encroachment upon its autonomy. Some white members immediately opposed the National Board's racial policy not only because it required local chapters to support civil rights legislation and the March on Washington scheduled for August 1963, but also because they claimed that the National Board had spoken for all local associations without their consent or representation.[23]

The Charleston YWCA did, however, take modest steps to bring its operations closer into step with National Board policy. In October 1963, a month after it disapproved the civil rights directive from the National Board, the Charleston YWCA added an African American to its executive committee. It also formed a six-member biracial committee consisting of three members from the "Negro" branch's committee on administration and three members from the Central Board of Directors. Virginia Prouty, now the Charleston YWCA executive director, stated that the biracial committee's role was to "meet with the president and executive director to determine what steps need to be taken by both groups to make for more meaningful relations in the YWCA and in the community." According to Prouty, "Relationships between national and the local YWCA have been and continue to be excellent. At no time has there been any thought of disaffiliation."[24]

The Charleston YWCA's reaction to the National Board's support of civil rights initiatives revealed the extent of racial tensions in Charleston. Virginia Prouty described black and white Charlestonians as "very tense and on a razor's edge" in an August 1963

telephone conversation with the coordinator of the YWCA's southern region. She was herself emotionally traumatized by local events, as there had been a number of demonstrations in Charleston that had cost her several nights' sleep. Black members were upset as well, but with the executive committee of the Central YWCA, not with the National YWCA. Anna Kelly, executive director of the Coming Street YWCA, contacted Prouty and voiced her opposition to the Charleston YWCA's letter to the general secretary of the National Board repudiating its national mandate supporting desegregation. In sending it, white members had neglected to communicate beforehand with black women and thus their opinions were not represented in the letter.[25]

Central YWCA members understood their Christian duty differently. Indeed, for them it did not include racial inclusiveness. Unlike black and white YWCAs in other parts of South Carolina, in Charleston—even at the leadership level—there was perpetual tension between the Coming Street branch and the Central YWCA. This was despite the efforts of many black members to foster better and more integrated efforts with the Central YWCA. After the National Board passed its resolution changing its purpose and policies in 1963, the newly formed biracial committee met in December 1964 to interpret its meaning for members and new board members. To demonstrate their tolerant inclusiveness, some white members even proposed listing courses being taught at the Coming Street branch (e.g., Russian and ceramics) in the Central YWCA's bulletin. The apprehension among some white members was palpable. One white member declared that she did not believe in interracial mixing. After the National Board sent a letter to the Charleston YWCA in 1965 asking for compliance with a directive from the Civil Rights Commission, Virginia Prouty and two program staff members resigned.[26]

Because of the touted "Christian" purpose of the YWCA, black members in Charleston, though aware of the racial dynamics of the South and South Carolina, were nevertheless surprised by many white members' negative reaction to the changing purpose of the YWCA's mission. They were adamant, however, about keeping a YWCA in the city, and pushed the local Association to adopt the National's directives. In March 1965, when the Association received a letter from the National Board urging compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, black member Althea Metz urged discussion among its members. Another black member, Emily Fielding, pointed out the small steps toward integration in one YWCA class and moved that the Charleston YWCA's committee on administration be in accordance with the Civil Rights Commission's request for racial inclusiveness, particularly because it was also in compliance with the purpose and philosophy of the YWCA.[27]

Even as they did this, black members maintained contact with officials on the National YWCA board and discussed their findings in their own meetings. In April 1965,

Althea Metz met with Hattie Droll, a member of the field staff for the Southern Region of the YWCA. When she reported back to the Coming Street YWCA, Metz underscored the importance of a "closer union" of the Central and Coming Street branch YWCAs in Charleston, and urged that they "work toward creating a feeling of one association."[28]

Clearly, many black members interpreted compliance with National YWCA policy differently from many white members. For the former, compliance did not mean a loss of community resources. Rather, it meant increased resources and community participation in a program that ensured racial inclusiveness. For the latter, accepting the mandates of the National YWCA almost certainly meant a loss in financial support from the local white community, resources on which they depended.

Throughout the 1960s, some members of both races worked to maintain the relationship between their two organizations. Black women continued to push for integration, white women for improved, but segregated, facilities. This clearly demonstrated that for white and black members alike the basic tenets of the YWCA were subject to interpretation. Many white members were held by the mores of a racist, segregated society. They fought and often won the battle to use their interpretation of Christian activism to support injustice.

Black members' attitudes toward the National Board's policies were not unlike those of predominantly black organizations that looked to the federal government as its "national chapter." For them, compliance with such progressive policies meant improved conditions and federal support. Black women understood the YWCA both nationally and locally as racially inclusive. The National Board stressed this same understanding.[29]

As white members of the Charleston YWCA were faced with desegregation, they were also deeply concerned – as we shall soon explore – about what they perceived as the National YWCA's movement away from its Christian and apolitical mission in its programs. Nancy Hawk, now president of the Board of Directors in Charleston, wrote the National Board of Directors claiming that charter members of the YWCA were displeased with changes in the National YWCA's policy. In 1966, the Charleston YWCA sent an integrated group to the National Conference in the Region in Atlanta, Georgia.

According to Hawk, instead of discussing the Guides to Participation,

> the delegation discovered that the Conference was set up to influence their thinking and that the summary of each discussion group, as well as the final summary, embodied actually the feeling of the National Staff and the representatives rather than that of the regional participants.[30]

In Hawk's view, white YWCA members saw the change in the YWCA's national policy as a "forerunner of eventual elimination of Christianity as the core of the YWCA

and the transformation of this important international association into a congress of women dedicated to economic and social reform." Consequently, at its annual membership meeting in May 1966, the Charleston YWCA held its first discussion on withdrawal from the National YWCA. A motion to disaffiliate was defeated (178 to 103 votes), presumably by members from the Coming Street YWCA. White YWCA members supporting disaffiliation offered several reasons for withdrawing from the National YWCA. One objection opposed proposed changes in the wording of the YWCA statement of purpose that would delete the words "Committed by our Faith as Christians." Other objections opposed to National's stands on such issues as halting bombings in Vietnam, seating Red China in the United Nations, guaranteeing minimum wage for all persons, abolishing capital punishment, and, of course, full integration of the organization.[31]

Nancy Hawk and charter members of the Charleston YWCA were distressed at the prospect of severing ties with the National YWCA, but they also argued that they had built a strong local organization with little contact with the National Board. Thus, they felt they had little to lose from disaffiliation and posited that they had more to offer the community if "we stress our Christian commitment."[32] Other white members did not necessarily agree with the policies of the National YWCA, but they did urge that the Charleston Association maintain affiliation. One member simply called the disaffiliation move what it essentially was, "a race issue."[33]

For black members in Charleston, fighting racism and other social injustices assumed a central position as part of the YWCA's "Christian" identity. After the Central YWCA discussed disaffiliation from the National Board, hostility among black and white members clearly reflected how differently each group perceived the YWCA as a community institution. In March 1967, Nancy Hawk asked to hear the Coming Street branch's plans, since it had chosen to remain affiliated with the National Board and was intent upon "blocking disaffiliation efforts." In Hawk's estimation, black women should have voted for disaffiliation and then applied for a charter that would have allowed both groups to remain autonomous. While Hawk admitted that the Charleston YWCA was open to everyone, the Central Board felt that the "purpose" of the organization must "contain a Christian commitment if the organization is going to continue Christian." For her, integration and national involvement in local affairs negated the effectiveness of the Charleston YWCA as a Christian organization. She further asserted:

> It seems to our board that there is a strong movement in this country to water down Christian beliefs until they are acceptable to anyone, thereby making them more popular. We feel it is time

> an organization of Christians reiterated those precepts of their faith which make it unique without regard to its popularity. We think the crises of our modern world need a stronger, not a weaker, Christian commitment.[34]

In short, Hawk felt that racially separate organizations were preferable for the Charleston YWCA to retain its "Christian" commitment.

For many white members of the Charleston YWCA, Christianity meant local autonomy, white leadership, and adherence to southern social mores. White YWCA members perceived its service to the community as one with which, in Hawk's words "we will have to be free to make decisions ourselves" and one that allowed them to retain their "traditional" and racially exclusive definition of Christianity.[35]

Black members, however, did not perceive the YWCA's Christian purpose in quite the same way. For them, affiliation and abiding by National rules meant an expanded definition of its Christian purpose; both were important because the YWCA's agenda was closely linked to the civil rights changes they themselves were pursuing in Charleston. Finally, they wanted to keep a YWCA branch operating in Charleston. In a move that impacted both black and white members, the overwhelming majority of the local board of directors favored the break because policies at the national level were "far from traditional."[36] With few exceptions, those who had opposed disaffiliation were members of the predominately-black Coming Street branch. Some members of the Charleston YWCA not only supported disaffiliation, but also hinted at communist infiltration of the national organization. One member ironically argued that the National YWCA had changed from a Christian organization into a "secular, socially conscious one." Another attacked the "socialist" stand the YWCA had taken "on many issues" and declared that the organization had "made pronouncements in areas best left to the experts." Still another insisted that a "Christian organization should stay out of politics."[37]

In May 1967, at a meeting held at the College of Charleston's gymnasium to accommodate a large crowd, a final vote of 538 to 102 affirmed the Charleston YWCA's withdrawal from the National Board of the YWCA. This marked the end of a sixty-one-year affiliation. Both the Central and Coming Street YWCAs were disaffiliated by the vote. Not all white members of the Charleston YWCA, however, supported disaffiliation. After the final vote, one woman immediately stood and announced that she was withdrawing her membership from Central YWCA and retaining it at the Coming Street branch. In her remarks about the final decision to sever ties with the National YWCA she quipped, "I presume the next step for this organization is to secede from the union!"[38]

After the vote, black members wasted little time in creating a new YWCA for the Charleston area. In June 1967, the Coming Street YWCA held its first meeting to initiate plans to reorganize a community YWCA for the Charleston area.[39] The National Board assisted the Coming Street YWCA in becoming a provisional YWCA, the first step to becoming a community YWCA.[40] African American women were adamant about retaining a local YWCA in the Charleston community and asserting their disaffiliation from the Central YWCA. Most black members refused to support continued affiliation with Central because many white members made it clear that their presence was not wanted. One black member reported that she and other members had had "past unfriendly experiences" at the Central YWCA. She further declared that she saw no advantage of remaining a "Branch to Central whose membership and leaders have always shown they did not accept us." Furthermore, although the Coming Street YWCA was supposed to have a representative on the Central Board of Directors, no one had been elected to serve, which made it further clear that white members desired neither black members' input, nor their presence.[41]

While African American women were aware of the social mores in Charleston, South Carolina, they felt they had a greater duty to pursue racial change for the city's African Americans in particular, and for all people in general. They recognized that the Charleston YWCA would be useful in this capacity only if it remained affiliated with the National Board. Thus, after the Charleston YWCA formally disaffiliated itself from the National Board on 15 March 1969, the directors of the Coming Street branch organized the YWCA of Greater Charleston. The new organization received a charter from the state and applied for a national charter, which it received on 2 February 1970.[42] This made the new integrated YWCA of Greater Charleston the only community YWCA for the South Carolina Lowcountry.[43]

Because the National YWCA had a copyright on the "Y" name, the Central Board of Directors had to consider plans to change the name of the Charleston organization.[44] Moreover, black members questioned why the Central YWCA continued to refer to itself as the YWCA when they had chosen disaffiliation from the National body. To emphasize the Central YWCA's break with the National Association and thus the creation of a new and inclusive entity, Christine Osborn Jackson, executive director of the new YWCA of Greater Charleston, declared to Charlestonians that her organization was the "only real Young Women's Christian Association in this area."[45]

This saga did not end with warm feelings among black and white members of the former Charleston YWCA or white members and the National YWCA. The Central YWCA realized even before disaffiliation that the National YWCA had a copyright on the "Y" name, yet continued to use it. The National Board of the YWCA now initi-

ated a lawsuit against the Central YWCA to discontinue use of the YWCA name and symbols. In 1971 the trial was conducted in federal court before Judge Sol Blatt, Jr., who decided in favor of the National Board YWCA. Thus, the Central YWCA became the Christian Family Y, the name it retained until 2003.[46]

The dissolution of the Central YWCA and the Coming Street YWCA into separate entities resulted in a different outcome than had occurred with YWCAs in other parts of the state. Although those in leadership positions in both Charleston Associations had met occasionally to discuss YWCA programs and policies, Charleston's basic membership rarely came together in integrated programs. Nor did they use common facilities. The Coming Street YWCA sought to include white Charlestonians in its programs, particularly after it became the YWCA of Greater Charleston. And, indeed, it was able to retain a few white members who had objected to the Central YWCA's position against integration. Due to societal habits that were slow to change, however, most of its functions and facilities today benefit, for the short term, its largely black membership. Nonetheless, during the forties, fifties, and sixties both the Central Association and the Coming Street branch clearly illustrated different interpretations of the YWCA's "Christian" purpose. For Central members it meant racial exclusiveness. To the Coming Street YWCA members the purpose clearly meant the inclusion of all Charlestonians in its programs.

NOTES

1. Virginia Prouty, Executive Director, Charleston YWCA to YWCA Board of Directors, 14 August 1963, Box 124, folder 10, National Board YWCA Records, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts, hereafter called SSC. This study's title was inspired in part by her words: "May we pray that we be given strength and faith to stand together, though our degrees of beliefs may differ, so that our YWCA will not falter in its purpose and service. We need each other today and in the days to come."

2. Mary S. Sims, *The YWCA: An Unfolding Purpose* (New York: Woman's Press, 1950), 83–84.

3. "The New Social Role of American Churches," *A Monthly Summary of Events and Trends in Race Relations*, vol. 4, no. 5 (December 1946): 140.

4. "Family Y hopes changes put it back on solid ground." *The News and Courier*, Charleston, South Carolina, 17 March 2003, 1-B.

5. Glenda Gilmore, *Gender and Jim Crow: Women and the Politics of White Supremacy in North Carolina, 1896–1920* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 192.

6. Minute Book, Coming Street Branch, 1954–1967, Records of the YWCA of Greater Charleston, South Carolina, entries for 1955. The records in question comprise two volumes, the first of which is cited here. A second volume, cited in subsequent notes, contains minutes from 1967–77. I consulted these volumes when they were housed at the YWCA. My recent inquiries (21 August 2007) indicate that the volumes, along with other records of the Coming Street Branch, had

been turned over to the Avery Research Center for American History and Culture. Their precise location there after the transfer is currently undetermined.

7. National YWCA Records, Belle Ingles, Visitation Report, 16–19 October 1944, reel 213.2, SSC.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid, and National YWCA Records, Miss Mamie E. Davis, Visitation Report, 7–15 October 1946, reel 213.2, SSC.

10. "White Supremacists Assailed By U.S. Judge Waring's Wife," 16 January 1950. Newspaper uncertain, perhaps the *Lighthouse and Informer*; clipping found in NAACP Records, Part 4, Voting Rights Campaign, 1916–1950, reel 11. Judge Waring infuriated segregationist whites with his rulings in *Elmore v. Rice* (1947) and *Brown v. Baskin* (1948), which eliminated South Carolina's all-white primaries.

11. Ibid.

12. Robert Lewis Terry, "J. Waties Waring, Spokesman for Racial Justice in the New South," (Ph. D. diss., University of Utah, 1970), 158.

13. Kathleen Carpenter, Visitation Report, 22–25 March 1950, Charleston, South Carolina, reel 213.2, SSC.

14. Minute Book, 1954–1967, Records of the YWCA of Greater Charleston, South Carolina, Meeting at the Central YWCA, 29 January 1954.

15. Ibid.

16. Ibid.

17. National Board YWCA Records, Virginia Prouty, Visitation Report, Charleston, South Carolina, 18 November 1955, reel 273.3, SSC.

18. National Board YWCA Records, Hattie Droll, Visitation Report, Charleston, South Carolina, 8–11 October 1956, reel 273.3, SSC.

19. Ibid.

20. National Board YWCA Records, Hattie Droll, Visitation Report, Charleston, South Carolina, 16 November 1957, reel 273.3, SSC.

21. Susan Lynn, *Progressive Women in Conservative Times: Racial Justice, Peace, and Feminism, 1945 to the 1960s* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1992), 145; The women met with President John F. Kennedy in July 1963.

22. Walter Edgar, *South Carolina: A History* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1998), 541.

23. "No Action Planned Against Local 'Y'," *News and Courier*, 2 October 1963, 17-A.

24. "'Y' Board to Add Negro," *News and Courier*, 3 October 1963, 1-B.

25. Mary Jane Willet to Sallie N. Johnson, 22 August 1963, National YWCA Records, box 124, folder 10, SSC.

26. Minute Book, 1954–1967, Records of the YWCA of Greater Charleston, South Carolina, Committee on Administration Minutes, 16 December 1964 and 12 April 1965.

27. Minute Book, 1954–1967, Records of the YWCA of Greater Charleston, South Carolina, 15 March 1965.

28. Minute Book, 1954–1967, Records of the YWCA of Greater Charleston, South Carolina, Committee on Administration Minutes, 12 April 1965.

29. Dorothy I. Height, "Black and White Decisions" *The YWCA Magazine* (February 1966), 2.

30. Mrs. John C. Hawk, President, YWCA Board of Directors, Charleston, South Carolina to the President, YWCA Board of Directors, June 1967, YWCA Greenville, box, 1 folder 20, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina.

31. "Policies Attacked: YWCA Votes to Quit National Organization," *News and Courier*, 20 May 1967, A1-2; Joel M. Clemons, "No Two-Thirds Majority: YWCA Effort to Cut Ties with National Body Fails," *News and Courier*, 18 March 1967, 1 B: 2–4; Mrs. John C. Hawk, President, YWCA Board of Directors, Charleston, South Carolina, to President, YWCA Board of Directors, St. Louis, Missouri, 13 February 1967, National Board YWCA Records, box 28, folder 1, SSC.

32. Ibid.

33. Ibid.

34. "YWCA Meeting Set to Plan Break With National Assn," *News and Courier*, 6 March 1967, 10-B.

35. Ibid.

36. "Policies Attacked, YWCA Votes to Quit National Organization," *News and Courier*, 20 May 1967,1-A. I have been unable to discover the exact tally of votes to disaffiliate.

37. Ibid.

38. Ibid.

39. "The History of the Charleston YWCA," http://www.ywca.org/site/pp.asp?c=euLSK7MKIpG&b=1000553 (accessed 21 August 2007).

40. Minute Book, 1967–1977, Records of the YWCA of Greater Charleston, South Carolina, Committee on Administration Minutes, 19 February 1968.

41. Ibid.

42. Ibid.

43. Minute Book, 1967–1977, Records of the YWCA of Greater Charleston, South Carolina, Committee on Administration Minutes, 2 February 1970 and 16 February 1970.

44. Jo Anne Plyler, "Policies Attacked: YWCA Voted to quit national organization," *News and Courier*, Charleston, South Carolina, 20 May 1967, 1-A.

45. "New YWCA Called Only 'Real' YWCA," *News and Courier*, 16 December 1969. 5A. Christine Osborn Jackson was also Coretta Scott King's first cousin.

46. Robert P. Stockton, "Local YWCA Loses Right To Use Name," *News and Courier*, Charleston, South Carolina, 4 November 1971, 1A, 2–4. Although the Greater Charleston YWCA was integrated in 1969, it subsequently struggled to recruit and retain white members. In 2003 the Christian Family Y, which had been desegregated by the 1980s at the latest, changed its name to the Charleston Family and Youth. Until its closing in 2004 due to financial problems, many

white Charlestonians considered it to embody the authentic YWCA in Charleston. See "Family Y hopes changes put it back on solid ground," *The News and Courier*, Charleston, South Carolina, 17 March 2003, 1-B, and Schulyer Kropf, "Financial woes close doors at Charleston Family, Youth," *Post and Courier*, Charleston, South Carolina, 26 February 2004, 1-B.

Evangelist Billy Sunday and the Evolution Controversy

Paul Matzko

By 1917, Billy Sunday was America's premier evangelist. Millions of Americans had already heard the former professional baseball player thunder against sin and call for repentance and revival. Audiences across America enjoyed his colloquial sermons and their frenetic delivery at meetings held for weeks at a time in specially constructed tabernacles that could seat as many as twenty thousand. During his ministry nearly a million people responded to his messages and "hit the sawdust trail."[1]

Although often considered anti-intellectual—he once declared that he knew no more about theology than a "jackrabbit does about ping-pong"—to some degree Sunday's unrefined style of preaching was affected.[2] His down-to-earth language and illustrations appealed to his primarily middle-class audiences and distinguished him from the more cerebral lectures of seminary-trained modernists like Harry Emerson Fosdick.[3] Popular notions aside, Sunday actually owned a well-thumbed book collection, and his creationist beliefs were relatively advanced, perhaps even ahead of his time.[4] Indeed, years before former Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan launched his anti-evolution crusade in 1921, Sunday had consistently opposed the "bastard theory of evolution."[5]

Sunday's four principal biographers—Robert F. Martin, Lyle Dorsett, William G. McLoughlin, and Roger Bruns—hardly mention his views about creation and evolution, instead focusing on his popularity, exuberant preaching style, and ardent support of Prohibition. Martin makes no mention of creation or evolution. Dorsett says only that Sunday's "antievolutionist posture was well-known." McLoughlin refers to evolution in his biography of Sunday, but argues that Sunday's dismissal of the theory was "a simple, dogmatic denial." And although Bruns more thoroughly examines Sunday's creation beliefs, he still claims that "the world did not get from Billy Sunday a theoretical defense" of the biblical account of creation.[6] Despite scant attention by his biographers, Sunday's belief in creation was vital to his theology and he rejected evolution as a form of scientific atheism.[7]

Because creationism was an integral part of Sunday's theology, evolutionary theory appeared to abolish faith itself. Understood in this light, Sunday's refusal to accept evolution was more than ignorance or pigheadedness. Sunday, like other fundamentalists, feared a scientific rationalism that left little room for the supernatural,

and the strident agnosticism of some prominent supporters of evolution did nothing to assuage their fears. The president of Stanford University, David Starr Jordan, described fundamentalist revivalism as "simply a form of drunkenness no more worthy of respect than the drunkenness that lies in the gutter." Jordan, a biologist by profession and an evolutionist by avocation, later offered his services to the defense at the Scopes Trial. Clarence Darrow, who directed the Scopes defense team, himself proclaimed Christianity a "slave religion" and declared that creationists "insult[ed] every man of science and learning in the world" because they believed in "fool religion."[8]

Sunday and other evangelical Christians had been put on the defensive by the spread of evolutionary theory. Even evangelical American scientists, like botanist Asa Gray, had embraced Darwin's theory. Evolutionary teaching rapidly disseminated through seminaries and colleges, and by 1880, up to half of evangelical ministers had rejected the literal Genesis creation account in favor of evolution. In 1919, a survey of midwestern colleges found that nearly three-quarters of those schools taught evolution, and less than a tenth openly taught creation. By the beginning of the twentieth century, belief in creation was fading.[9]

Nevertheless, once religious conservatives determined that evolutionary theory logically led to a denial of biblical inspiration, they discarded the theory of evolution and turned back to creation. Geologist George Frederick Wright remained a staunch Christian Darwinist, like his mentor Asa Gray, until he realized that evolutionists were attacking the authority of the Bible. Over several decades, his views shifted, until, in 1915, he wrote an article for *The Fundamentals* attacking biological evolution and defending creation. But most evangelicals did not repudiate evolution until the Scopes trial in 1925, when attorney Clarence Darrow ridiculed William Jennings Bryan's understanding of creation before a national audience. Evangelicals were galvanized by Darrow's blatant attack on biblical authority, and after the Scopes trial, creationism was reborn under the leadership of creationists Harry Rimmer and George McReady Price.[10]

Saying that Sunday was a creationist is easy. Discovering exactly what Sunday believed about creation is difficult. Sunday did not preach any one sermon that summed up his creationist beliefs; his popular sermon "Nuts for Skeptics to Crack" focused on religious modernism, not creation. Newspaper editing also contributes to the uncertainty. For example, on 22 March 1923, Sunday preached "Nuts for Skeptics to Crack" in Columbia, South Carolina. The following day two newspapers, the *Columbia Record* and the *State*, published the "full" text of his sermon. The texts are identical down to the punctuation—except for several paragraphs completely missing in the sermon provided by the *Columbia Record*. In any case, although Sunday had no organized system of creationist thought, he firmly believed in divine creation.[11]

One of Sunday's basic creation beliefs was that the Holy Spirit had been the instrument of creation. Although God the Father was the ultimate creator of the physical universe, the Holy Spirit, Sunday argued, had carried out the Father's creative plan. The Holy Spirit's instrumentality in creation corresponded perfectly with Sunday's overall pneumatology. The Holy Spirit was the "voice" of God the Father, drawing sinners "from the paths of sin, to those of righteousness and of truth." Sunday poetically described the Holy Spirit as an "aurora" that illumined the way for followers of God as well as the "incense" that should perfume a believer's life. He saw the working of the Holy Spirit evidenced both by Samson's strength and by Joshua's answered prayer preventing the sun from setting.[12]

In support of this position, Sunday quoted Genesis 1:2 and Psalm 104:30. By placing the Holy Spirit on the earth at creation, a literal reading of Genesis 1 implies participation in the creative act. Although Psalm 104 does not appear to refer to creation, the psalmist assigns the Spirit a role in human reproduction and the daily renewal of nature. It must have seemed logical to Sunday that if the Holy Spirit were responsible for renewing life, He would have been equally responsible for creating it.[13]

Sunday could have borrowed part of this interpretation from C.I. Scofield, whose *Reference Bible* (1909) was widely used in fundamentalist circles. Sunday had owned and read Scofield's *Plain Papers on the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* in which Scofield cited Genesis 1:2 to prove that the Holy Spirit was "associated in the work of creation." Scofield, however, did not say that the Spirit performed the actual creative act, so Sunday must have arrived at this notion from another source or on his own.[14]

Sunday and Scofield also handled geological theories differently. During the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, fundamentalists struggled to explain what seemed to be a plethora of evidence for long geologic ages that could not be fitted into a straightforward reading of Genesis. In their attempts to harmonize the new geological theories with the Genesis creation account, Scofield and Sunday adopted different hypotheses.

Scofield believed in the "Gap Theory," which proposed two separate creative acts. The first creation, described in Genesis 1:1, was judged by God in verse 2 and laid waste, leaving an earth devoid of life. After an unknown period, God performed a second creative act, replenishing the earth with plant and animal life and recreating man to exercise dominion over it. Scofield was able to relegate the geologic ages to the period after the first creation and before the second, ensuring there would be "no conflict of science with the Genesis cosmogony."[15] Sunday instead preferred the "Day-Age Theory," which proposed only one creation, but held that the seven days of creation in Genesis 1:3–2:2 were indeterminate periods and not literal twenty-four-hour

days. Sunday quoted II Peter 3:8: "one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." In this scheme, the awkward geologic ages fit conveniently into the seven "days" of creation.[16]

Despite their differences, both Sunday and Scofield agreed that modern man had been created no more than six thousand years ago; man had not been created during those indeterminate geological ages. Scofield adopted Archbishop James Ussher's chronology, which dates the creation of man to 4004 BC. Sunday argued from silence, pointing out that it was impossible to "prove that mankind has lived on this earth over about 6000 years from the day that God created Adam down until now." Sunday repeatedly mentioned that the devil had "been preying on this old world for 6,000 years" and that Cain had been in Hell for 6,000 years after killing his brother Abel.[17]

Sunday and Scofield also believed in the worldwide flood described in the seventh chapter of Genesis. But while both men accepted a literal Noachian flood, neither gave the Flood any significance in the creation versus evolution debate, mentioning it only in passing references to "antediluvians." While flood geology is the backbone of the modern creationist movement, during the early part of the twentieth century, only self-taught geologist George McCready Price favored "catastrophic" flood geology. He believed that the Genesis flood covered the entire earth and deposited layers of sediments that corresponded with the rock stratum most geologists claimed were millions of years old. Because Price was a Seventh-day Adventist, a cult in the eyes of most contemporary evangelicals, Fundamentalists did not give flood geology serious consideration. Most creationists, therefore, including Sunday, believed in an old earth, preferring the Day Age or Gap Theories to Price's defense of a geologically young earth.[18]

Rather than using the Flood to defend creation, Sunday pointed to the intelligent design he saw in the universe. God had designed the stars, flowers, and mountains just as some human being would design a dress, a house, or an automobile. Mankind had been formed as part of God's divine plan, and Sunday believed ignoring that plan the "greatest crime"; it would be senseless for a "fish to dig in the ground" or a "gopher to live in the water." Human life had purpose because it was part of God's sovereign order. Mankind had been created "to do right and serve Him."[19]

Intelligent design left no room for evolution. Sunday stumbled on the old teleological argument of early-nineteenth-century English philosopher and apologist William Paley, who had popularized "argument from design" in his *Natural Theology*. Paley proposed that when someone came across a watch lying on the ground, he naturally assumed that a watchmaker had created it. Paley then argued that the universe,

a far more complicated mechanism than a watch, must have had a proportionately greater creator.[20] Sunday may have never heard of William Paley, but he updated Paley's example. Sunday pointed to the pulpit from which he was speaking and the sounding board amplifying his voice as proofs that "a design tells of designer." To Sunday, explaining creation through natural causes was like trying to explain "electric lights and deny electricity" or "a locomotive and deny steam."[21]

Sunday may have appropriated this intelligent design argument from A. Wilford Hall's *The Problem of Human Life*, which Sunday had in his library. Hall used the term "intelligent design" several times to describe the work of a machine and the wings of birds and insects. In any case, Sunday incorporated the idea of intelligent design into his preaching.[22]

Sunday also engaged in apologetics, attacking evolution and supporting creation with relatively sophisticated arguments. By no stretch of the imagination could Billy Sunday be considered a philosopher, yet he used the classic cosmological argument to argue supernatural creation: to exist, everything in nature depends on something independent from itself; therefore, the universe in its entirety must depend on something distinct from itself. The cause must be greater than the effect, thereby implying that the Creator must be greater than the creation.

Sunday adapted the cosmological argument to prove divine creation. He pointed out that humans could build a tabernacle, but not the lumber itself. "You can build out of material, but you can't create the material." God, however, was not limited to creating things from materials already in existence; He could create out of nothing. Sunday believed that God's originality in creation "was proof of His Divinity." God was independent of, and greater than, His creation. Sunday used the cosmological argument to prove the existence of God and to criticize the "infidel" who, to build a universe, required "a little star dust," some base material being necessary to initiate evolution. Thus, in Sunday's mind, the God who could create something from nothing was clearly superior to a "god" which could not.[23]

Sunday's "infidels" were rationalists who opposed creationism on a foundational level. Believing that "opinions . . . should be based on reason and knowledge rather than on religious belief" left little room for the childlike faith preached by Sunday.[24] During the latter half of the nineteenth century, rationalism had infiltrated American seminaries through the spread of German Higher Criticism. The new Christian rationalists, also known as modernists, questioned the veracity of Biblical miracles while still holding to some tenets of Christianity.[25]

Sunday's literal interpretation of Scripture aligned him with the Fundamentalists in their fight against modernism. He frequently preached against those who

believed that the Bible was a guide but not an authoritative, divinely inspired Book, and who accepted evolution at the expense of a literal belief in the creation account of the first chapter of Genesis. Sunday, like the Fundamentalists, upheld the authority of scripture even in the face of seemingly irrefutable scientific evidence.[26]

Sunday responded to rationalism by pointing out that much of nature was a mystery. Because science was unable to explain some biological processes, Sunday argued, rationalists were hypocritical to reject Christianity as irrational, while simultaneously accepting unexplained natural phenomena. Sunday oversimplified his argument by rhetorically asking how a "black cow can eat green grass and give white milk." But not all Sunday's examples were so simplistic. For instance, Sunday also asked why beans climbed a pole from right to left while hops did the opposite. Even in the twenty-first century, the causes of right- versus left-hand orientation remain a mystery.[27]

Billy Sunday believed that God had created more than the physical universe. God had also created "divine order": the natural laws that ran the universe. When men sowed and reaped in season, they followed a heavenly pattern; when they ignored the divine order, they reaped bad consequences instead of blessing. If one violated "God's laws of sanitation," he paid "the price with disease." Sunday took this principle one step further by proposing that most disease was "caused by our own voluntary acts." Sin resulted in sickness of both soul and body.[28]

Sunday did not limit belief in natural law to the physical world but saw divine order in the spiritual world as well. To Sunday, "the laws of faith are just as certain as the laws of steam and the laws of electricity." He rejected the dichotomy of the physical and spiritual worlds advocated by many contemporary theistic evolutionists. The latter attempted to differentiate between the spiritual realm—where God had complete control—and the physical world—where science, not God, was supreme. Sunday had gone beyond rejecting evolution simply because it denied a literal creation. Denying God's creation of natural law was tantamount to denying God's creation of universal spiritual law. Evolution became more than a foe of scriptural literalism; it challenged the foundational sense of right and wrong. Sunday refused to contemplate the possibility that a "man can be an Evolutionist and a Christian [at the] same time."[29]

Sunday equated evolution with atheism. By attacking the underpinnings of morality and limiting God's divine plan, evolution came close to eliminating God altogether. At a minimum, evolution weakened faith in God's power. Sunday believed that God was worthy of trust because His promises to Christians were not "made by one who would like to have been able to fulfill [them] but didn't have the power."

Instead, "they are made by the great God who made the world and the sea and the land." A God unable to create was unreliable. Evolution turned an omnipotent God into an impotent deity.[30]

Furthermore, by casting doubt upon God's power and reliability, Sunday believed that evolution would destroy trust in His moral plan. In "Nuts for Skeptics to Crack," Sunday warned his audiences that if "you give evolution full swing . . . [then] you will have two hemispheres of crime and a thousand penitentiaries and lazarettos and brothels." He feared that evolution would separate men from their moral bearings.

Sunday also questioned the evolutionary belief that man could improve himself morally. In his words, evolutionists believed that "better and better grows the heart by natural improvement." Indeed, Darwinists claimed that mankind would improve morally, physically, and intellectually through natural selection, a process that might be accelerated through eugenics. Sunday, however, quoted Jeremiah 17:9 to assert, "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." Without God, man remained depraved.[31]

Sunday also believed that evolution failed to provide any distinction between man and brute. He said that mankind possessed five aspects: physical, mental, emotional, esthetic, and spiritual, of which animals shared the first four. In some respects, animal abilities even surpassed those of man. Eagles, moose, and deer could respectively see, hear, and run better than human beings even though they did not have comparable intelligence. Sunday claimed that animals experienced emotions like those of a mother caring for and defending her young. Indeed, animals seemed to be more emotionally stable than many humans. Animals even appeared to possess a love of beauty; Sunday cited a mocking bird's "liquid beauty" as it sang, as well as the vanity of a peacock.[32]

The essential difference between man and beast, Sunday submitted, was that man had a spiritual nature, or soul, that no animal could ever possess. No matter how great the intelligence of a cat or a horse, neither had "faith, moral, and conscience faculties." A dog may be able to have faith in its owner, but not in the unseen. Animals had no moral sense; they did not know right from wrong or feel guilt about an immoral choice. Sunday laughed at the idea of a monkey apologizing for lying, saying his prayers, or repeating the Apostle's Creed.[33]

Sunday probably acquired his ideas about the relationship between man and the animals from George Frederick Wright, the geologist who had attacked evolution in *The Fundamentals*. Wright declared that God had created man superior to the animal by asserting that "no animal ever uses, much less makes, a tool." Man,

however, used tools, made fires, employed language, and was a "religious animal." Sunday said that "a monkey never used a tool or built a fire . . . a monkey was never gifted with speech."[34]

Sunday's strongest rhetoric, usually reserved for attacks on saloonkeepers, denounced evolution as a "spirit-killer." Sunday argued that evolution brought no spiritual comfort. The survival of the fittest provided little consolation to a mother who had just lost her child or a widow her husband. Sunday noted that life, without belief in the supernatural, was bound to physical existence; there was no afterlife. A mother would never again see her dead child. A widow would never spend another day with her husband. Sunday alleged he could visit that grieving widow, and within half an hour of Bible reading and prayer, her tears would be wiped away. Solace came from the belief that one day a believer would be reunited with lost loved ones. Sunday thought that evolution denied not only creative power, but also life after death.[35]

Furthermore, Sunday feared that evolution would lead men to hell. At the fiery conclusion of his sermon, "After Death, Judgment," Sunday pictured lost souls standing before the Judgment Throne of God. Among the blasphemers and scoffers stood the "haughty high priests of erring science" who had sponsored the "bastard theory of evolution." Their belief in the "fortuitous concurrence of atoms" had led them to deny God's creative power and had doomed them for all eternity. When face-to-face with God, even the most godless skeptic would finally believe. Science without belief, said Sunday, was incapable of putting out the "fires of hell."[36]

Although Sunday opposed Darwinism in no uncertain terms, he actually believed in microevolution. While studying varieties of finches on the Galapagos Islands, Darwin had had his epiphany about natural selection. In response, creationists, including Sunday, distinguished between development and evolution. Sunday believed in "the development of the species" but would not concede that it was possible to "change the species into another species." In modern terms, Sunday accepted microevolution, change within a species, while rejecting macroevolution, change into different species. For support, Sunday cited "Old Burbank," the horticulturist Luther Burbank, whose improved potato had not "turned . . .into a lemon." With rustic bluntness, Sunday equated believing in macroevolution to believing that dressing up a pig would keep it from "boring in the barnyard or drinking slop."[37]

Sunday was not the first to distinguish between micro- and macroevolution. Fellow Presbyterian evangelist Alexander Patterson, who taught at Moody Bible Institute, wrote in 1903, "The changes in certain species . . . are not new species, but only varieties." Instead of using potatoes, Patterson cited the differences between varieties of tomatoes as an example.[38] Sunday visited Moody Bible Institute in 1915,

and although there is no record that Sunday and Patterson met, there are striking similarities between their ideas and examples.[39]

Both Sunday and Patterson argued that ancient Egyptian flora and fauna disproved macroevolution. Patterson noted that the "mummied [sic] remains of cats and crocodiles and ibises in Egypt" were virtually identical to those of modern animals: "Surely 4,000 years would show some evolution if there had been such a thing." Sunday found his proof in Egyptian "flowers that have been embalmed and preserved for 4,000 years" and have not "added a leaf, or a stem, or petal." He also mentioned an unnamed animal from the Nile River valley that had not "added a curl to his tail nor claw to his foot."[40]

Though he would not have been familiar with the term, Sunday also believed in regressive evolution. He thought that unused organs could become "devitalized." As an example, he mentioned the blindfish of Mammoth Cave. Since Mammoth's "dark subterranean caves" had no light, these fish had gradually lost their eyesight. He asserted that the principle behind "devitalizing organs" applied equally to the biological and spiritual realms, allowing him to make the spiritual application that apathetic believers would lose their faith if they did not exercise it. Unless they wanted to be spiritually blind, like fish in a dark cave, they had better walk the "sawdust trail" and open their eyes to Jesus.[41]

Sunday had chosen to support the most incongruous form of evolution. Darwinists struggled to apply the theory of natural selection to regressive evolution. To work, natural selection required some benefit from change, but fish with functional eyes had no advantage in the dark caves, while fish with vestigial eyes gained nothing from the regression.[42]

It is hard to know where Sunday acquired his belief in regressive evolution. In 1880, A. Wilford Hall wrote about the blindfish of Mammoth Cave, but pointed out that evolution is "distinctly opposed to the destruction of any useful organ." If the fishes in the cave had been exposed to any glimmer of light, they would have redeveloped their eyes. By 1924, George McCready Price wrote of the blindfish in Mammoth Cave, but Sunday had used them as an example seven years earlier.[43]

Sunday had some exposure to the work of Louis Agassiz, noted anti-Darwinian geologist of the mid-nineteenth century, although Sunday's library contains none of Agassiz's works. But in a letter to William Jennings Bryan, Sunday explicitly referred to Agassiz, whom Sunday said had found ancient insects identical to modern species entombed in a Florida reef "thousands of years old." Indeed, Agassiz had visited the Florida reefs and had also referred to Mammoth Cave, where he wished to conduct an investigation "of the eyeless animals." Nevertheless, Agassiz rejected the theory that

the blindfish were proof of regressive evolution. Where Sunday learned of regressive evolution remains a mystery.[44]

Sunday's support for creation earned national attention. In June 1925, William Jennings Bryan asked Billy Sunday to participate in the upcoming Scopes Trial in Dayton, Tennessee. Ten days later, the superintendent of the Dayton school system, where John Thomas Scopes had been indicted for teaching evolution, publicly did the same. Sunday was away from home, but when the Associated Press asked Nell Sunday if her husband would travel to Tennessee for the trial, she replied, "I know he won't do it."[45]

On 4 July, Sunday apologized to Bryan for not being able to attend the trial and offered an assortment of suggestions he hoped Bryan could use to discredit evolution. There were a number of reasons Sunday may have decided not to participate. A pressing concern was his health. In January, he had checked into the Mayo Clinic and been diagnosed with a nervous disorder caused by overwork. He then conducted two lengthy campaigns in Winston-Salem, North Carolina, and Newport News, Virginia. Sunday also knew his intellectual limits. He had almost no college training, let alone scientific credentials. Unlike Bryan, perhaps he realized that his limited knowledge of science would impair his credibility as a witness. Whatever it was that kept Sunday from the Scopes trial, he ended his note to Bryan by assuring him that "all the believing world is back of you in your defense of Christ and the Bible."[46]

Sunday's hesitation to attend the Scopes trial should not be viewed as an erosion of his creationist beliefs, which remained immutable until his death in 1935. The text of "Nuts for Skeptics to Crack," which he preached in Bangor, Maine, in 1927, is virtually identical to the version he preached in Columbia, South Carolina, in 1923 and in New York City in 1917. Sunday would no more change his views on creation than he would deny the inspiration of the Bible. He died convinced that his faith demanded nothing less than belief in a literal creation.[47]

Prohibition, which Sunday strongly supported, was repealed during his lifetime and is now nearly a joke. Creationism, opposed by an overwhelming scientific consensus, should have disappeared with it. Yet recent polls show nearly half of American adults still identify with some form of creationism, and only a seventh believe mankind evolved without divine superintendence. Ironically, over the past twenty years the Scopes Trial has been re-enacted, with creationism, instead of Darwinism, put on trial in Georgia, Kansas, Pennsylvania, California, and Louisiana.[48]

Sunday's creationism outlived the evangelist because millions of Americans shared his views. Their creationist beliefs were relatively sophisticated and theologically important, and the ad hominem attacks of Darrow, who accused creationists

of being "bigots and ignoramuses," served only to drive creationism underground. Creationists lost face as a result of the Scopes Trial, but in response they formed their own networks of schools and associations. In the four generations since the Scopes Trial, creationism, and its fosterling intelligent design, have reemerged with a vengeance. In that sense at least, Sunday lives.[49]

NOTES

1. Lyle Dorsett *Billy Sunday and the Redemption of Urban America* (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1991). Though lacking citations or an index, Dorsett provides an excellent overview of Sunday's life and ministry.

2. William G. McLoughlin, "Huckster in the Tabernacle," *Time Magazine*, 10 October 1955. Online text http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,937270,00.html; Robert F. Martin, *Hero of the Heartland: Billy Sunday and the Transformation of American Society, 1862–1935* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 2002), 53.

3. Fosdick pastored Riverside Church in New York City and preached the famous anti-fundamentalist message entitled "Shall the Fundamentalists Win?" in 1922. http://www.historymatters.gmu.edu/d/5070/

4. W. A. Firstenberger, *In Rare Form: A Pictorial History of Baseball Evangelist Billy Sunday* (Iowa City: University of Iowa, 2005). Firstenberger offers fascinating insights into Sunday's paraphernalia and personal library at the Billy Sunday Historic Site Museum in Winona Lake, Indiana.

5. Ronald L. Numbers, *The Creationists* (New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1992), 42. Numbers wrote the definitive history of modern creationism.

6. Martin, *Hero of the Heartland*; Dorsett, 149; William G. McLoughlin, *Billy Sunday Was His Real Name* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1955), 132; Roger Bruns, *Preacher: Billy Sunday and Big-Time American Evangelism* (New York: Norton, 1992), 119.

7. "Nuts for Skeptics to Crack," Evening 24 May 1917, *Papers of William and Helen Sunday*, ed. Robert Shuster (Wheaton, IL: The Billy Graham Center, Wheaton College, n.d.), Reel 11, 14. During the 1917 New York campaign, Sunday mentioned his beliefs about creation or evolution in over twenty sermons.

8. Edward J. Larson, *Summer for the Gods: The Scopes Trial and America's Continuing Debate Over Science and Religion* (New York: BasicBooks, 1997), 5, 25, 41.

9. Numbers, ix–40. The survey is especially revealing considering that the Midwest tended to be more conservative than the Northeast; The "death of creationism" seems incongruous at the beginning of the twenty-first century when almost half of Americans believe in young earth creationism. At the time of the survey in 1991, even one quarter of college graduates said they believed in creation despite the universal teaching of evolution in public education.

10. George Frederick Wright, "The Passing of Evolution," *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth*, A.C. Dixon comp. (Los Angeles: Bible Institute of Los Angeles, 1917), 72–87. *The Fundamentals* was a series of articles by theological conservatives and compiled by Baptist preacher A.C. Dixon, which defined the most basic beliefs of Christianity and attempted to

unite fundamentalists from all denominations against the spread of modernism; Numbers, 40–101. George McReady Price had written a defense of creationism in 1902, but since he was a Seventh-day Adventist initially, most conservative evangelicals were leery of his ideas.

11. Dorsett, 69; *The Columbia Record*, 23 March 1923; *The State*, 23 March 1923. With the exception of the missing paragraphs, the 1923 sermon was nearly identical to the 1917 New York campaign version of "Nuts for Skeptics to Crack."

12. "Introductory Remarks 2," Afternoon 8 April 1917, Reel 9, SP, 9–10; Judges 15:14; Joshua 8:29.

13. Genesis 1:2 – "And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." Psalm 104:30 – "Thou sendest forth thy spirit, they are created: and thou renewest the face of the earth."

14 Sunday may have owned a copy of Scofield's Reference Bible; rumor has it that his copy was given away by Mrs. Sunday before finally ending up in the hands of the Rev. Jerry Falwell; C. I. Scofield, *Plain Papers on the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (n.p: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1899), 30. Sunday's copy of this work has reader's notes.

15. C. I. Scofield, *The Scofield Reference Bible*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1945), 3–4; Scofield cites Jer. 4:23–26, Isa. 24:1 and 45:18 in support of a world emptied of life.

16. "Nuts for Skeptics to Crack," Evening 24 May 1917, Reel 11, SP, 30–31. Sunday mentioned that "anthropologists have estimated the age of man on earth from thirty thousand to a million years," then goes on to quote II Peter 3:8.

17. Scofield, 3; "Nuts for Skeptics to Crack," 30–31; untitled sermon, Evening 10 April 1917, Reel 9, SP, 4; untitled sermon, Noon 22 April 1917, Reel 10, 4; "After Death, Judgment," Afternoon 10 June 1917, Reel 11, 17.

18. Untitled sermon, Noon 12 April 1917, Reel 9, SP; Scofield, 12–14. Scofield ascribed prophetic symbology to elements of the Noachian flood, such as picturing the ark as a "type of Christ" since it gave refuge from God's judgment; Numbers, 75–101; John C. Whitcomb and Henry M. Morris, *The Genesis Flood: The Biblical Record and Its Scientific Implications* (Philadelphia: The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1961). *The Genesis Flood* popularized flood geology and sparked the rise of young-earth creationism.

19. "Fishing on the Wrong Side," Afternoon 26 May 1917, Reel 11, SP, 9–10.

20. William Paley, *Natural Theology: or, Evidences of the Existence and Attributes of the Deity* (London: J. Faulder, 1809), 12: 1–2. Online text http://www.hti.umich.edu/cgi/p/pd-modeng/pd-modeng-idx?type=HTML&rgn=TEI.2&byte=53049319

21. "Nuts for Skeptics to Crack," Evening 24 May 1917, Reel 11, SP, 13–14. His example was designed to appeal to the New York audience. "The old Hudson flowing along and the Palisades tell me of a creator that ran his finger down and made the pathway for it to flow into the sea."; "The Worth of God's Way," Evening 7 June 1917, Reel 11, SP, 20.

22. A. Wilford Hall, *The Problem of Human Life Embracing the 'Evolution of Sound' and 'Evolution Evolved' with a Review of the Six Great Modern Scientists* (New York: Hall, 1880), 2: 367, 505–6. Sunday's copy of this book has reading marks. Hall was a Methodist clergyman who held some quirky ideas about acoustics. For a discussion see M.C.M. Wright's "A Short History of Bad Acoustics" in *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, October 2006, Volume 120, Issue 4, 1807–15. Thankfully

Sunday avoided picking up either Hall's acoustic quackery or his proclivity for lengthy titles.

23. Untitled sermon, Noon 2 June 1917, Reel 11, SP, 29. Sunday did not use the Latin phrase "ex nihilo" for "out of nothing," but he understood the concept.

24. "Rationalism," in Erin McKean, ed., *New Oxford American Dictionary,* 2d ed. (Oxford: Oxford University, 2005); untitled sermon, Afternoon 1 May 1917, Reel 10, SP, 10. Sunday did not need to understand salvation to believe in it. "Oh, yes, I know that he is my Saviour now, but I don't know the process. All I know is that I repented. How I was born again is beyond me, but I just left it to the Lord."

25. A fundamentalist view of modernism can be found in J.M. Stanfield's *Modernism: What It Is, What It Does, Whence It Came, Its Relation to Evolution* (New York: Christian Alliance Publishing Company, 1927). Book II, "The Hypothesis of Evolution," connects modernism with belief in evolution.

26. William G. McLoughlin, *Billy Sunday Was His Real Name* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1955), 119, 121. McLoughlin's work was the first scholarly biography of Sunday. Impressively, McLoughlin wrote it before the Sunday Papers were compiled.

27. "Nuts for Skeptics to Crack," Evening 24 May 1917, Reel 11, SP, 9–11; An excellent discussion on the possible origins of right and left hand orientation can be found in Chris McManus's *Right Hand, Left Hand: The Origins of Asymmetry in Brains, Bodies, Atoms and Cultures* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002). Reviewer Dr. Kurt Benirschke of the Department of Pathology at UCSD Medical Center noted, however, "When all is said and done, the real scientific understanding for handedness still escapes our knowledge." http://jhered.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/96/4/471

28. Untitled sermon, Afternoon 11 April 1917, Reel 9, SP, 5; "God's Detective," Evening 23 May 1917, Reel 11, SP, 14–15. Sunday's view of disease was simplistic. For example, he thought that cancer originated from accidents that bruised the tissues and ruled out the possibility that cancer could be hereditary. He noted that blindness was often associated with syphilis sufferers who frequently had been infected by sexual relations with prostitutes.

29. Untitled sermon, Evening 19 April 1917, Reel 10, SP, 14; Interestingly, contemporary geologist George Frederick Wright came to the same conclusion. He had been an advocate of Asa Gray's Christian Darwinism, but in the 1890s, he began to realize the profound theological effects of denigrating God's creative power in the physical universe. Sunday owned a copy of *The Fundamentals* (n.d.) in which Wright published an essay, "The Passing of Evolution"; Sunday to William Jennings Bryan, 4 July 1925, Box 47, BP.

30. Sunday to WJB, 4 July 1925; "If Ye Love Me Keep My Commandments," Morning 20 May 1917, Reel 11, SP, 21; "Mighty Man Who Cannot Save," Morning 6 May 1917, Reel 10, SP, 9.

31. "Nuts for Skeptics to Crack," Evening 24 May 1917, Reel 11, SP, 17; Lawrence M. Friedman, *American Law in the* 20th *Century* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002), 102, 108–10. A belief in eugenics led some Social Darwinists to support sterilizing "undesirables": convicts, the mentally disabled, and African-Americans.

32. "The Man Without a Soul," Afternoon 7 June 1917, Reel 11, SP, 10–14.

33. Untitled sermon, Evening 29 May 1917, Reel 11, SP, 19–20; *Bangor Daily News*, 13 June, 1927, 1. How the concept of morality developed continues to be a much debated topic. For a discussion

read Frans de Waal's *Primates and Philosophers: How Morality Evolved* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006).

34. Numbers, 32–33. A.C. Dixon was rather confused by Wright's seeming vacillation between creationism and evolutionism; George Frederick Wright, "The Passing of Evolution," in R.A. Torrey et al., eds., *The Fundamentals: A Testimony to the Truth* (Los Angeles: Bible Institute of Lost Angeles, 1917), 4: 82–83. Sunday owned a copy of *The Fundamentals*, though it is unclear whether or not he was one of the original recipients; "The Man Without a Soul," 13–14.

35. "The Man Without a Soul," Afternoon 7 June 1917, Reel 11, SP, 14; "Feeding the Five Thousand," Afternoon 10 May 1917, Reel 10, SP, 11–12.

36. "After Death, Judgment," Afternoon 10 June 1917, Reel 11, SP, 18–19; untitled sermon, Afternoon 1 May 1917, Reel 10, SP, 6; Sunday's phrase "the fortuitous concurrence of atoms" comes from Cicero's *De Natura Deorum*. Epicureans used the phrase to describe how the world had formed itself without any divine intervention. Sunday believed that the unbelief of evolution was a new stanza to an old tune.

37. "Nuts for Skeptics to Crack," Evening 24 May 1917, Reel 11, SP, 15. Luther Burbank developed the popular Russet-Burbank potato that most Americans eat today as a side order of fries; "Nuts for Skeptics," 16.

38. Alexander Patterson, *The Other Side of Evolution* (Chicago: Bible Institute Colportage Association, 1903), 28.

39. Chicago Historical Society, "Billy Sunday outside the Moody Bible Institute, 1915," *Encyclopedia of Chicago*, http://www.encyclopedia.chicagohistory.org/pages/3692.html (25 October 2006); Patterson was a friend of D. L. Moody, the man who converted Sunday's mentor, J. Wilbur Chapman, to Christianity. Patterson's *The Other Side of Evolution* was admired by A.C. Dixon, pastor of Moody Church in Chicago and compiler of *The Fundamentals*, a copy of which Sunday owned. Sunday spoke at the Moody Church, and his funeral service was held there; The Moody Church, "The History of the Moody church," http://www.moodychurch.org/information/history.html (25 October 2006).

40. Patterson, 43; "Nuts for Skeptics to Crack," SP, 16; "Nuts for Skeptics to Crack," *The State*, 23 March 1923.

41. "No Second Chance," Evening 3 May 1917, Reel 10, SP, 15; "Opportunity and Responsibility," Afternoon 2 May 1917, Reel 10, SP, 5.

42. R. Borowsky and H. Wilkens, "Mapping a Cave Fish Genome: Polygenic Systems and Regressive Evolution," *Oxford Journal of Heredity*, http://jhered.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/93/1/19 (7 November 2006). Indeed, to this day, a clear explanation for regressive evolution remains elusive.

43. Hall, 458–459.

44. W.A. Sunday to William Jennings Bryan, 4 July 1925, Box 47, BP. Sunday never specifically mentioned A. Wilford Hall or George McCready Price either in his sermons or correspondence; Elizabeth Cary Agassiz, ed. *Louis Agassiz: His Life and Correspondence* (New York: Houghton, Mifflin, and Company, 1893), 480–82; Aldemaro Romero, "Jean Louis Rodolphe Agassiz," *Arkansas State University*, http://www.clt.astate.edu/aromero/new_page_17.htm (7 November 2006)

45. "Bryan to Sunday," 23 June 1925, Box 1, Folder 34, SP, Reel 2; *New York Times*, 4 July 1925, 1.

46. "Sunday to Bryan," 4 July 1925, Box 47, *Papers of William Jennings Bryan*, edited by Joseph D. Sullivan and Allan Teichroew (Washington, D.C.: Manuscript Division, Library of Congress, 2006); Dorsett, 35, 129; Bruns, 280. While coaching Northwestern University's baseball team, Sunday took several courses at a preparatory school on the campus.

47. "Nuts for Skeptics to Crack," 24 May 1917, SP; *The State*, 23 March, 1923; *The Bangor Daily News*, 13 June 1927.

48. Gallup, 8–11 September 2005, http://www.galluppoll.com/content/?ci=21814&pg=1

49. There are a number of creationist scientific organizations including the Creation Research Society (www.creationresearch.org) and the Institute for Creation Research (www.icr.org). The informal network of colleges teaching creation has evolved to the point of having its own accreditation agency (http://www.tracs.org/accredited.htm).

Billy Sunday's 1923 Evangelistic Campaign in Columbia, South Carolina

Jonathan Newell

One of the largest and most successful evangelistic campaigns in South Carolina's religious history occurred in Columbia in early 1923. For six weeks, evangelist Billy Sunday dominated headlines, captivating audiences with an evangelical message of patriotism and moral living. Although his career had been in decline since the triumphant 1917 campaign in New York City, Sunday found the Columbia campaign a brief return to past glory. It was unusually successful because Southern cities, having been neglected during Sunday's heyday, were still eager to associate with the celebrity evangelist. His message of nativism and religious orthodoxy resonated with the values of South Carolinians, and they rewarded him with enthusiasm and adulation.[1]

Southerners appreciated the fact that Billy Sunday had achieved celebrity the old-fashioned way—he earned it. Poverty and hardship marked Sunday's formative years after his birth in rural Iowa in 1862; a tryout with the Chicago White Stockings in 1883, however, brought Sunday personal and financial success. His reputation as a fleet-footed base-stealer under "Cap" Anson brought him national recognition. Then Sunday converted to Christianity in 1886, married in 1888, and quit baseball in 1891 to work for the Young Men's Christian Association. In 1895, he embarked on a full-time evangelistic career.

While already a recognized athlete, Sunday achieved greater celebrity with his captivating style of evangelism. His revivalism little resembled the earlier American revivals of the Puritan theologian Jonathan Edwards. Sunday's sinners were not in the hands of an angry God; they were moral agents free to choose or reject salvation. Sunday's campaigns, therefore, emphasized systematic effort to sway the sinner's will.[2]

Although shy and insecure, Sunday preached his message of morality, repentance, and faith in Jesus with an athletic zeal that transfixed audiences. During campaigns, Sunday preached twelve forty-five minute sermons a week. While delivering these sermons at the top of his lungs to vast audiences, he used acrobatic antics and dramatic gestures such as smashing chairs or standing on pulpits to emphasize points. He also used slang, since it enabled the unchurched to understand "the idea in a jiffy." Though Sunday took exception to the fact, many attended his meetings simply for the entertainment value they provided.[3]

Sunday began his evangelistic career by holding meetings in small Midwestern towns, but by 1908 he had begun to hold meetings in larger cities. He soon became a national phenomenon. Large cities vied for his services, while smaller cities like Columbia could only read of his campaigns in the newspapers. At the peak of his influence in 1917, he preached to tens of thousands in New York City. There, Sunday and twenty-six staff members campaigned for ten weeks, preaching salvation and attacking sin. Almost ninety-eight thousand people responded to his invitations, and the city rewarded him with an offering of $120,500 ($1,890,000 in 2006 dollars, as noted hereafter). Through all this, Sunday lived the life of a celebrity, meeting with presidents, dining with the Rockefellers, and playing charity baseball games with movie stars.[4]

By the early 1920s, however, Sunday's popularity in the urban North declined, He turned from celebrity to curiosity as many there abandoned his old-fashioned values and religious beliefs. New modes of entertainment like radio and movies competed with the entertainment value of evangelistic meetings. Soon he turned to the South, where he would find a receptive audience whose values still matched his own.[5]

Unlike the more sophisticated cities, smaller Southern cities like Columbia jumped at the opportunity to host the nationally known evangelist. In Columbia, community leaders hoped that Sunday's preaching would bring moral and financial improvement. Planning for a Columbia campaign had begun in 1921 before Sunday's 1922 Spartanburg campaign, and by early 1923, enthusiasm for the campaign was at a fever-pitch.[6]

Efforts to unite the city around the campaign led to the formation of the interdenominational Columbia Evangelical Committee. The committee was headquartered in the downtown YMCA . W. D. Melton, president of the University of South Carolina, presided as its chairman, and ministers from twenty-seven churches, including Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, Episcopal, and Christian served with him. The committee managed the $25,000 ($295,000) campaign expenses and supervised preparations.[7]

The major task was the construction of a "tabernacle" that would meet Sunday's needs. The result was the $14,000 ($165,000) "pine temple," located one block south of the capitol on the corner of Greene and Main Streets across from the University of South Carolina's "Horseshoe." Construction started on 27 January with workmen using over 112,000 feet of fresh lumber from Lexington County to build the 136 by 234 foot building. Twenty-five tons of sawdust provided a "sawdust trail" for the 30,000-square-foot building. In addition to electric lights and heating stoves, the tabernacle contained an infirmary, several offices, and benches to seat six thousand people. The choir area behind the platform seated another one thousand. A one-thousand-watt lamp hanging over the pulpit provided illumination, and a sophisticated sounding board called an "augiphone" amplified Sunday's voice.[8]

Although national dailies had stopped covering Sunday, both local newspapers, the Columbia Record and the State, provided extensive coverage of the preparations and actual campaign. Their continuous coverage increased the public's anticipation and gave Sunday flattering reviews. Besides publishing front-page summaries of every meeting, the papers printed the full text of Sunday's sermons. Even details like Sunday's first supper in Columbia merited mention. Sunday knew the value of good press, and special seating was reserved for newspaper reporters at the front of the tabernacle.[9]

Sunday arrived in Columbia on Saturday, 24 February, to a tumultuous welcome headed by the governor and mayor. Sunday launched the campaign the next morning, and by day's end, he had preached to twenty-three thousand people. Demand to see the "Baseball Evangelist" grew steadily. Sunday preached two services every day from Tuesday to Sunday. At the Friday night service on 2 March, the estimated attendance was seventy-five hundred. Because of good weather, the attendance for the following two Sunday services was seventeen thousand, with people "crowded in rows of three or four deep around the walls" and two thousand listening outside.[10]

Like any good celebrity, Sunday played to his audience's sympathies. While his sympathies had never been with the South, either politically or historically, he publicly honored the "Lost Cause." The service on 7 March celebrated Columbia's Confederate heritage. Homer Rodeheaver, the trombone-playing song leader, began the service with old gospel songs and bugle calls for the thirty-five Confederate veterans in attendance. When he played "Dixie," "the crowd stood and cheered and rebel yells were in the air." Although Sunday's father died as a Union soldier, Sunday lauded Confederate leaders. When addressing the General Assembly, Sunday opened with " a beautiful tribute to Lee, Jackson, Jeb Stuart and other warriors of the South." During a service later that day, he praised Lee and claimed that he never passed Wade Hampton's grave without removing his hat and saluting.[11]

As the campaign progressed, Sunday's star power drew ever more South Carolinians. His campaign provided special evenings for the participation of fraternal organizations, civic groups, and workers' associations. Groups like the Elks, Kiwanis, Rebekahs, Shriners, Masons, Knights Templars, Odd Fellows, and Woodmen of the World attended, bringing members from as far away as Charleston. The Sunday campaign reserved seats for the delegations at the front, and the clubs returned the favor by bringing bands or wearing uniforms.[12]

Many of these groups responded to invitations issued by Sunday. Ostensibly. the invitations were designed to start sinners down the "sawdust trail" to repentance. Sunday's invitations, however, gave the public the opportunity to shake Sunday's hand. These "trail-hitters"—regardless of motivation—were considered "a product of revival

by which its success is measured," and the number of trail-hitters from the previous day's services was usually printed in a front page article in the State.[13]

Yet Sunday's celebrity, his polite nods to the "Lost Cause," and his acrobatic preaching do not explain fully the success of his six weeks in Columbia. It was his message that resonated with South Carolinians, for it spoke to their interest in religious orthodoxy, political conservatism, and social stability. In short, it spoke to their hope and fears. While Northern audiences had lost interest, Sunday found Southern audiences receptive to the old-fashioned values of old-fashioned religion. He claimed there was "more religion in Tennessee, Virginia and North and South Carolina than in any other states," and he believed that the South lacked "undesirable foreigners and wild-eyed soap-box orators who might contaminate the Americanism of the old stock."[14]

Realistically, these "foreigners" and "orators" were not Columbia's problem; by 1930 less than two percent of the people in Richland County were immigrants. In fact, "many of the great questions of the day, from the local perspective, were non-issues—things such as the Red Scare, Christian Fundamentalism, racism, the Ku Klux Klan, immigration quotas, and even Prohibition." Sunday found in South Carolinians an audience with established social views, eager to hear political radicalism condemned and true patriotism exalted.[15]

Before delivering his nativist, politically conservative "Americanism" sermon, Sunday allowed Alvin Owsely, commander of the American Legion, to present the Legion's views on the issue. These views were nationally known since the Legion had proposed a plan for Congress to facilitate "Americanizing" immigrants. By educating immigrants in English and civics and closing the country to immigrants for five years, the Legion hoped to "wipe out every 'little Italy,' 'little Poland,' 'little Greece' and every other kind of segregated foreign settlement."[16]

After Owsely's remarks, Sunday attacked the "the Socialistic, I.W.W., Communistic, Radical, lawless, anti-American, anti-church, anti-God, anti-marriage gang" who he said were "laying the eggs of rebellion and unrest in labor and capital and home." Preaching with all the vehemence previously reserved for the Kaiser, he hoped that America would not become "the dumping ground for Europe's filth." Columbians agreed heartily, and many of the seven thousand people in attendance responded to Sunday's invitation to "[promise] to stand by God, Christ and country." Thus Columbians came to view Sunday not only as one who respected their Southern identity, but also as one who fearlessly guarded their developing post-war national identity. [17]

During his Americanism sermon, Sunday alluded to another subversive movement of the day—religious liberalism. Since the late 1800s, new ideas in science and

theology had been eroding orthodoxy. Social work, evolution, and higher textual criticism hollowed out the traditional meanings of the Virgin Birth, miracles, and the Resurrection. By the 1920s, many Northern audiences had turned to these new beliefs. Sunday's one-time supporter John D. Rockefeller, Jr. had turned on him and was building the palatial Riverside Church for the archliberal Harry Emerson Fosdick. The South, however, maintained a conservative religious outlook and an environment favorable to a growing Protestant fundamentalist movement. Had the egg-heaving, Pullman-riding H. L. Mencken come through Columbia at the time of Sunday's campaign, he would have found plenty of targets.[18]

During the campaign, Columbia's churches provided Sunday substantial support. Some Baptist churches canceled services so members could attend the meetings. Lutherans and Catholics had attended pre-campaign prayer meetings but did not cancel services. Such inaction did not upset Sunday. Instead of expressing a strident anti-Catholicism, Sunday, in statements uncharacteristic of most contemporary Protestants, declared, "If you are a good Catholic," he said, "I hope to God you will be a better one." To Sunday, the struggle against liberalism overrode any sectarian concerns; Columbia's Catholics were simply another ally in the struggle of faith and modernism.[19]

National modernists had already provided Sunday with a foil—Percy S. Grant, a liberal Episcopalian minister in New York. Just before the Columbia campaign, during Sunday's campaign in Knoxville in January 1923, controversy erupted over Grant, who had questioned Christ's deity and said few clergymen "educated in the large universities" accepted it either. Bishop William Manning, a leading conservative Episcopalian, confronted him, but Grant did not retract his statements. Sunday grasped the opportunity to contrast Grant's urbane intellectualism with his homespun evangelical beliefs. Sunday praised Manning and attacked Grant, defending Christ's miracles against the "vagaries and bunk" of liberalism. Referencing these national events while campaigning in Columbia, Sunday said Percy S. Grant and other liberals were "ministers who 'spit' on Jesus Christ." He defended the truthfulness of the Bible, telling unbelievers that "the inconsistency is not in the Bible, but in your rotten life." In Sunday's eyes, Grant and other seminary-educated liberals were spiritual Bolsheviks determined to overthrow America's religion.[20]

Sunday then turned his verbal barrages on "atheism with a new name"—evolution. On 22 March, Sunday preached the sermon "Nuts for Skeptics to Crack," attacking evolution. Labeling it a "bastard theory," he said, "If you believe your great, great granddaddy was a monkey, then you take your daddy and go to hell with him, but leave me out!" Sunday urged the audience to reject such beliefs by listing artists,

poets, scientists, and politicians who accepted the Bible. Thus Sunday was plotting himself and his religiously conservative audience on a course that ended two years later in the collision of urban liberalism and rural conservatism in a small courtroom in Dayton, Tennessee.[21]

Unlike nativism and liberalism, race never became an issue during the campaign. Sunday did not use his influence to alter racial conditions; instead, he allowed the all-white campaign committee to set the racial boundaries. Even though men like Richard Carroll, an influential African-American minister, acknowledged that Sunday would "comply with Southern conditions," he described Sunday as the "greatest [preacher] in the world" and gave full support to the campaign. On 25 March, Sunday preached to almost ninety-five hundred African-Americans at the tabernacle. Out of the seventy-nine campaign services, this was their only service. Despite the limited outreach, the campaign appeared to improve racial relations, and the mayor asked "for a continuation of the present good feeling between the two races." The fact that Sunday did not use his celebrity as platform for social change only further endeared him to white South Carolinians.[22]

After Sunday's African-American service, the campaign entered its final weeks. Sunday's views and personal dynamism continued to draw increasing numbers. Sunday gave the first invitations of the campaign on 5 March, and soon the list of trail-hitters included the governor, the lieutenant governor, legislators, 256 Knights Templars, 500 Boy Scouts, and a group of Master Masons. By 5 April, trail-hitters totaled 10,445, giving Sunday his largest number for the year; by 7 April, Sunday had shaken hands with more trail-hitters in Columbia than anywhere else during the previous two years.[23]

As the campaign closed, Columbians gave Sunday the celebrity sendoff they believed he deserved. After preaching his final sermon to an audience of 37,500, seeing 4,400 trail-hitters, and receiving a $25,000 offering ($295,000), Sunday left on a "veritable triumphal march" for the rail station. Thousands of visitors stood along Main Street from the Jefferson Hotel to Union Station. Six hundred tabernacle ushers, using ropes attached to the front to the car, pulled his Packard sedan from the hotel to the station. Two bands marched in front while well-wishers sang, yelled, and rushed the "ushers' chariot." When Sunday arrived at the station, it took the combined effort of policemen and University of South Carolina students to get him to the train. Sunday called the event "the greatest demonstration that has ever been given me" and said that "Columbia is ahead of Boston and Chicago and all the other cities."[24]

One of Sunday's staff members claimed that the "Columbia revival was in many ways the greatest campaign Mr. Sunday has ever conducted. . . . Never have I seen so much interest in a campaign, and never before such statewide participation

in a revival." Likewise, the *State* declared that "Never before has a religious meeting aroused such enthusiasm." The numbers seemed to prove the campaign a success. The total attendance for the seventy-nine meetings was 479,300, twenty-three times the white population of Columbia. The number of Columbia's trail-hitters, 17,232, was greater than in any Sunday campaign held in a city of similar size. Forty-four hundred came forward on the last day, a number second only to the 7,000 at the end of the New York City campaign of 1917. In the opinion of the Greenville *Piedmont*, it could "not be doubted by any fair-minded observer" that Columbia was "a better city because of Billy Sunday."[25]

Hoping to capitalize on the campaign's success, churches sprang into action. Tabernacle and First Baptist held special services the following week. On the two Sundays following the end of the meetings on 8 April, forty-six people were baptized at the First Baptist Church, compared with just eight on 1 April. Nine Methodist churches held services for ten days after the revival and contacted trail-hitters who had signed decision cards. By 26 April, almost three hundred people had joined some Methodist church in Columbia.[26]

Sunday's success in Columbia can in part be explained by his celebrity. For six weeks, he captivated Columbia, giving its citizens a chance to hear the man whose campaigns had been nationally acclaimed. Those who came to see his vigorous, acrobatic style never left disappointed. His messages left South Carolinians feeling comfortable about their values and society. He confirmed their faith and boosted their patriotism. He found the presence of Percy Grant's liberalism and Eugene Debs's socialism intolerable, yet he overlooked Jim Crow's racism and found room for the "Lost Cause." Consequently, Sunday and his campaign organizers produced a campaign that earned the enthusiastic support of thousands of South Carolinians. But as Governor McLeod noted, "figures and statistics" did not measure the full impact of the campaign; only "time and eternity" could "tell the far reaching effects of the gospel . . . as presented here in Columbia to the people of South Carolina."[27]

NOTES

1. Lyle W. Dorsett, *Billy Sunday and the Redemption of Urban America* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 2001), 92–93.

2. Sydney E. Ahlstrom, *A Religious History of the American People,* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1972), 459–61; W. Glyn Evans, "A Survey of Evangelism in America," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society,* 14, 3 (1971): 165–69; William G. McLoughlin, Jr., *Revivals, Awakenings, and Reform: An Essay on Religion and Social Change in America,* 1607–1977, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 123–28.

3. Dorsett, 147; *The State,* 13 March 1923, 3; 22 March 1923, 1.

4. Dorsett, 94–95, 106–15; currency values determined at www.measuringworth.com, 20 March 2007.

5. Dorsett, 148–49, 127–28, 132–33; Walter Edgar, *South Carolina: A History* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1998), 483; George M. Marsden, *Fundamentalism and American Culture: The Shaping of Twentieth-Century Evangelicalism:* 1870–1925 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 102–4, 170; *The State*, 14 Jan 1923, 14; George B. Tindall, *The Emergence of the New South:* 1913–1945 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1999).

6. *Columbia Record*, 1 Jan 1923, 1; 6 April 1923, 8; *tate*, 25 Feb 1923, 7; 9 April 1923.

7. *Columbia Record*, 21 Jan 1923, 1; 22 Jan 1923, 1; 6 Feb 1923, 8; *The State,* 5 April 1923, 3; 6 April 1923, 3.

8. "Unlike a sounding board, it does not magnify the speaker's voice, but distributes the sound waves so that persons in every section can hear distinctly." *The Columbia Record*, 30 Jan 1923, 8; There was also "a large electric sign, holding the picture of Billy Sunday, hanging over the main entrance to the building." *The State,* 25 Feb 1923, 7; the tabernacle's location is now occupied by Wardlaw College and Drayton Hall. "Campus Overview." http://www.sc.edu/cgi-bin/uscmap/overview.cgi (2/23/2004); *The Columbia Record*, 23 Jan 1923, 3; 28 Jan 1923, 8; 29 Jan 1923, 3; 30 Jan 1923, 3; 4 Feb 1923, 2; for a picture of the interior see *The Columbia Record*, 18 Feb 1923, 5; for the exterior see *The State,* 11 Feb 1923, 3.

9. In *The State* campaign gossip columns were called "Sunday Shrapnel" and "Caught on the Fly." In the *Columbia Record*, they were called "Billy Says" and "Shavings from the Trail." *The Columbia Record*, 21 Jan 1923, 1; 30 Jan 1923, 3; 23 Feb 1923, 1; *The State*, 10 Jan 1923, 12; William G. McLoughlin, Jr., *Billy Sunday Was His Real Name* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955), 270.

10. Moore, 333, 447; *The Columbia Record*, 20 Feb 1923, 8; 23 Feb 1923, 1–3; 24 Feb 1923, 1; 25 Feb 1923, 1, 8; 26 Feb 1923, 1–2; 2 March 1923, 1; 3 March 1923, 1; 5 March 1923, 1.

11. Sunday probably had ample opportunity to make good on his word since Hampton's grave in the Trinity Episcopal churchyard lies next to one of the two main routes leading from the tabernacle to the Jefferson hotel. At the beginning of March, the Wade Hampton Chapter of the KKK donated $100 to the campaign by letter, thanking Sunday for "your manly stand for all that is good, as well as your continued work for the Master." *The Columbia Record*, 28 Feb 1923, 1; 7 March 1923, 1; *The State*, 1 March, 1923, 1; 3 March 1923, 2; 8 March 1923, 2. McLoughlin, *Sunday,* 272.

12. *The Columbia Record*, 9 March 1923, 1; 15 March 1923, 1; 16 March 1923,1; 17 March 1923, 1; 22 March 1923, 1; 23 March 1923,1; 28 March 1923,1; *The State*, 7 March 1923, 1; 9 March 1923, 1; 21 March 1923, 1; 29 March 1923, 1.

13. "Homer Rodeheaver, who is a Mason, had asked them all to take the fourth degree and many responded to his call." *The State*, 5 March 1923,1; 9 March 1923, 1; 11 March 1923, 1; 24 March 1923,1; 28 March 1923, 1; 5 April 1923, 1; 6 April 1923, 1–2; 7 April 1923, 1; 8 April 1923, 1; Dorsett,108.

14. Sunday "rarely failed to offer his conservative Protestant audiences the views they held most dear." Ahlstrom, 900; Marsden, 102–4, 170, 179; McLoughlin, *Sunday,* 272; *The State*, 14 Jan 1923, 14; *Columbia Record*, 4 Feb 1923, 5.

15. "Richland County had few (if any) card-carrying Communists, virtually no foreign-born residents (only 1.4 percent) in 1930, and little need of Klan assistance in formulating racial

attitudes." Moore, 329; *The Columbia Record,* 10 March 1923, 1, 2; *The State,* 10 March 1923, 1.

16. *The Columbia Record,* 28 February, 1923, 1; 11 March, 1923, 12.

17. *The Columbia Record,* 10 March 1923, 1, 2; *The State,* 10 March 1923, 1.

18. For an excellent overview introduction to these religious trends, see William E. Hordern, *A Layman's Guide to Protestant Theology* (New York: Macmillan, 1968), 29–110; Ahlstrom, 774–784; Dorsett, 45–47; McLoughlin, *Sunday,* 281.

19. McLoughlin, *Sunday,* 285. It should be noted that Mark Carlisle, pastor of the Washington Street Methodist Church and a vice chairman of the campaign committee, "grew increasingly disenchanted with tactics of Sunday's organization, but he dismissed services at Washington Street for two Sundays and held a follow-up week of services." Archie Vernon Huff, Jr., *Tried by Fire* (Columbia: R.L. Bryan Company, 1975), 86–87; *The Columbia Record*, 22 Jan 1923, 1; 22 Feb 1923, 8; 24 Feb 1923, 5; 26 Feb 1923, 3; First Baptist Church Minutes, Furman University Baptist History Collection, hereafter FUBHC, microfilm reel 1, 17 Jan 1923; North Trenholm Baptist Church (Tabernacle) Minutes, FUBHC, microfilm reel 1, 13 February 1923; 1 April 1923.

20. Marsden, 91–93, 102, 117, 171, 174–77, 183–84; McLoughlin *Sunday,* 281–82. "Percy Stickney Grant, an author and member of the clergy, wrote several works on social issues, notably *Fair Play and the Workers, Socialism and Christianity,* and *Religion of Main Street.*" Teresa O'Neill, ed., *Immigration: Opposing Viewpoints*, (San Diego: Greenhaven Press, 1992), 116; Marsden, 178; *The Columbia Record*, 29 Jan 1923, 8; 1 March 1923, 2; 4 March 1923, 3; 10 March 1923, 2;14 March 1923, 2; 22 March 1923, 1; 23 March 1923, 2. *The State,* 20 Jan 1923, 2; 26 Jan 1923, 1–2.

21. McLoughlin, *Sunday,* 282; *The Columbia Record,* 1 March 1923, 2; 4 March 1923, 3; 14 March 1923, 2; 22 March 1923; 23 March 1923, 2.

22. "His [Carroll's] message advocated self-help and economic advancement for blacks while discouraging efforts to achieve political and social equality between the races. His influence with contemporary white leaders in political, business, and Southern Baptist clerical circles brought him to prominence in South Carolina before and after the First World War." "Richard Carroll Papers, 1908–1977," http://www.sc.edu/library/socar/uscs/1998/carrol98.htm." (3/29/04); *The Columbia Record*, 12 March 1923, 1; 24 March 1923, 2; 28 March 1923, 1; 29 March 1923, 1; 5 April 1923, 1; *The State,* 29 Jan 1923, 3; 21 Feb 1923, 12; 20 March 1923, 3; 26 March 1923, 1; 6 April 1923, 3; 9 April 1923, 3; 10 April 1923, 2; McLoughlin, *Sunday,* 272–74; Robert F. Martin, *Hero of the Heartland* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002), 116.

23. *The State,* 5 March 1923,1; 9 March 1923, 1; 11 March 1923, 1; 24 March 1923,1; 28 March 1923, 1; 5 April 1923, 1; 6 April 1923, 1–2; 7 April 1923, 1; 8 April 1923, 1.

24. *The Columbia Record*, 8 April 1923, 1; 9 April 1923, 1; *The State,* 8 April 1923, 1, 2; 9 April 1923, 1, 3. The Sunday tabernacle continued to see use during April. As early as March 8, planners of the fifth annual Palmafesta and Automobile Show had reserved the tabernacle to hold the event. The Palmafesta opened on April 23 and featured a week of "music, fashions, automobiles, pretty girls, [and] trade displays." Sunday would visit the tabernacle again on November 26, 1923 during his Charleston campaign. *The Charleston Evening Post*, 26 Nov 1923, 1; *The Columbia Record* 9 April 1923, 1; *The State,* 22 April 1923, 13.

25. To put the figures in perspective, the campaign's attendance of 479,300 would fill USC's Williams-Brice Stadium approximately 6½ times. *The Columbia Record,* 3 April 1923, 1; 9 April 1923, 1; 26 April 1923, 4; *The State,* 9 April 1923, 3; 6 April 1923, 3; 9 April 1923, 2; 10 April 1923, 1, 2.

26 First Baptist Minutes, FUBHC, 28 March 1923; 3 May 1923; *The Columbia Record*, 10 April 1923, 3; *Southern Christian Advocate,* 26 April 1923, 2; *The State,* 6 April 1923, 3, 13 April 1923, 2

27. *The State,* 5 April 1923, 3; McLoughlin, *Sunday,* 281, 296.

Religious Responsibility and Political Culpability in the Parliament of 1628

Philip Whalen

I

A rich and contentious historiographical tradition lies between the long-term causes of the English Civil Wars outlined in Laurence Stone's *Origins of the English Revolution, 1529–1642* (1972) and the eleventh-hour trigger events championed in Anthony Fletcher's *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (1989). Margaret Judson long ago recognized in *The Crisis of the Constitution* (1949) that Parliament's case "during forty years of constitutional debate and conflict" preceding the fall of the British monarchies "rested not on one but on many arguments, some of them legal and constitutional, others more political."[1] Subsequent scholarship has confirmed that the religious, political, and constitutional agendas of early Stuart England (1603–1642) are best addressed simultaneously.[2] Conrad Russell staked out this position in his *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621–1629* (1979), *The Causes of the English Civil War* (1990), and *The Fall of the British Monarchies, 1637–1642* (1991). Surprisingly, however, short-term interpretations for the outbreak of the English Civil Wars, as found in Anthony Fletcher's *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (1981) and Caroline Hibbard's *The Popish Plot* (1983), have revived interest in religious factors. If not exactly a return of the Puritan Revolution model, these works reveal a "religious turn" in recent scholarship.[3]

Regardless of how the events are viewed, Charles I's downfall remains linked to dissatisfaction with a confessional absolutism understood by some contemporaries through the prism of a defensively hostile worldview that was built around the notion of an international Protestant alliance and activated by perceived threats to English liberties.[4] Even when not exactly militant or explicitly linked to international Calvinism, this dynamic was fueled by any alleged manifestations of "popery." The Puritan rhetoric expressed in the Commons' debates of 1628–29 was born in the climate of political uncertainty and religious ambiguity associated with the Tudor reformations.[5]

Drawing heavily upon Calvinist covenant theology, John Foxe's *Book of Martyrs* (1563) provided an existential teleology for contemporary England: "none so carefully flattered the most basic and best known Protestant prejudices and preconceptions about Catholicism."[6] Foxe likened England to a biblical elect nation. Her existential

and teleological quest, he argued, was to defend the reformed faith, which he depicted in terms of an ongoing process that began when England cast off the "popish yoke" under Henry VIII. The persecutions of Mary Tudor, the possibility that Mary Queen of Scots could become England's monarch, and the threat posed by the Spanish Armada were subsequently fitted into this framework. For his part, Foxe characterized the Marian bishops—and not foreign elements—as the chief persecutors of the followers of Christ.[7] His exposition of the flaws of "Romish" religion and worldly ceremonies reinforced existing Protestant prejudices, underscored the righteousness of the reformed faith, and incited the godly to seek further radical reform to consolidate the gains of the Reformation and to purify the Church of England. Surrounded by the legions of the Antichrist who, Foxe alleged, worked incessantly to subvert reformed religion, England's existential purpose was to pursue its vision of religious reformation until the "second Coming" prophesied in the biblical books of Daniel and Revelations.[8] As Christopher Hill notes, "Antichrist stood for bad, papal repressive institutions: exactly which institutions was anybody's choice."[9] This habit of thought was sustained throughout the late Tudor and early Stuart periods by the general availability of the Bible in the vernacular (such as the Coverdale, Cranmer, Geneva, Bishops, and King James/Authorized translations), Foxe's works along with similar pamphlets and sermons, and the writings of James I.[10] The potential for these beliefs to cause tensions within the Church and State was acknowledged when James I reprimanded Richard Sheldon in 1625 for meddling with foreign policy when the latter denounced the Pope as the Antichrist in a sermon delivered at Paul's Cross.[11]

Despite their doctrinal differences concerning the reformed Church, Puritans and most Conformists shared common ground in their emphasis on the concept of the godly commonwealth, governed by an elect elite, and expressed in terms of the survival of English Protestant nationalism.[12] But Conformists or creedal Calvinists reduced the scope of experimental Calvinism (see definition below) from the collective level to the personal level. They practiced predestinarian theology within the context of a Christian Church open to all. Recognizing predestinarian theology as the theological cement of the established church and as its common denominator, creedal Calvinists such as Bishop Whitgift and Richard Hooker opposed experimental Puritan attempts to employ the pulpit as the vehicle for the doctrinal revision of the Christian community.[13] Separatist or semi-separatist tendencies in experimental Calvinism, by contrast, were what differentiated Puritans from conforming creedal Calvinists or Episcopal Protestants who constituted the bulk of the Elizabethan and Jacobean Church. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes describe experimental Calvinists or Puritans thus:

> "[a]s individuals, Puritans emphasized an active individual understanding or internalization of the fundamentals of faith as revealed in scripture and expounded through preaching. They were those who had tried most determinedly to put into practice a version of Calvinist theology . . . described . . . as experimental predestinarianism. In practice, if not strictly in theory, they accepted that it was possible to discover who was among the elect in this world and therefore search for assurance that they numbered among the saints. On a personal level this produced a tendency towards introspection, assiduous scriptural study, attendance at sermons, and conscientious attempts to live all aspects of life according to God's word. More broadly, Puritans sought out like-minded Christians, to form communities of the Godly, and distinguish themselves from those who complacently accepted an ungodly world. They also tended to confirm and demonstrate their inner assurance of salvation by an external, activist program of reform in the world . . . . There they attempted to root out popery and establish a godly, moral regime in the church and in society as a whole." [14]

While the distinction between creedal (Conformist) and experimental (Puritan) Calvinism is essential to understanding the divisions within the Church of England, it is also important to remember that many Conformists and Puritans shared a recognizable agenda. Puritans, as "hotter sort of Protestants" in Derek Hirst's formulary, were those who "manifested at least some of a cluster of attitudes" vis-à-vis the Church of England and looked to their own consciences in deciding to oppose that church's liturgy under Charles I.[15] This was not a position that Conformists and men of law adopted easily. Nicholas Tyacke notes that "only when predestination teaching was outlawed by the leaders of the established church . . . did its exponents find themselves in opposition to the government."[16]

Because the Foxean discourse informed public opinion during the 1620s and 1630s, when contemporaries hoped that the Parliament of 1628 would resolve important issues relative to royal authority, religious policies, if momentarily tabled, were not entirely absent from their attention. Foremost were concerns over the billeting of soldiers, the Forced Loan, and the imprisonment of loan refusers (who were eventually released in January 1626). It did not take long for negotiations between King and parliament concerning the reach and nature of royal authority to strain further their relationship. Charles I's "unsatisfactory" responses to the Commons' overtures

in 1628 fatally and profoundly affected many MPs' attitudes concerning the King's good will. This frustration pushed them to fall back on their Foxean expectations of a justly administered kingdom. While the initial recourse to legislation in 1628 was prompted by Charles' religious policies, it also revealed—so L. J. Reeve argues—a tendency among Commons members to transfer their ideological concerns about constitutional conflicts concerning prerogative power into fears about "an overriding Conspiracy against Church and State."[17] In a state of apprehension, and with varying degrees of self-consciousness, they increasingly employed the divisive and damning idiom of anti-popish language. Sir John Eliot notably led this rhetorical shift following the King's responses to the Commons' Remonstrance against the Duke of Buckingham (King Charles's closest friend and chief advisor), to the Petition of Right, and to the Commons' Declaration against the royalist sermons preached by Roger Manwaring and printed together in one volume entitled *Religion and Allegiance*.[18] So long as Charles I ruled through prerogative powers and inhibited further religious reform, normal discussions of national policies typically couched in constitutional terms easily shifted to a more explosive rhetoric of religious responsibility. The following discussion not only retraces how the Commons employed these rhetorical shifts in its negotiations with the King, but also sheds light on the terms and conditions under which complaints against royal policies and advisers became attacks on the Crown itself.

II

At war with both France and Spain, Charles was desperate for additional revenues in 1628. War expenses exceeded £1,000,000 per year. The King had already spent the Queen's dowry, a substantial portion of Buckingham's personal fortune, and the entire sum of monies raised through the Forced Loan of 1626–27 to subsidize unsuccessful military expeditions to Cadiz in 1625 and to the Isle of Rhé in 1627—enterprises that Sir Simonds D'Ewes, Elizabethan antiquarian and future member of the Long Parliament, characterized as a "fatal blow and dishonor . . . to the English Nation" and predicted could lead to the "joint destruction of England and the Low Countries."[19] A plan to collect Ship Money in February 1628 was scuttled when the Privy Council advised the monarch otherwise.[20] Eager to defend his honor and provide a military victory that would both bolster his public support and redeem Buckingham's popularity, Charles prepared another expedition to La Rochelle. Englishmen knew that the King needed supply and they believed that he would dissolve a parliament within a fortnight if it refused him his request for subsidies.[21]

Charles's decision to summon a parliament for March 1628 displayed a willingness to work within the existing parliamentary system despite his apparent anxiety concerning the loyalty of his people.[22] This confidence was bolstered by a newly formed alliance between the Duke of Buckingham and the Earl of Pembroke, who promised to protect the King's favorite from attacks in parliament. As D'Ewes relates, the Duke was generally considered responsible for "all other mischief in Church and Government."[23] This perception of Buckingham stretched back at least to the Parliament of 1626, when Eliot accused him of being like Sejanus, the ancient Roman commander of the Praetorian Guard and counselor to Emperor Tiberius who was executed after the discovery that he aimed at the throne himself. Public recognition of this treacherous advisor had been revived in Ben Johnson's early tragedy by the same name.[24] Pembroke's alliance with Arundel in 1626 had made possible the attacks on the Duke within that parliament.[25] Now, however, the marriage between Buckingham's nephew (and heir) and Pembroke's daughter temporarily silenced the Duke's opponents. After the Duke, the Earl controlled the greatest number of proxies in parliament.

Despite the absence of documentary evidence, the Buckingham-Pembroke alliance appeared secure in 1628. Russell argues that an agreement was made "before the Parliament [of 1628] assembled, at which some of its leaders agreed not to attack the Duke."[26] This would explain why parliament initially refrained from attacking "evil counselors," as these would have logically pointed to Buckingham and to persons under his patronage, including many whose Arminian or Roman Catholic religious sympathies rejected Calvinistic predestination theology. In view of this restraint on political strategy, the Commons at first expressed its paramount fear of the growth of arbitrary government in the established idiom of constitutional rights and liberties. This strategy, which was based on the "growing cult of the rule of law as an ideal that could stand beside the religious ideals of John Foxe," lasted only so long as the Commons believed that the King's intentions were sincere.[27] When Charles gave the lie to this premise with his equivocal and unacceptable response to the Petition of Right, the Commons reverted to its previous attacks on the King's "evil counselors," now targeting, for example, Roger Manwaring, who had preached before Charles in July 1627 that parliamentary assent was not essential before taxation could be levied. The attacks reveal how religious and constitutional issues joined in defense against any alleged "alteration of government".[28]

Sermons preached with royal approval during Charles I's early reign had espoused a Calvinist worldview that was steeped in Old Testament concepts of justice, guided by Augustinian notions of salvation, haunted by the immanence of

the Antichrist, and desirous of further religious reforms in the Church of England. Numbered among such reforms were the purging of Catholic remnants (in liturgy, vestments, ceremonies, symbols, altar location), and the revision of the Canons of 1604 by incorporating, for example, the Lambeth Articles of Faith into the Thirty-Nine Articles.[29] By the late 1620s, however, some contemporaries began to identify Laudian and Arminian tendencies of worship within the Church of England. These included the railing off of altars in the east end of churches, more extensive use of the Book of Common Prayer at the expense of sermons, support for royal policies from the pulpit, and the practices of bowing and signing the cross at scribed moments during worship and of kneeling to receive holy communion. Bishop William Laud argued for the universality of grace being freely available to all. Richard Montagu's recognition of Arminianism and Roman Catholicism as legitimate Christian faiths received only inconclusive examination.[30] The Church's support during 1626–28 for the King's Forced Loan was also noted. These developments were considered by some to be obstacles to further ecclesiastical reform and indications of a burgeoning "papism" centered at Whitehall.[31] The political impact of a defensively hostile Calvinist worldview allegedly defending English rights and liberties and popularized by John Foxe was most evident in the aforementioned rhetorical shift from constitutional to religious strategies in attacks on the King's prerogative powers during the parliament of 1628.

The session opened on 17 March in an atmosphere of reserved cordiality. Charles reminded parliament in his opening speech that "there are times for action; wherefore, for example's sake, I mean not to spend much time in words, expecting accordingly, that your (as I hope) good resolutions will be speedy." After further reminding the members of the necessities of war and of "common dangers," the King requested "such supply as to secure ourselves and to save our friends [referring to the Huguenots under siege at La Rochelle] from imminent ruin." He threatened that "if you (which God forbid) should not do your duties in contributing what the state at this time needs[,] I must in discharge of my conscience use those other means which God hath put in my hand."[32] This warning drew an equivocal response from the Commons. Charles's threat to seek "other means" not only reminded the House of alleged recent abuses against subjects' property and liberty, but also underscored the importance of voting subsidies in order to avoid dissolution. The Commons, in turn, addressed these issues simultaneously through use of religious rhetoric to shift political responsibility increasingly away from evil counselors and onto the King himself.

A week of general debate following the King's speech concerned the state of the government and the kingdom's religious health. The Commons then turned its attention on 24 March to recusancy, Jesuits, billeting, the allegedly illegal imprisonment of

loan refusers, and the royalist sermons of Robert Sibthorpe and of Roger Manwaring in support of the Forced Loan. At the same time, a separate committee prepared a bill for five subsidies (for £275,000) that would supply about one-fifth of the monies the king needed. Expecting the Commons' grievances to be settled, the Committee of the Whole voted on 4 April to grant the King five subsidies. As no actual subsidy bill had yet been drafted, the vote was a statement of intent rather than a legally binding act. Because the House approved the subsidies in principle, it informed Charles of its intent on 7 April.[33] The King, overjoyed with the prospect of revenues, declared, "[a]t first I liked Parliaments but since—I know not how—I was grown to a distaste of them. But I am now where I was. I love Parliaments. I shall rejoice to meet with my people often."[34] This euphoria was short-lived. D'Ewes had already noted previously on 27 March that "it being already generally feared that this present Parliament, and all the good from it, would come to nothing."[35] The House of Commons had gained assurance of its continuous sitting until it voted to raise the subsidies in question, but for most of March and April, it refused to proceed in supplying the remainder of the needed funds. Through Wentworth's influence, the bill for Five Subsidies was held up in Committee.[36] Instead, on 29 April, the Commons drafted a bill on the liberties of the subject.[37] This bill addressed the alleged illegality of billeting soldiers without the householder's permission, the levying of loans and taxes without parliamentary assent, and the imprisoning of subjects without trial or bail. Charles's secretary of state, Sir John Coke (not to be confused with Sir Edward Coke), warned the House that this bill impinged on the royal prerogative. Subsequently, debate led by Wentworth attempted to modify the bill into a Remonstrance that claimed that the specified illegalities had been committed by the King's ministers and not by his express authority, since Charles possessed no power to command illegal acts.[38] This Remonstrance was presented to Charles on 5 May.[39] Forewarned of its content and not deceived by the dubious distinction made by the Commons between malfeasance and misfeasance in his prerogative, the King replied that "he would not hear of any encroachment upon the sovereignty or prerogative which God had put into his hands."[40] Charles's unyielding position angered the Commons, which now responded by drafting the Petition of Right that more clearly and forcefully presented the same grievances. In addition, the Commons refused to report the bill of Five Subsidies out of Committee until Charles first accepted the Petition.[41]

Debate in the Commons regarding the King's objection to attacks on his ministers and to the Remonstrance of 5 May, both of which Charles interpreted as attacks on his royal prerogative, led the House to entertain the possibility that "a common, shared language could articulate different, even contrary positions."[42] The Commons, however, did

not easily abandon the legal idiom, which reflected the contemporary belief that "words might themselves possess an authority which permitted no different interpretation." The House, therefore, repeated its attempt to "codify the law as a means to resolving political problems" in the Petition of Right.[43] The Petition reflected the persistent hope of the Commons that clear legal articulation could express a distinction between the inviolability of the royal prerogative and its execution through royal officers.

These deliberations, however, were accompanied by an increased awareness of the rhetorical possibilities provided by a Calvinist world-view. The issue of Arminianism, although set aside for the time being, had been assiduously investigated in separate committees chaired by John Pym and subsequently could serve as a pretext to prepare indictments against alleged "popish conspirators" on short notice. The House of Commons was fully aware that the Calvinist world-view could be employed—as could Sir John Coke's legal idiom—in direct and comprehensive attacks on the nature of Charles's entire court through targeting his ministers and favorites.[44] Peter Lake's contention—namely, that "[t]he application of a given set of symbols or nexus of attitudes to a particular run of events is largely a product of the circumstances, character, and purposes of the persons involved"—was now borne out following Charles's lukewarm acceptance of the Petition of Right.[45]

The Petition addressed the grievances formerly included in the Remonstrance of 5 May in what one historian calls "a harder and more obnoxious form."[46] Formulated in this form, these grievances were to be enacted, upon the King's acceptance, with the binding force of law. The text refrained from attacking Charles directly, but asserted that past actions done by his orders had been in direct violation of the laws of England.[47] While the Petition was being drafted, the King attempted between 7 May and 25 May to conciliate the House of Lords. On 12 May, Charles sent a letter to the latter in which he consented to "never again imprison anyone for refusing to lend him money, and that when he did imprison he would always disclose the cause as soon as it could be done conveniently for the safety of the State."[48] In the same letter, however, Charles stood firm on his prerogative rights:

> We find it still insisted on, that in no case whatsoever, though they should never so nearly concern matters of state and government, we or our Privy Council have power to commit a man without cause shown, whereas it often happens that should be cause shown the service itself would thereby be destroyed and defeated. And [that] the cause alleged must be such as may be determined by our judges of our courts at Westminster in a legal and ordinary way of justice,

> whereas the cause may be such as those judges have no capacity of judicature nor rules of law to direct and guide their judgments in causes of that transcendent nature which happening so often, the very intermitting of the constant rules of government for so many ages within this kingdom practiced would soon disclose the very frame and foundation of our monarchy. . . . Without overthrow of sovereignty we cannot suffer this power to be impeached. Notwithstanding to clear our conscience and just intentions, we publish that it is not in our heart, nor will we ever extend our regal power (lent onto us from God) beyond that just rule of moderation in anything which shall be contrary to our laws and customs, wherein the safety of our peoples shall be our only aim.[49]

Charles's letter caused the Lords to test the viability of a conciliatory approach. Because of the King's promise not to imprison loan refusers without showing just cause, the Lords proposed that the Petition be brought into conformity with the King's letter.[50] When the Commons rejected this suggestion, both Houses further debated the extent to which the Petition impinged on the royal prerogative. The Commons resolved to leave the Petition unamended, while Buckingham urged the Lords to water down its language. Some Lords wanted a formulation that would leave Charles free to execute his prerogative authority, but would hold his ministers liable to prosecution. The problem with this, it was argued, was that it would allow Charles to claim that his officers were merely following his orders. This impasse between the two Houses was broken on 28 May when a group of leading Lords voted against the inclusion of any amendments to water down the Petition. These Lords included not only prior opponents of the Forced Loan, but also men who had been personally alienated by Charles's policies, such as Bishop Abbot, Bishop Williams, the Earl of Arundel, and the Earl of Bristol.[51] Couched in gracious and obsequious language, the Petition listed existing laws protecting English subjects from the alleged abuses recently endured. It asked "the King's Most Excellent Majesty" to consent that,

> no man hereafter be compelled to make or yield any gift, loan, benevolence, tax, or any such like charge without common consent by act of parliament, and that none be called to make answer or take such oath or give attendance or be confined or otherwise molested or disquieted concerning the same or refusal thereof. And that no freeman in any such manner as is before mentioned be imprisoned or detained. And that your Majesty would be pleased

> to remove the said soldiers and mariners, and that your people may not be so burdened in time to come. And that the aforesaid commissions for proceeding by martial law may be revoked and annulled. And that hereafter no commissions of like nature may issue forth to any persons whatsoever to be executed as aforesaid, lest by color of them any of your Majesty's subjects be destroyed or put to death contrary to the laws of this land.[52]

Once adopted by both Houses, the Petition of Right awaited the King's response.

The King prevaricated for several weeks, during which he consulted his judges to determine how assent to the Petition might affect his prerogative powers. They informed him that he could still imprison loan refusers for "a convenient time" before a writ of habeas corpus would apply, but that the particulars of any such adjudication could only be based on the merits of a case at hand.[53] At the same time, Charles received news that Catholic forces had defeated his ally, King Christian IV of Denmark. Similarly, Admiral Denbigh's attempt to lift the siege of La Rochelle had failed. Under these circumstances, and having lost the support of the Lords, Charles resigned himself to accept the Petition. His first response on 2 June, however, was stated in such ambiguous language that he succeeded only in further antagonizing parliament. Without referring to the Petition, he stated that

> The King willeth that right be done according to the laws and customs of the realm; and that the statutes be put in due execution, that his subjects may have no cause to complain of any wrongs or oppressions contrary to their just rights and liberties, to the preservation whereof he holds himself in conscience as well obliged as of his prerogative.[54]

Aside from reiterating his prerogative rights and powers, Charles's reply deviated from the traditional reply ("*soit droit fait comme est desire*") required to give the Petition binding authority, and thus effected no legal outcome. The House of Commons was so dismayed that it immediately repeated the attacks made before 1628 on Charles's ministers. On 3 June, Francis Rouse (John Pym's half-brother) attacked Manwaring's royalist sermons on taxation and obedience,[55] and Eliot recapitulated the grievances of the Commons.

Rouse charged Manwaring with attempting "to alter and subvert the frame and fabrik of this estate and common-wealth." In a "mischievous plot to alter and subvert the frame of government" replete with "sundry Jesuits and friars with whom he consulted and traded his divinity," Manwaring had allegedly employed the "judgment

of a false prophet" to corrupt the King, to persuade English subjects that they are bound to obey illegal commands, and to create discord between the populace and their ruler. For Rouse, Manwaring also "robs the subjects of their property of their goods," and "seeks to blow up parliaments and parliamentary powers."[56] Distinctions between the followers of true and false prophets were also alleged in order to instill a sense of apocalyptic urgency in the House and to isolate Charles's counselors. Rouse's allusions to the Gunpowder Plot and allegations of popish conspiracy were immediately echoed in Eliot's speech.[57]

Although not infused with the heated religious rhetoric of Rouse's anti-popery, Eliot did not limit himself to strict legal constructions. His speech illustrated how political, religious, and common law concerns intertwined to generate a powerful challenge to royal authority, as the King quickly recognized. Eliot reminded the Commons that present domestic grievances and international setbacks reflected "not so much the strength of our enemies, as the weakness of ourselves."[58] He identified the cause of England's condition as "insincerity and doubling in Religion," which is "the greatest and most dangerous disorder of all others." Sincerity in religion, Eliot claimed, would bring "maturity of councils, sufficiency of generals, incorruption in officers, opulence in the King, liberty in the people, repletion in treasure, plenty of provisions, reparation of ships, preservation of men: our ancient English virtue. . . ." He noted that "as the heavens oppose themselves to us for our impiety, so it is we that first opposed the heavens." To support this assertion, he cited the toleration of "Papists in the North" and the neglect of Elizabeth I's policies whereby she had "depressed her enemies, and upheld her friends." Eliot compared Elizabeth's Spanish foreign policy with that of the King, and thereby revealed the "Insufficiency and Unfaithfulness of our Generals" at Cadiz, Rhé, and La Rochelle as both a cause and effect of England's martial and moral degradation. As in many of his previous speeches that sought to defend the "true Faith" and oppose Charles's policies simultaneously, Eliot employed a religious rhetoric to implicate royal officers at the highest levels of government in an alleged popish conspiracy, which "might be thought a conception from Spain." This indictment of the King's policies and, in effect, of Buckingham and his coterie, led Charles to urge both Houses to expedite business concerning supply.[59]

The Commons, despite several objections to Eliot's bold implications, disregarded this royal message, and instead drafted a Declaration of Commons against Manwaring. Pym's influence, as expressed in his lengthy speech concerning the anti-Calvinist elements in Manwaring's works, was patent.[60] The Commons characterized Manwaring's sermons as "wicked and malicious," for they aimed to

> seduce and misguide the conscience of the king, touching the observation of the laws and customs of the kingdom, and the rights and liberties of the subjects; to incense his royal displeasure against his good subjects so refusing; to scandalize, subvert, and impeach the good laws of government of this realm, and the authority of the high court of parliament; to alienate the king's heart from his people, and to cause jealousies, sedition, and divisions in the kingdom.[61]

Charles responded by warning the Commons not to interfere with affairs of state and by adjourning the House of Lords on the next day, 5 June. This led the lower house to believe that the King intended to adjourn, prorogue, or dissolve parliament. In order to finish its business, the Commons resumed its ministerial attacks. Leading members—Eliot, Coke, Long, Digges, Rich, Prynne, Selden, Coryton, and Kirton—steered the debate. Coke declared:

> I think the Duke of Buckingham is the cause of all our miseries, and till the King be informed thereof, we shall never go out with honor here. That man is the grievances of grievances. Let us set down the causes of all our disasters, and they will all reflect upon him.[62]

This determination made Charles reconsider his course of action. On 7 June, he said that he had meant only to remind the Commons to address present rather than past issues, whereupon the House asked the King to give an unambiguous response to the Petition. He promptly did so in the traditional formulation. This appeased the Commons, which set aside its pending attack on Buckingham, but nevertheless maintained its anti-court, anti-popish strategy by attacking Manwaring between 8 June and 12 June. On 12 June, the Commons finally passed a bill to raise the Five Subsidies and, aware that time was running out, passed judgment on Manwaring. It ordered that he be sent to prison, fined £1,000, and declared unfit to hold ecclesiastical office. His sermons were to be burned. The King's ministers, however, did not immediately carry out the sentence.[63] This accomplished, the House moved on to consider more influential "papists" at the royal court. Within a week, the fears concerning the supposed popish conspiracy and intrigue that had pervaded the session erupted into full debate.

On 13 June the Commons decided that "Dr. Neile, bishop of Winchester and Dr. Laud, bishop of Bath and Wells, be named to be those near about the king who are suspected to be Arminians." The details of this accusation were left unspecified, presumably because its invocation of the malevolent influence of "evil counselors"

had been well rehearsed in the recent attacks by the Commons on Sibthorpe, Manwaring, and Buckingham. This imputation was certainly the House's intention when, on the following day, 14 June, it drafted a Remonstrance against Buckingham as "being the cause of all grievances." This Remonstrance reiterated the Calvinist worldview employed by Eliot in his 3 June speech on the grievances of the Commons.[64]

Following Eliot's lead, the Remonstrance informed Charles that "there is a general fear in your people of some secret working and combination to introduce into your kingdom some innovation and change in our holy religion," and also a "fear that there is some secret and strong co-operation here with the enemies abroad." The "imminent dangers" and "urgent affairs of this church and government" were blamed on Buckingham's "excessive power." "[S]ince that abuse is the cause of these evils," the Remonstrance urged Charles "to consider whether it be safe for the king and commonwealth, that a man of his power should be so near his majesty." Buckingham's power and patronage were further linked to "the increase of Popery within this kingdom." This, the Remonstrance alleged, was manifested in the favor "papists" receive at court "which is conceived to amount to no less than a toleration, odious to God," and in their "meetings and conferences," where they plot "to the hazard of your majesty's safety and the state." Further complaints included the alleged suppression of Calvinist works and preaching, the open profession and practice of "popish religion" in Ireland, and the "daily growth of the Arminians, that being, as your majesty well knows, but a cunning way to bring in popery." Such suspect persons were "Protestants in shew, but jesuits in opinion and practice." For the rest, the Remonstrance decried the dishonorable maritime defeats under Buckingham's charge, the Duke's use of royal monopolies "for private gain" at the expense of the national economy, the increased incidence of Dunkirk piracy against English vessels, and the "decay of trade, and destruction and loss of ships and mariners." This formal indictment of Buckingham was presented to Charles on 16 June. The King countered by announcing his intention to prorogue the parliament on 26 June.

During the remaining ten days, both Houses did all in their power to curtail what they considered royal absolutism. On 21 June, the Lords ordered Manwaring to submit a formal retraction of his support for Charles's use of prerogative powers. His submission read in part, "I do here . . . acknowledge the many errors and indiscretions which I have committed."[65] Furthermore, he conceded his sermons "to have been full of many dangerous passages, inferences, and scandalous aspersions."[66] The Commons also returned to the question of Charles's allegedly illegal collection of revenues. The House drafted another Remonstrance, this concerning Tonnage and Poundage, on 21 June. The Commons conceded that the matter needed much

more detailed attention, but declared nevertheless that "the receiving of Tonnage and Poundage, and other Impositions, not granted by parliament, is a breach of the fundamental liberties of this kingdom, and contrary to your majesty's royal answer to our late Petition of Right." It would be "much more prejudicial to the right of the subject, if your majesty should continue to receive the same, without authority of law, after the termination of the session."[67] The difference between this second Remonstrance and the Petition of Right is that the former no longer sought to place criminal blame solely on royal officers or ministers. Instead, ultimate responsibility was laid at the feet of the King.

Early in the morning of 26 June, the date Charles had warned would end the session, he summoned the Commons to attend him in the House of Lords, where he promptly prorogued the parliament. Blaming "divers fiery spirits," Charles left the Commons with unfinished business that, as the session of 1629 would later indicate, would cripple further attempts to reconcile the court and parliament. The prorogation also confirmed suspicions that the threat of "popery" lurked in the form of royal ministers, because once again parliament had been ended to save Buckingham and to thwart new attacks on Laud and Neile. Popular opinion accepted these developments as confirmation of the subversive potential of Arminianism.[68] In November 1628, Matthew Sutclift, the Dean of Exeter, preached that he hated "the apostates from faith and traitors to God's true Church . . . those among us that palliate Popish heresies and under the name of Arminius seek to bring in Poperie, and endeavor with all the skill to reconcile darkness to light."[69] For his part, D'Ewes noted that he could not tell what Buckingham's religion was, but firmly believed the Duke "had highly provoked God."[70]

Events between the parliamentary sessions of 1628 and 1629 conspired to confirm suspicions held both by Charles and by Parliamentarians. Charles perceived parliamentary leadership as a populist Puritan plot to undermine monarchy itself.[71] From the royalist perspective, criticism or opposition to the Court was simply viewed as "persecution, insubordination, or subversion."[72] On 27 January 1629 the King ordered that copies of the Petition of Right printed by the Commons for public distribution be destroyed.[73] In their place, Charles circulated an edition of the Petition with his 2 June reply along with his 26 June speech that warned against any "false construction" of the Petition that prohibited the collection of Tonnage and Poundage.[74] Five months previously, on 23 August 1628, John Felton had assassinated the Duke of Buckingham.[75] "Buckingham's death eliminated at a single stroke the personality who had served, in terms of political logic, to explain entirely the unhappy state of the nation."[76] This decisive political event inaugurated Charles's personal rule.[77]

The discourse of anti-popery inhibited moderate discussion and made consensual politics impossible during Charles I's reign.[78] So long as the King defended his prerogative powers, protected his supporters with royal appointments, identified Calvinism with Puritanism, and equated Puritanism with subversion, the Parliamentarians were left with little alternative in 1629 but to repeat the 1628 strategy of linking religion and constitutional politics. As Sir Henry Earle noted in parliament on 27 January 1629:

> As for the passing of bills, settling of revenues and the like, without settling religion, you take away my life, and not only mine, but the life of the whole state and kingdom. For I boldly say, never was there in point of substance a more near connection between the matter of religion and the matter of state in any kingdom in the world than there is in this kingdom at this day.[79]

Renewed attacks on Arminians demonstrated the continued pertinence of the Foxean intellectual framework and its ability to challenge royal authority. Regardless of whether the Parliamentarians perceived absolutism as a prelude to "popery" or "popery" as a prelude to absolutism, both scenarios were framed in similar terms and led to similar conclusions about monarchy in England.

NOTES

Linda Hayner provided helpful comments and constructive criticisms on the original conference presentation draft.

1. Margaret Judson, *The Crisis of the Constitution* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers State University Press, 1988), 248. The first edition appeared in 1949.

2. A sample of recent scholarship ranges from Glenn Burgess, *The Politics of the Ancient Constitution, 1603–1642* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1992) and J. P. Sommerville, *Politics and Ideology in England, 1603–1640* (New York: Longman, 1986) to David Como, *Blown by the Spirit: Puritanism and the Emergence of an Antinomian Underground in Pre-Civil-War England* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004) and Peter Lake, *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004).

3. The literature on Puritans, Puritanism and the Puritan Revolution is massive. Three historians —Christopher Hill, *Puritanism and Revolution* (New York: Schocken Books, 1967) and *The Intellectual Origins of the English Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965); William Haller, *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1955); and Michael Walzer, *The Revolution of the Saints* (Boston: Atheneum, 1969)—revived polemical interest into the origins of the English Civil Wars and the role of Puritanism therein. On the varieties of Puritan experiences, see Jerald C. Brauer, "Types of Puritan Piety," *Church History* 56.1 (1987), 39–58 and Patrick Collinson, *The Religion of Protestants* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982). On the Calvinist world-view inherited from Elizabethan times, see Peter Lake, "The Significance of the Elizabethan Identification of the Pope as Antichrist," *Journal of Ecclesiastical*

History 31.2 (1980), 161–78; Carol Z. Wiener, "The Beleaguered Isle: A Study of Elizabethan and Early Jacobean Anti-Catholicism," *Past and Present* 51 (1971), 27–62; and idem, "Puritanism, Anti-Catholicism, and English Politics, 1621–41," in Michael G. Finlayson, ed., *Historians, Puritanism and the English Revolution* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983), 96. Tom Webster has more recently provided a prosopographic composite of the Puritan worldview seen through the minds of individual clergymen in *Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement, 1620–1643* (Cambridge: The University of Cambridge Press, 2003). Finally, J. Sears McGee provides a useful Tudor-Stuart bibliography on H-Albion at <http://www.h-net.msu.edu/~albion/logs/logsapr95/0089.html> (posted 13 April 1995, accessed 2 January 2008). Kevin Sharpe has provocatively asserted that "it is now orthodox to dismiss [Christopher] Hill's and [Michael] Walzer's identification of a revolutionary Puritanism and even to play down the differences between puritans and Anglicans…. [S]cholarship has valuably demonstrated that *simple* polarities between 'Anglican' and 'puritan' cannot be sustained." See Sharpe, *The Personal Rule of Charles I* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1992), 731–32. Sharpe further argues (757) that "committed puritans remained," before 1637, "a small band who often felt themselves beleaguered outcasts; unsupported by their neighbors, as well as hounded by ecclesiastical authorities, a few took ship to New England. If puritanism was not popular, radical puritans were a tiny sect, not a large band."

4. Protestants who advocated further reforms in the Church of England are generally referred to as Puritans. First used as an epithet by their religious opponents or social detractors under Elizabeth I and James I, the term gained widespread acceptance after the national prominence of Arminianism under Charles I; see Conrad Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621–1629* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1979), 27. Derek Hirst reminds us that the term Puritan, which he defines as a "cluster of attitudes" during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, has long, and confusingly, served the cause of reductive interpretations of the course of English history between the Reformation and the Restoration. See his *Authority and Conflict: England, 1603–1658* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986), 66. "Not all Puritans," however, "were puritan," as Conrad Russell notes. In fact, he argues that "almost the only person to lay claim to the title of 'Puritan' for himself was so improbable a character as John Donne." Russell concludes that "[t]here can thus be no agreed definition of 'Puritanism', and any statement about what Puritans believed must be mainly a reflection of the definition chosen." See *The Crisis of Parliaments: English History, 1509–1660* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971), 167. Hugh Trevor-Roper's definition of Puritanism adds yet another distinction by cutting horizontally between high church Calvinism and low church Puritanism. Defining the former, which was representative of the church establishment under James I, as "authoritarian, elitist, and even ceremonious" in relation to the latter, which was representative of the parish laity, as "individualist, moralizing, anticlerical and philistine," Trevor-Roper warns that "the terms [Puritan and Calvinist] were often confused in common speech". William Laud's chaplain and biographer, Peter Heylen, was sensitive to this distinction when he wrote, "nor am I of opinion that Puritan and Calvinian are terms convertible, for though all Puritans are Calvinians, both in doctrine and in practice, yet all Calvinians are not to be counted as Puritans also; whose practices many of them abhor and whose conformities they detest." See Hugh Trevor-Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans and Puritans* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987), 44. The debate has not subsided. Peter Lake

recently argued that Puritanism was rather "a series of negative gestures directed against the [Elizabethan] settlement and the Church it created." See *Moderate Puritans and the Elizabethan Church* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 1.

5. This mentality exhibits a strong nationalist, xenophobic, and anti-Catholic tendency. The first polemicist of this tradition was John Bale, a Carmelite turned Protestant reformer. Prolific during the 1540s and 1550s, Bale's exegesis of the biblical books of 1 and 2 John, Daniel, Revelations, and Thessalonians created a view of the universe as polarized between the forces of good and evil. Bale expanded Augustine's two cities into two churches, of Christ and of the Antichrist. He identified the Pope as the Antichrist and the institutional forms of his power as Babylon, thereby questioning the apostolic tradition and the validity of the pre-Reformation Christian Church: "[b]y co-joining the prophesies of St. John with historical and contemporary events, John Bale created an important method of biblical exegesis and a new view of the past. Furthermore, he established a framework that placed the contemporary call for reformation in chronological perspective, emphasized the necessity of spiritual strife, and promised the preordained triumph of those who fought for the true Protestant church." See Paul Christianson, *Reformers in Babylon* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978), 21.

6. John Clifton, "Fear of Popery," in Conrad Russell, ed., *The Origins of the English Civil War* (London: Macmillan, 1973), 148. Elizabeth I ordered copies of Foxe's works placed alongside Erasmus's *Paraphrases* in parish churches throughout England. Also see Peter Lake, "Anti-Popery: The Structure of a Prejudice," in Richard Cust and Ann Hughes, eds., *Conflict in Early-Modern England* (London: Longman, 1988), 75, 77.

7. Christianson, *Reformers in Babylon*, 8.

8. Haller, *Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution*, 19–20.

9. Christopher Hill, *Antichrist in Seventeenth-Century England* (London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1971), 45.

10. Christianson, *Reformers in Babylon*, 95–96; Hill, *Antichrist in Seventeenth-Century England*, 44–45.

11. Fewer books on the subject of the Antichrist were published as Bishop Laud's influence grew (c. 1624–25), and the Church of England no longer proclaimed Foxean beliefs once he became primate in 1633. See Hill, *Antichrist,* 37–38, 65 and Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590–1630* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 184.

12. See L. J. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 71.

13. See Peter Lake, "Calvinism and the English Church 1570–1635," *Past and Present* 114 (1987), 39–44.

14. Richard Cust and Ann Hughes, eds., *Conflict in Early Modern England* (London: Longman, 1988), 22.

15. Derek Hirst, *Authority and Conflict: England, 1603–1658* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986), 66.

16. Nicholas Tyacke, "Puritanism, Arminianism and Counter Revolution," in Russell, *The Origins of the English Civil War*, 120.

17. L. J. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, 276–77.

18. See James F. Larkin, *Stuart Royal Proclamations, Vol II: Royal Proclamations of King Charles I, 1625–1646* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 197–99.

19. Simonds D'Ewes, *Autobiography and Correspondence*, 2 vols. (London, 1845), 1:37–72.

20. Samuel Gardiner, *History of England, 1603–1642*, 10 vols. (London: Longmans, Green, 1896), 6:227–28.

21. Charles Carlton, *Charles I: The Personal Monarch* (London: Routledge, 1983), 99.

22. Richard Cust, *The Forced Loan and English Politics, 1626–1628* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 88.

23. D'Ewes, *Autobiography and Correspondence*, 1:380.

24. Albert H. Tricomi, *Anti-court Drama in England: 1603–1642* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1989), 139, and Malcolm R. Smuts, *Court Culture and the Origins of a Royalist Tradition in Early Stuart England* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1987), 79.

25. Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics, 1621–1629,* 289.

26. Ibid., 341.

27. Ibid., 350.

28. Ibid., 375.

29. Leo Solt, *Church and State in Early Modern England, 1509–1640* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 140.

30. J. Sears McGee, "William Laud and the Outward Face of Religion," in Richard L. DeMolen, ed., *Leaders of the Reformation* (Toronto: Associated University Presses, 1984), 329 and Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590–1630* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1987), 180.

31. Anthony Fletcher's *The Outbreak of the English Civil War* (New York: New York University Press, 1981) and Caroline Hibbard's *Charles I and the Popish Plot* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983) argue that perceptions of an Arminian threat to English rights, liberties, and property became significant only in the late 1630s and early 1640s. In addition, a number of works further assert that Arminian theology only challenged Calvinist hegemony within the Anglican Church after Charles's accession in 1625. See G. W. Bernard, "The Church of England c. 1529–c. 1642," *History* 75 (1990), 183–206; Hugh Trevor-Roper, *Catholics, Anglicans, and Puritans*; J. Sears McGee "William Laud and the Outward Face of Religion," 318–44; Nicolas Tyacke *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590–1630*; Peter Lake, "Calvinism and the English Church 1570–1635," *Past and Present* 114 (1987), 32–76, and idem, "Anti-Popery: The Structure of a Prejudice," 72–106.

32. J.P. Kenyon, *The Stuart Constitution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986), 67.

33. An actual subsidy bill still needed to be drawn up so that the House could formally vote on its language. Typical procedure concerning House bills was to vote on a "first reading" to indicate preliminary approval and then to continue working on the bill in committee. This was a way of showing constructive good will without making a commitment until the Commons got what it wanted. I thank Malcolm Smuts for clarifying this procedure.

34. Roger Lockyer *The Early Stuarts: A Political History of England, 1603–1642* (Harlow: Longman Group UK, 1990), 227.

35. D'Ewes, *Autobiography and Correspondence*, 1:373.

36. Russell, *The Crisis of Parliaments*, 307.

37. Gardiner, *History of England*, 6:264–65.

38. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, 24–26.

39. Ben Bragge, ed., *The Proceedings of the Lords and Commons in the year 1628 Against Roger Manwaring, Doctor of Divinity* (London, 1719).

40. Gardiner, *History of England*, 6:264.

41. Kenyon, *The Stuart Constitution*, 68–71.

42. Kevin Sharpe, *Politics and Ideas in Early Stuart England* (London: Pinter Publishers, 1989), 40.

43. Sharpe, *Politics and Ideas*, 40–41.

44. Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics*, 345.

45. Peter Lake, "Constitutional Consensus and Puritan Opposition in the 1620's: Thomas Scott and the Spanish Match," *Historical Journal* 25 (1982), 825.

46. Gardiner, *History of England*, 6:275.

47. Ibid.

48. Ibid., 6:277.

49. Quoted in Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics*, 362.

50. Gardiner, *History of England*, 6:277.

51. This group also included the earls of Saye and Sele, Clare, Essex, Lincoln, Warwick, and the recent addition of Bedford. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, 22.

52. Quoted in Kenyon, *The Stuart Constitution*, 70.

53. Gardiner, *History of England*, 6:294–95.

54. Ibid., 6:297.

55. Appointed Chaplain to Charles I in 1626, Roger Manwaring's sermons before the King in St. Giles Church in 1628 declared not only that the King's royal command imposing taxes and loans without consent of Parliament was binding on the conscience of the subjects of the kingdom (at peril of damnation), but also maintained that the authority of parliament was not necessary for raising aids and subsidies. Referred to as *Religion and Allegiance*, these sermons were printed along with another sermon in the same vein. See Roger Manwaring, *Three Sermons* (London, 1627).

56. Cobbett, *Parliamentary History of England*, 36 vols. (London: T. Curson Hansard, 1806), 2:377–79.

57. Ibid., 2:380–85. Eliot described England's state of affairs in the terms employed in Thomas Scott's satirical *Vox Populi* (Leyden, 1620).

58. Cobbett, *Parliamentary History of England*, 2:381.

59. Ibid., 2:381–85.

60. Ibid., 2:388–400.

61. Ibid., 2:389.

62. Gardiner, *History of England*, 6:305.

63. Manwaring made submission to the House on his knees in 1629 and was pardoned by the King. Returned to ecclesiastical office by the latter, Manwaring would become Dean of Worcester in 1633 and Bishop of St. David's in 1635 before being imprisoned and finally stripped of office by the Long Parliament.

64. Cobbett, *Parliamentary History of England*, 2:419–20.

65. Ibid., 2:430–32.

66. Ibid., 2:420–27.

67. Ibid., 2:432–33.

68. G. W. Bernard, "The Church of England, c. 1529–c. 1642," *History* 75 (1990), 302, and Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, 93.

69. Nicholas Tyacke, *Anti-Calvinists: The Rise of English Arminianism, c. 1590–1630*, 215.

70. D'Ewes, *Autobiography and Correspondence*, 1:288, 386.

71. The reality of this mode of political thought was reflected in Charles's identification of "the malevolent disposition of some ill affected persons" as responsible for parliament's failure in 1628. Quoted in Hirst, *Authority and Conflict*, 84.

72. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, 177.

73. Previous and concerted attacks on Buckingham by members of parliament inclined the King into believing that a "relatively small group of ideologically motivated men" were contesting his authority over "the integrity of the whole system." See Lake, "Anti-Popery: The Structure of a Prejudice," 91 and Smuts, *Court Culture*, 35.

74. Russell, *Parliaments and English Politics*, 399.

75. Felton's motives can only be inferred from the fact that he had been passed up for naval promotion and that a copy of the Petition of Right was found sewn into his hatband. See Gardiner, *History of England*, 6:349–51.

76. Reeve, *Charles I and the Road to Personal Rule*, 35.

77. Hirst, *Authority and Conflict*, 155.

78. Smuts, *Court Culture*, 276.

79. Quoted in Wallace Notestein and Frances Relf, *Commons Debates for* 1629 (Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota, 1921), 19.

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 European, Asian, U.S., Southern, and South Carolina history are routinely presented. 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 1 January to 31 December. Student members must currently be enrolled in school. Regular members are those who are employed or are actively seeking employment. Life members are ten-year members of the organization who have retired. To renew or join, please return this application with your check to: Rodger Stroup, Treasurer SCHA, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 8301 Parklane Road, Columbia SC 29223
Telephone: (803) 896-6185; Fax: (803) 896-6186; E-mail: stroup@scdah.state.sc.us

Name and title (please print)

Address

City, state, and zip code

Phone/Institutional affiliation

E-mail address

Membership category (check one):

- ❑ Student ($10)
- ❑ Regular ($20)
- ❑ Life member

Membership status (check one:)

- ❑ Renewal
- ❑ New

Area(s) of interest

Minutes of the Seventy-seventh Annual Meeting
3 March 2007

The South Carolina Historical Association held its seventy-seventh annual meeting on 3 March 2007 at Coastal Carolina University. Registration was conducted from 8:30. a.m. to 9:00 a.m. with coffee and assorted pastries. Concurrent sessions began at 9:30 a.m.

Session I: 9:30 a.m.–10:45 a.m.
Panel A: African-Americans in South Carolina [Edwards 251]
Chair: Janet Hudson (University of South Carolina, Continuing Education)

Mary Jo Fairchild (College of Charleston) "African American Museums, Cultural Centers and Historic Sites as Social Movements: The Impact of Historical, Cultural and Educational Dissemination on the Quest for Equality in Twentieth Century America."

Cherisse Jones-Branch (Arkansas State University): "May We Pray That We Be Given Strength and Faith To Stand Together': Conflict, Change and the Charleston, South Carolina YWCA, 1940s–1960s."

Scott Withrow (North Greenville University and Greenville Tech) "Joseph Willis: South Carolinian and Free Person of Color. "

Panel B: Institutional Histories [Edwards 252]
Chair: John Hammond Moore (Independent Scholar)

John Matzko (Bob Jones University): "The Move of Bob Jones College from Cleveland, Tennessee to Greenville, South Carolina, 1946–47"

Elaine Townsend (University of South Carolina, Columbia): "A Brief History of the School of Social Work at the University of South Carolina 1934 through 1954"

Panel C: Education and History [Edwards 253]
Chair: Robin Copp (South Caroliniana Library)

Dr. Lars Seiler and Dr. Tracy Seiler, "Teaching World History in South Carolina Schools"

John J. Navin (Coastal Carolina University) "Employing Upper Level History Courses in Civic Engagement Efforts"

Session II: 11:00 a.m.–12:15 p.m.

Panel D: The Confederacy [Edwards 251]
Chair: Tracy Power (South Carolina Department of Archives & History)

Lewie Reece (Anderson University) "The Man and the Hour Have Met: Jefferson Davis, Confederate Nationalism, and Southern Unionism"

Barry A. Price (Coastal Carolina University): "From the Trenches to the Graveyard: The Confederate Veteran and the Image of the Conquered Warriors of the Lost Cause"

Panel E: Global Gatherings [Edwards 252]
Chair: Linda Hayner (Bob Jones University)

Kevin Witherspoon (Lander University): "Before the Eyes of the World:' The 1968 Olympics and Mexican National Identity

Philip Whalen (Coastal Carolina University): "Confessional Absolutism under Charles I, 1625–1642"

Panel F: South Carolina History [Edwards 253]
Chair: Tyler Boulware (West Virginia University)

Elaine Nichols (South Carolina State Museum): "Sullivan's Island Pest Houses: Quarantine Stations For the Sick and Dying"

Edward Salo (Brockington and Associates, Inc.) "Operating by Charters: The Legal Regulation of Ferries in South Carolina from 1709 to 1898"

Kate O'Donnell (University of South Carolina, Columbia): "The Republican Mother in South Carolina 1790–1840"

Luncheon, Keynote Address and Business Meeting 12:30 p.m.–2:15 p.m
Wall Building
President Bernard Powers introduced Dr. Walter J. Fraser emeritus professor of history from Georgia Southern University. Dr. Fraser is the author of *Lowcountry Hurricanes: Three Centuries of Storms at Sea and Ashore.* He presented an interesting review of the impact of hurricanes on the South Carolina coast.

Additional business
Following Dr. Fraser's remarks President Powers called the annual business meeting to order. The minutes of the 2006 annual meeting were approved as printed in the *Proceedings*.

Rodger Stroup, treasurer, presented the treasurer's report. Dr. Stroup commented that the Association finished 2006 in the black. The increase in dues instituted in 2005 has enabled the Association to cover the increased costs of publishing the *Proceedings* without having to increase subscription costs for libraries.

The nominating committee presented the following slate of officers and board members:
President: Joyce Wood (Anderson University)
Vice President: Andrew Myers (USC Upstate)
Secretary: Lars Seiler (Spring Valley High School)
Treasurer: Rodger Stroup (SC Department of Archives & History)
At-Large: E. E. "Wink" Prince (Coastal Carolina University)
At-Large: Tracy Power (SC Department of Archives & History)
At-Large: Kevin Witherspoon (Lander University)
The report of the nominating committee was approved by acclimation.

Announcements
The 2008 meeting of the Association will be Saturday 1 March 2008 at the South Carolina Archives & History Center in Columbia.

Session III: 2:30 p.m.–4:00 p.m.
Panel G: Orangeburg Massacre [Edwards 251]
Chair: Marvin Dulaney (Avery Research Center, College of Charleston)
This panel consisted of scholars/activists closely acquainted with the events of early February 1968. Participating were Jack Bass, a co-author of *The Orangeburg Massacre*, and a Professor of Social Sciences and Humanities at the College of Charleston; and William Hine, a professor of history at South Carolina State University;

Panel H: Billy Sunday in S.C. [Edwards 252]
Chair: A.V. Huff, Jr. (Furman University)

Jon Newell (Bob Jones University): "Billy Sunday in Columbia"

G. David Mathues (Notre Dame University): "Billy Sunday's Charleston Campaign"

Paul Matzko (Bob Jones University): "Evangelist Billy Sunday's beliefs on Creation and Evolution"

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 and editors, manuscripts may be published in *The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association.*

In general, manuscripts should not exceed 4500 words (about eighteen double-spaced pages) including endnotes. As soon as possible after the annual meeting, authors should submit two paper copies and one electronic copy to the editors for review. The electronic copy should be submitted as an e-mail attachment in Word for Windows or WordPerfect for Windows format. E-mail addresses for the editors follow this note. The electronic text should be flush left and double-spaced, with as little special formatting as possible. Do not paginate the electronic version of the paper. All copies should use 12-point type in the Times New Roman font. Place your name and affiliation, along with both electronic and postal contact information, on a separate page. The title of the paper should be at the top of the first page of the text, in bold type. Please use margins of one inch throughout your paper and space only once between sentences. Indent five spaces without quotation marks all quotations five or more lines in length.

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 "NOTES" centered between the margins. List endnotes in Arabic numerical sequence, each number followed by a period and space, and then the text of the endnote. Endnotes should be flush left and single-spaced. If your word-processing program demands the raised footnote numeral, it will be acceptable. Foreign words and titles of books or journals should be italicized. For the rest, *The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association* adheres in matters of general usage to the fourteenth or fifteenth edition of *The Chicago Manual of Style.*

Editors:
Robert Figueira, Lander University, figueira@lander.edu
Stephen Lowe, University of South Carolina, lowesh@gwm.sc.edu