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Readers,

I have had the privilege of being a part of the creation of *The Gettysburg Historical Journal* for two years. Both years I have been impressed by the quality of work exhibited by students at Gettysburg College. This year was particularly impressive because not only did we receive many submissions from history students but from other disciplines relating to history as well. This provided us with a large pool from which to choose this year’s selections. This year’s *Journal*, perhaps more than any other year, reflects the variety and depth of the work done within the various halls that constitute Gettysburg College.

A goal of *The Gettysburg Historical Journal* has always been to provide a diverse selection of topics. Once again in this, the fifth volume of the Journal, we have strived to bring a variety of subjects together. From subjects such as the 1954 *Brown vs. Board of Education* decision to transportation systems of Pennsylvania we see the creativity of our contributors.

The fact that so many students have submitted their work to be criticized and analyzed by a group of editors as well as to be read by the public demonstrates the confidence they have in their own abilities. Unfortunately we were not able to print every submission we received. There were many worthy of this *Journal*. Here are the best of the best. We now submit this publication to you as a reflection of the great work that is being done throughout our campus. I am proud to call these students my fellow scholars and my hope is that you will enjoy reading their work as much as I have.

Stephanie M. Bender
General Editor
Southern slaveholding women during the Civil War are usually portrayed as either Eve or the Virgin Mary. They are either depicted as staunch patriotic wives and mothers who out of love suffered and sacrificed most of their worldly goods for the Cause, or as weak-willed creatures who gave up on the war, asked their men to come home, and concerned themselves with getting pretty dresses from the blockade runners and dancing at elaborate balls and bazaars. This latter view, which seems cut so superficially from *Gone With the Wind*, is nevertheless one that is common in Civil War scholarship today. Confederate women are seen as individuals who whimsically stopped supporting the war the moment it inflicted a moment of consumer inconvenience on them, leading historians to suggest that women, with their slipping morale, symbolized the weak Confederate nationalism that helped erode the will of Southern citizens to continue the war. It is thus imperative to understand the role of women in the South and their relationship to the war in order to understand if their actions helped to contribute to the defeat of the Confederacy.

The place of these women must be reexamined closely. Because women often did wish the war to be over, it is easy to conclude that they simply stopped supporting the war. Expressions of fatigue and suffering during the war must not be interpreted as a desire for peace regardless of victory, and requests or hopes for brothers, sons, and husbands to return home can not be construed as a massive call for desertion and a complete renunciation of female support for the war. Therefore, one must look at the writings of these Southern women critically in order to discern whether statements about the war that seem to express eroding support may actually have been a desire for the war to end, but only with a Confederate victory.

As mentioned, it has become common for historians to propose that over time women began to reject the war and thus represented one of the numerous divisions in Confederate society that, coupled with military exhaustion, helped end the war. Drew Faust has been a major proponent of this theory. She argues that the war forced women, especially of the slave-holding planter class, into uncomfortable roles. For example, they had to take over jobs their husbands used to do, such as overseeing the planting and watching the slaves. They did not enjoy taking on these difficult tasks and felt overworked, as they not only had to take care of the household by themselves, but also were expected to show their commitment to the South by constantly donating their food, money, household goods, and time to the Confederate war effort. Over time, this expected patriotism eroded because the wealthy women did not want to continue taking the place
of men and longed for their easier lives before the war. Meanwhile, poorer women rejected the war because they could not adequately support their families without their husbands.

Therefore, by the end of 1863, most Confederate women wanted the war to be over. The lack of commitment to the war is seen, according to Faust, in writings in which women lamented the death and destruction of the war and complained about the overwhelming work that they faced, and in letters written by women of all social classes, asking their men to leave the army and return home to help plant crops or run the house.1 George Rable, too, agrees with the theory of diminished morale on the part of women, believing that the war left women dispirited and caused tensions to mount between wealthy and poor women as they were unable to work together or support each other during this time of crisis.2

However, Anne Sarah Rubin in her book *A Shattered Nation: The Rise and Fall of the Confederacy, 1861-1868*, interprets comments about the war made by Southern women in a different framework. She sees women becoming weary with the war because of the death and terrible shortages of food, but believes that this “war-weariness” did not necessarily mean that women denounced the war entirely or wanted the Confederacy to lose.3 Rubin strikes a key point—negative statements about an event do not necessarily symbolize one’s rejection.

A key group by which to test these rival views are the slave-holding women of South Carolina: Carolinian women were part of the most rabid, pro-secession political culture in the South, and therefore are ideal to measure the real fall of morale. Because the majority of the state did not see any major battles or engagements until late in the war when Sherman invaded in 1865, Carolinian women’s writings were not dependent on tactical blips in the military situation; if anything, they might have shown the most apprehension for provoking federal vengeance.

Most evidence suggests that the slaveholding women of South Carolina supported secession and expressed their commitment to the Confederacy from the very beginning of the war. They did so by urging men to enlist and by organizing themselves to support the oncoming conflict. Even before Fort Sumter was fired upon, Sarah Palmer, the daughter of plantation owner Dr. John Saunders Palmer, wrote to her brother and encouraged him to serve if war broke out. “Go!” she exclaimed, “I would not have you stay at home and be branded with The Cowards.”4 When Mary Chesnut’s husband turned down an offer for a commission in the army early in the war, she was “deeply mortified.”5 Emma Holmes, a young woman in Charleston, looked forward to the coming crisis, writing in February of 1861 that:

A revolution, wonderful in the rapidity in with which it has swept across the Country, from the Atlantic almost to the Pacific, convulsing the whole of what was once our

---

pride and boast ‘The United States,’ now alas broken into fragments through the malignity and fanaticism of the Black Republicans.\textsuperscript{6}

Adele Petigru Allston, the wife of rice planter Robert F. W. Allston, wrote to her friends who sided with the North expressing her disbelief that they would not understand the Southern point of view. “Every act of Lincoln’s administration has shewn [sic] the spirit of a usurper, a cunning plotting crafty usurper,” she argued, and went on to ask her friends to stay in the South longer and to understand why Southerners had to fight the North.\textsuperscript{7} Diaries attest to the fact that women supported the war from its infancy, supported by records of work that women did to immediately support the Confederacy. As early as January 1861, women were sending bandages to Charleston as a central location for war preparation and collecting money, making uniforms, flags, and mattresses.\textsuperscript{8}

Once the war began, the women of South Carolina rushed to support it in appropriate and feminine ways, such as sewing and donating money and other items. The Soldier’s Relief Association was the major body that women organized in Charleston to help the war effort. The leaders divided Charleston into wards, with each ward headed by a woman who would oversee any relief measures in that area. The group met daily at a depository to collect a variety of items including sheets, food, underclothing, tea, and brandy.\textsuperscript{9} Towns throughout South Carolina had women’s organizations like the Soldier’s Relief Association that supported the war. Accounts of war work include women making flags to present to regiments, women nursing daily at hospitals, sewing circles composed of school-age girls, money collected from everyone from established ladies to children, and individual triumphs such as one woman who made three pairs of socks daily.\textsuperscript{10} The women often ran the meetings and formed different committees in these associations and imposed rules on themselves so that the organizations were run efficiently. For instance, The Young Ladies’ Hospital Association, composed solely of unmarried women in Columbia, met each Tuesday, and any absent member was charged ten cents unless she had a valid excuse.\textsuperscript{11} \textit{South Carolina Women in the Confederacy}, two celebratory volumes about women’s work in the state, lists at least 127 relief agencies in the state; this list does not include the work that women did with the South Carolina Hospital Aid Association, an organization ran by men, but supplied by women, and the countless acts of local charity women performed, such as taking in refugees.\textsuperscript{12} In addition, the Free Market of Charleston was supported by women. This charity organization benefited the families of poorer soldiers

\textsuperscript{6} John F. Marszalek, ed., \textit{The Diary of Miss Emma Holmes: 1861-1866} (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1979), 1.


\textsuperscript{8} Mrs. A.T. Smythe, Miss M.B. Poppenheim, and Mrs. Thomas Taylor, eds., \textit{South Carolina Women in the Confederacy}, vol. 1 (Columbia: The State Company, 1903), 8-9.

\textsuperscript{9} Ibid., 12-13.

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid., 82.

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., 91.

by giving food to the underprivileged soldier’s wife and children and relied on donations from civilians. As of 1863, the Market fed roughly 800 families.\textsuperscript{13} 

The abundance of charity work that was done by women in the first year of the war continued strongly into 1862. The \textit{Charleston Mercury} usually recorded weekly donations that were received by the Soldier’s Relief Association, by other organizations such as the Ladies’ Christian Association, the Ladies’ Clothing Association, or donations received at hospitals or to centralized depots in Charleston and Columbia. For example, on February 6, 1862, the Ladies’ Christian Association listed monetary donations from both men and women, as well as contributions in the form of blankets, material, shirts, socks, jam, scarves, mattresses, sugar, and other materials.\textsuperscript{14} Throughout 1862, the lists of donations received from these associations were long. On July 14, 1862 alone, the \textit{Charleston Mercury} listed over seventy monetary donations and numerous material donations to a hospital in Charleston.\textsuperscript{15} 

Besides the charity work mentioned above, the women of the state also donated money in order to partially fund the building of two gunboats, primarily the \textit{Palmetto State} and to a lesser extent, the \textit{Chicora}. Lists of donations for the boat appeared sometimes multiple times a week in the \textit{Mercury}. Because most of the money from the state for this project came from women, the boats were affectionately termed the “Ladies’ Gunboats.” A large fair was organized in May of 1862 to sell items for the gunboats, and numerous private fundraisers were held throughout the state. As of October 3, 1862, the total amount collected for the \textit{Palmetto State} was $30,188.53. The celebration for the launching of the boat took place on October 11, 1862, and it was requested that ladies from the state come to Charleston and partake in the ceremony.\textsuperscript{16} 

While women enthusiastically showed their support for war through material contributions in 1861 and 1862, they also wrote of their commitment to the Confederacy and followed military events closely, cheering on the armies. Women were upset about the losses of the Sea Islands and Port Royal in their state and of the continuing struggle waged by the Union to gain islands in the area around Charleston. Leora Sims, a South Carolina schoolmate of Harriet Palmer, another daughter of Dr. John Saunders Palmer, wrote at the loss of Port Royal: “Our beloved Carolina is now an asylum for imps that even Hell cannot surpass, for I think that these are the days when the spirits from the bottomless pit are let out on the earth.”\textsuperscript{17} Women expressed frustration and sadness over any Confederate loss immediately, especially if the defeat took place in their state. They laughed about military leaders whom they considered to be cowardly, and they expected their men to fight hard and win. Also referring to the loss of Port Royal and the defeat of two South Carolina regiments, Mary Chesnut wrote: “General Lee sent

\textsuperscript{13} Ibid, 8. 
\textsuperscript{14} \textit{Charleston Mercury}, 6 February 1862. 
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 14 July, 1862. 
\textsuperscript{16} \textit{Charleston Mercury}, 3 October, 1862. 
\textsuperscript{17} Towles, 317.
them, they say. Preux chevalier. Booted and bridled and gallant ride he. So far his bonnie face has only brought us ill luck.”

Mary Maxcy Leverett, a woman who resided in McPhersonville after her family left their home in Beaufort due to Union occupation, and who sent three of her sons to the defense of the Confederacy wrote to her son Milton in May of 1862 expressing her disdain for defeat and hope for more victories: “I feel so incensed about the news nowadays that I can scarce write with patience—we are doing nothing but giving up men, forts, and towns. If half our public men were hanged or put in pillory, it would be good for the country.” Mary Leverett also did not fear war in her own land: “We, South Carolina, commenced this struggle, and it is our duty and ought to be our glory to bear the brunt of it,” she wrote to another son, Fred, in June of 1862. Grace Brown Elmore, a twenty-two year old woman from Columbia, was willing to sacrifice her state for victory as well. Upon hearing the news that the town of Beaufort was to be shelled, she wrote: “Surely t’is for our good in the end. My God thou will not let devils come amongst thy people.” These women were angry with Confederate losses, but remained perfectly willing to sacrifice, and wanted the Confederate leaders and soldiers to fight for the South’s independence.

In February 1862, a letter from the “Daughters of Charleston” appeared in the Mercury. In it, the writers criticized men for suggesting that the women and children leave Charleston should an attack or siege occur. The letter not only chastised the men for not fighting hard enough for the Confederacy, but also portrayed women as more patriotic than men. The writers exhorted: “Sir, if the men of Charleston will only do their duty as faithfully as the women have done theirs, there will be no panic.” The women also expressed their contempt for men who refused to serve the Cause:

It is a disgrace for young men to skulk under the yellow flag, or seek official shelter, when Carolina, our beloved Carolina, whose name has ever been the symbol of honor and chivalry is calling to them to save her from the degradation of conquest, by a foe in whose track comes desolation and ruin, at the very thought of whose excesses your wives, mothers and sisters turn pale.

The letter further warned male citizens that the women would give the names of all men under sixty who were not enlisted to the army. South Carolina women expected their men to fight for their state and for the Confederacy, believed that they were the most dedicated citizens, and would not accept men who do not do their part in the war. The idea that women were

18 Woodward, 230.
19 Ibid., 134.
20 Ibid., 128-9.
22 Charleston Mercury, 26 February 1862.
the most loyal citizens to the Confederacy is frequently seen in their letters and journals at the time. Thus, women of South Carolina were not afraid to endure bloody battles and combat in order to secure victory.

As 1862 ended, and the war entered its second and third full years in 1863 and 1864, South Carolina women, while not bearing the brunt of the fighting like their sisters in Virginia, were forced to experience hardship due to runaway slaves, high prices, and the Union blockade. Yet, their commitment to the war and their determination to see the Confederacy win was still strong, as seen through their own words and actions. While Drew Faust believes that Confederate women gave up on the war by this time, South Carolina women were in fact ready to support the war until the end. Mrs. William Mason Smith, who traveled from her home in the Northern hills of South Carolina to Richmond to nurse her injured son, witnessed his long and painful death in August of 1864. Yet, in late 1864 when there were rumors of enemy troops near her home, Mrs. Smith wrote a letter to her mother-in-law saying: “I will lose all we have here; but if I can give up the lives of my sons in the Cause, surely I can stand the rest.” Even though she had seen the death of her son before her eyes, Mrs. Smith did not reject the Confederacy when she realized she may lose her house, nor did she call for her other son who was in the army to come home.23 Grace Brown Elmore wrote of her utter hatred for the North in November of 1864 and of her desire for the war to continue after the long and bloody battles in the summer and during Sherman’s campaign in Georgia, commenting: “Rather would I see every drop of my blood spilled upon the battlefeild [sic], my home among the things that were, every suffering the heart could feel be bourne [sic] by me than this Confederacy go back to the North.”24

Women underwent a great deal of stress and suffering, yet managed to have hope. Meta Morris Grimball and her husband, who lived primarily in the Colleton District throughout the conflict, lost much of the comfort they had enjoyed in life during the war. Her husband sold most of their slaves, and she wrote that she felt terrible when she did not have enough food to give to a poor woman who came begging at her door. When her son, William, died in the army in 1864, she displayed no bitterness to the Confederacy or its armies, commenting only: “All this shews [sic] that his life, though short, was not without its use, his example may lead others to strive after good.”25 Mary Leverett, in writing to her son who had been assigned to defend Fort Sumter, praised the work that he was doing in the army. She considered his new placement to be a great honor “equal in glory to the Battle Abby Roll of Honour of Old England.”26 Adele Allston lost her husband in 1864, but when she wrote to her son in the Confederate army and informed him of his father’s death, she was quick to place the importance of his military service

24 Weiner, 79.
26 Taylor, Matthews, and Power, 303.
over his family: “You must not my beloved pine for home, or dwell too much upon it. Such a state of mind will unfit you for your duties there. Remember that the honour, the good name of our House now rests upon you.”

Women felt that having their men fight for their state and country was honorable even as the war progressed. These statements are quite contrary to the findings of historians who believe that most women did not want to sacrifice more and no longer cared about victory after 1863.

In the spring and summer of 1863, Charleston underwent bombardment as shells from Union troops attacking Fort Sumter and surrounding islands reached the city. But again, women’s morale was not destroyed. Pauline DeCaradeuc Heyward, a young woman who lived in Aiken, South Carolina, described the resolve of the citizens of Charleston during the bombardment in 1863 writing: “. . . . The Charlestonians seem determined to sacrifice everything—life, property, friends, before giving up.” Harriet Palmer, who had numerous friends in Charleston, echoed the sentiments of Pauline Heyward about the siege of Charleston saying that the city would never be taken because “no man, woman, or child of South Carolina would be spared” in its defense. Emma Holmes was in Charleston during the summer of 1863 working as a teacher, and heard the battle each day. She lived her life as best as she could, and although she noted that her days were “monotonous” as she and her sister had to do more work because her brothers were in the war, she never commented that she wanted the Confederacy to flounder. She did not mention the bombardment in her journal greatly, and in September of 1863, she rejoiced, like a loyal Confederate, at the victory at Chickamauga, even though she knew there were many casualties.

Another indication of the strong will of South Carolinian women in 1863 and 1864 was their continuing charity work that supported the soldiers and the hospitals. In September of 1864, a man who traveled from Virginia to South Carolina praised South Carolina women openly, writing that they were more generous than Virginia ladies. He claimed to have witnessed them feeding soldiers who were traveling through the state and noted that they took very good care of their wounded men at home. This traveler was correct in commenting late in the war that the women of the state performed a good amount of charity work. Reports of donations appeared in the Mercury in 1864 about once per week, as they did in 1861. Although it is nearly impossible to count the number of contributions that were made due to the sheer number of relief organizations and missing records, from the material available, it is evident that women were active. As always, women donated money and goods, or held fundraisers in the form of

27 Easterby, 199.
28 Faust, 238-9.
31 Towles, 363.
32 Marszalek, 289, 309.
33 Charleston Mercury, 12 September, 1864.
concerts or performances of tableaux. Even in middle to late 1864, donations continued to pour in. Reports from various associations account for the continued generosity of women. In a June 1864 report of Spartanburg’s Relief Association, over thirty donations were received.34 In the *Mercury* on October 31, 1864, twenty-eight gifts were acknowledged, an average weekly figure for donations in 1863 and 1864.

While the number of contributions was not as great as in the early part of the war, women’s support for the war must not have ended because these organizations existed and still commanded a fair number of donations per week. As shortages in food and other materials become more severe, it is not surprising that donations dwindled. This does not mean a rejection of the war by women. Women may have cheered for the Confederacy just as much as they always had, but simply could not be as generous.

Along with a drop in charity work, historians frequently depict Confederate women as selfish, as they complained about the amount of work that they had during the war. Yet, the women of the South valued duty as much as men and wanted to materially help the war effort so long as they were able. While it was a man’s duty to fight in the war, it was the duty of women to support the men in all of their efforts. In fact, women may have held themselves up to higher standards of duty than their men did, and while historians see Confederate women becoming more selfish during the war, they most likely could not have done much more. Rubin notes that: “Confederates held women to almost impossible standards of patriotic self-sacrifice, and when women could not measure up to those ideals, they were subject to public chastising and complaints about their lack of spirit.”35 For instance, on July 31, 1863 in the *Charleston Mercury*, a letter from “Annie” urged women to do even more by drying fruits and vegetables for the troops. She said that: “Every one should now, and as long as the materials last, be making pickles, catsup, drying apples, peaches, figs, and any other fruits they may have.”36 Women pushed one another to do more because at the time, it was expected for women to be completely self-sacrificing. Thus, calls from men to women and from women to one another for more sacrifices have been looked upon as a lapse in morale, when in reality women were trying to cope with intense demands and encourage one another. Women knew what was expected of them, and they did their best.

For example, Mary Chesnut acknowledged that she had her own role in the war in August of 1864 when she volunteered as a nurse every day, getting up at five in the morning to go to the hospital in Columbia commenting: “There must be no dodging duty.”37 Although Mary Chesnut did enjoy her fair share of parties and balls during the war, as many historians have

34 Conner and others, 66-7.
35 Rubin, 60.
36 *Charleston Mercury*, 31 July 1863.
37 Woodward, 641.
commented, she knew women had duties too. Other women who never would have thought of working, such as Emma Holmes, found themselves earning a living as teachers, governesses, or clerks in the government. Malvina S. Waring, a young girl who came from a previously wealthy family, signed treasury bills day after day to earn money. She also performed charity work while employed, bringing gifts and food to the hospital in Columbia.38 The work done by women is summarized by Mrs. Thomas Taylor in a speech given to the South Carolina Division of the Daughters of the Confederacy in 1900. Although she ignored that any dissent existed among women, she was correct in describing them as “organizers, manufacturers, moral government among hordes of negroes, overseers, lumber millers, land clearers, traders. . . . [they] ditched and drained fields, built storage barns, standing over their negro workmen, cheering, urging and checking.”39 Despite the racist language, Mrs. Taylor effectively conveyed that women of all classes did much more work than they had before the war, and considering the adjustment that most had to make within their homes, the amount of work they did for the armies and hospitals was quite impressive. Southern women altered their lives for the Cause and supported the war as best they could.

At the end of 1864 and the beginning of 1865, the atmosphere in South Carolina abruptly changed by the fear of General Sherman's invasion of the state. The first of Sherman's troops to enter the state were under General William T. Ward, who arrived from Georgia in the first week of 1864. Prior to his invasion, Sherman had received letters and notes from residents of South Carolina taunting him, warning him that their state would never surrender. These threats only made Sherman more determined to hurt South Carolina residents and bring a war to them that he believed they had begun.40 In January, Sherman sent General Oliver Otis Howard to Beaufort and then inland, while General Henry Slocum was sent across the Savannah River. Sherman purposefully separated his troops to spread Confederate resistance and to make South Carolinians believe that he was after Charleston.41 To meet the Federal troops, Confederate resistance was slim. Most of the state was defended by scattered cavalry or state militia, consisting of old and young men.42

While the Confederates were planning for Sherman to go to Charleston first, his main objective was actually Columbia, where there were few Confederate defenders. Sherman arrived in Columbia on February 17, 1865. Before he arrived, the quartermaster's shop was thrown open to the citizens, and as crowds gathered, kegs of powder were mistakenly ignited, killing about forty citizens.43 That night, about one-third of Columbia was set afire, most likely by Union troops, although Sherman and others later claimed that the city caught fire when retreating

38 Smythe, Poppenheim, and Taylor, 274-5.
39 Taylor, Matthews, and Power, 317.
42 Barrett, 49.
43 Wallace, 550.
Confederates burned cotton.\textsuperscript{44} Like Columbia, many towns in South Carolina felt Sherman’s wrath and were burned, including Gillsonville, Grahamville, McPhersonville, Orangeburg, Lexington, Barnwell, and Hardeeville.\textsuperscript{45} Numerous plantations around the state were burned as well, and citizens everywhere lost their livestock, food, furniture, and personal belongings to Sherman’s army.

However, despite the burnings and raids of Sherman’s Army, South Carolina women were not dismayed by seeing the war on their land, and in some cases, in their homes. Sherman’s men often commented on the bitter nature of the women of the state and of their utter hatred of the Northern troops. One New Jersey soldier with Sherman commented about the women: “There is not a particle of the craven fear in them—determined and resolute no giving in.”\textsuperscript{46} This resoluteness was manifested in many ways, such as in their calls for continued fighting and in promises of unwavering support. In the January 24, 1865 edition of the Mercury, “Many Wives and Mothers of Charleston” appealed to the men of the South, as they had done before, to fight and not to surrender, writing:

\begin{quote}
We, women of Charleston, not enthusiastic girls, but women whose hair has whitened through the anguish of this awful war, whose husbands sons, brothers, have died for South Carolina and Charleston, entreat to be heard. . . . We implore, as the greatest boon, fight for Charleston! At every point, fight for every inch, and if our men die, let them die amid the blazing ruins of our homes; their souls rising upwards on the flames which save our city from the pollution of the enemy. Send out the women and children yet in the city. Thousands of Charleston women scattered through the land will share with them their all. They shall not starve. But let there be no excuse for deserting the sacred homes of us and our ancestors.”\textsuperscript{47}
\end{quote}

By bringing this call for defense to the public arena of a newspaper, South Carolina women displayed that they were as committed to the Cause as ever. These women, as they mentioned, had already mourned the loss of loved ones in the war and struggled as prices rose higher and higher to feed and clothe their families, yet they begged the army to fight for their city.

Women throughout the state echoed similar calls for defense, signaling that they did not cower into submission upon encountering Sherman. Grace Brown Elmore wrote in January 1865 that she was appalled that Confederates let Sherman go through Georgia “unopposed and unimpeded” and hoped that from then on the Confederates would do a better job defending their land.\textsuperscript{48} Emma LeConte, a Columbia resident, watched her city burn. But she, like other women, was not willing to see the war end even though she witnessed the destruction of Co-

\textsuperscript{45} Glatthaar, 142.
\textsuperscript{46} Ibid., 72.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 72.
\textsuperscript{48} Conner and others, 85-6.
lumbia first-hand. She wrote that the United States flag at the South Carolina statehouse was a “hateful symbol of despotism” and on February 21, after surveying the damage of her beloved city, and having nothing left to eat but rancid salt pork and meal concluded: “Before they came, I thought I hated them as much as was possible, now I know there are no limits to the feeling of hatred.” Mrs. C.P. Poppenheim, who was residing on a plantation in Camden, witnessed the plundering of her house for five days. The troops took all food, animals, clothing, oil, and anything else they found of use. Mrs. Poppenheim responded to this destruction by loathing the North, calling the Yankees “wicked,” “vile,” and “brutal wretches.” Emma Holmes claimed that she “taunted” the Yankees and told them: “We would never be subdued, for if every man, woman & child were murdered, our blood would rise up & drive them away.” One story, recounted by William Gilmore Simms in his 1865 book about the burning of Columbia, tells of a woman who boldly proclaimed to a Union soldier that the South would never fear Sherman or the Union troops. The soldier then held a gun to the woman, but she did not flinch and slowly lifted her head to meet his eyes. He responded: “You have pluck enough for a whole regiment.”

Whether or not this last story is true, it nevertheless symbolizes the courage displayed by many of the women of the state and the spirit that prevailed. Some women of South Carolina seemed to redouble their commitment to the South by witnessing the terrible acts of war. Mary Maxcy Leverett wrote to her son in late February 1865 after federal troops invaded her home. She said that the soldiers, as they ransacked the rooms, asked her if the South would give up. Mary responded defiantly: “No! It would make us more determined & drive every man into the field with feelings more embittered & intense than ever. It was a good thing for us.” Anne Sarah Rubin echoes Mary Leverett in that she believes that as Confederate women suffered more and more deaths in their families and underwent increasing hardships. Instead of giving up, they looked for a higher cause, and for them, the Confederacy offered a purpose in life.

Of course, this is not to say that women did not want peace or wondered if the sacrifices being made were too great. It is true that many women questioned what was happening. Mary Chesnut asked in July 1864 after the death of a friend in the war: “Is anything worth it? This fearful sacrifice—this awful penalty we pay for war?” Emma Holmes solemnly wrote that her journal was like a “catalogue of death” as she incessantly recorded the deaths of men she knew. Women continually wrote of how they wished for peace. Emily Harris, a woman with seven children and ten slaves in Spartanburg, South Carolina, had so much work to do
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on her farm without her husband that she struggled daily to feed her children and wanted her husband to come home, although he never deserted.57 Drew Faust believes that many Southern women encouraged their husbands to desert, and that many men left the armies because of requests from home.58 However, it is impossible to know the number of men who did desert because calls from home were so pressing. Gary Gallagher notes that Confederate desertion was only a problem right at the end of the war, and that may have been because Southern soldiers knew that the North had the numerical and material advantage, recognized their defeats on the battlefield, and knew that the war was ending.59

Moreover, the women who asked their men to come home did not necessarily do so because they no longer supported the Confederacy. For instance, Margaret A. Easterling, a widow from the Marlborough District of South Carolina located in the upcountry, asked the Confederate Secretary of War, James Seddon, to send home her more “feeble son,” even telling him that her older son could stay in the army. She explained: “I need not tell you of my devotion to my country, of the sacrifices I have made, and of the many more I am willing to make. Search history and you will see that woman is always true to her country and that there was never an Arnold in the Female World.”60 This letter clearly demonstrates that even though she asked for her son to come home, Margaret did not denounce the Cause, and she displayed her support by stating that one of her sons could stay in the army. She needed help on her farm and had nobody left to turn to. In fact, many of the petitions received by Confederate officials offer evidence that women were willing to sacrifice and to negotiate with Confederate leaders, but simply needed a man’s help. Sometimes, men deserted to come home during planting season, but returned to the army when their job was done.61 Women who wrote asking for their husbands or sons to come home may not have thought what the loss of a number of men would do to the armies of the Confederacy; they wanted their men to come home, but the rest to stay. Thus, as Rubin concludes, “Even as they acted in ways that hurt their new nation, Confederates professed their love for it. They wanted the war to end, but they wanted it to end in victory, even as they did little to help it.”62 Maybe asking for help with the crops was just that, and not a larger call for the war to end.

Perhaps the extent to which Confederate women wanted their nation to be victorious is seen in their response to the Confederate surrender and prospect of Northern rule in the future. Any misgivings they had about the war seemed to pale in comparison for their sadness
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at defeat and utter hatred of the North. Emma LeConte was shocked and extremely upset when she learned about the surrender of Lee, exclaiming:

We give up to the Yankees! How can it be? How can they talk about it? Why does not the President call out the women if there are [not] enough men? We would go and fight, too—we would better all die together. Let us suffer still more, give up yet more—anything, anything that will help the cause, anything that will give us freedom and not force us to live with such people—to be ruled by such horrible and contemptible creatures—to submit to them when we hate them so bitterly.63

LeConte thus echoed other women from around her state in placing the commitment of women to the Cause over men, and she decidedly wanted the conflict to continue until the South won. Harriet Palmer was so disgusted by word that Richmond had been surrendered and was so sure of Southern victory that she did not believe the news: “All Yankee lies. I don’t believe one word of it. Indeed I do not want to hear of such a peace as I know it would be if it were brought about in such a way.”64

Ella Lorton, a woman from Pendleton, South Carolina, experienced the death of her brother in the war and the death of her father from illness in 1862. Her mother had to sell a number of their slaves, and they were in debt. Yet, she too was angry at the news of surrender, and she even wrote of “rejoicing over Lincoln’s death.”65 Emma Holmes was equally appalled: “To go back into the Union!! No words can describe all the horrors contained in those few words. Our souls recoiled shuddering at the bare idea.”66 Pauline DeCaradeuc Heyward lost two brothers in the service, and most of what was in her home was taken by Union troops. But she could not give up on the South: “All our brave Generals, unequalled soldiers, my own gallant Brothers, was it for this that you died? Subjugation! Never! God will raise us yet!”67 Emmala Reed, who resided in the hilly country of Anderson and whose brother lost a hand in the war was disgusted at the idea of Northern rule after Lee’s surrender: “How awfully [sic] humiliating & deplorable—and what is to be the result? What our fate—are we ruined—subjugated?” She was so desperate for good news that she hoped that General Joseph Johnston would bring late victory.68 And Mary Chesnut, who had continually written about the mounting number of deaths and wondered if the war was worth the sacrifice, was anything but relieved when she learned the result of the conflict: “We are scattered—stunned—the remnant of heart left alive with us filled with brotherly hate.”69 The women of South Carolina seemed prepared to continue the fight.
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By looking at the support of the war from South Carolina women in their words, in their work for the Confederacy, and in their reactions to defeat, it becomes clear that they were not ready to end the war on terms of Northern victory. They wanted to see the carnage of war end and of course have their husbands and sons return home, but wanted this with a Confederate victory. Southern women may have expected more from themselves than they could sacrifice during the war, but considering the hardships they faced under the most trying circumstances, they did what they could, even if they could not measure up to their own standards.

For four years, the slaveholding women of the South did their best by executing jobs they had never done before and by devoting themselves to supporting the war. They cheered secession, urged their men to enlist, organized bazaars and sewing circles, and donated what they could spare. They encouraged men to defend their homes, and expressed dissatisfaction when the armies did not seem to be fighting hard enough. While it was natural that what they could do for the Cause dwindled as their inflated currency could buy less and less and simple essentials of life became harder to come by, they still expressed hope for the Confederacy in their writings. Encountering the enemy caused them fright, but it also fanned their hatred for the North even more so that when the end arrived, although they may have been tired of war, they were not at all ready to go back into the Union. The unreconstructed Southern woman, with her dreams of the Lost Cause and antebellum life was thus born, and the loyal South Carolina lady in her heart forever glorified the short life of the Confederacy.
The Influence of the Pennsylvania Mainline of Public Works

Joseph A. Strausbaugh

The Pennsylvania Mainline of Public Works, authorized and begun by Governor John Andrew Schulze in 1826, was the main transportation artery across Pennsylvania from the beginning of its operations in 1828 until the Pennsylvania Railroad purchased it in 1857. Though it was only in service for about thirty years, the Mainline was instrumental in shaping and affecting individuals, both passengers and employees of the canal; as well as Pennsylvania towns such as Saltsburg, Alexandria, Pittsburgh, and Philadelphia. This in turn affected national commerce.

A combination of factors contributed to the founding of the Mainline system. By 1825 the Erie Canal had opened and was an immediate success in terms of commerce and trade. Part of its success resulted in the siphoning of western business from Philadelphia, sending it instead through New York. Pennsylvanians interested in commerce saw the West as an enormously valuable market. They argued that the commonwealth needed an internal improvements project that would give Philadelphia “a cheap, all-water transportation line with which it could prevent the threatened New York monopoly of the western trade.”1 Adding to this threatening situation for Pennsylvania commerce was a movement in Maryland to build a canal along the Potomac, causing the Pennsylvania state legislature to speed up its deliberations on a statewide transportation system.2 With these events in mind, and the economic fate of the commonwealth hanging in the balance, a transportation system was authorized that was to “earn huge profits,” “capture the trade of the west,” and “would develop the population, agriculture, and industry of the entire state.”3 In this way the system was constructed not just to benefit Philadelphia’s national and international commerce operation, but also to “provide access to Philadelphia for the timber, mining, and manufactures of all parts of the Commonwealth, even those regions west of Allegheny Mountain.”4 The Mainline of Public Works was thus devised as a multi-modal system that would run east-west across the state to meet the public’s economic demands, particularly those of Philadelphia.
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The Mainline of Public Works was divided into five sections: The Columbia and Philadelphia Railroad (CPR), Eastern Division Canal, Juniata Division Canal, Allegheny Portage Railroad (APR), and Western Division Canal. The reason for the segmented and disjointed nature of the system was the commonwealth’s geography. While much of the distance was flat enough that canals or railroad tracks could be laid, a system of inclined planes called the APR, was needed to traverse the Allegheny Mountains, through which a canal could not be feasibly built. These segments also represented the delineations in system sections as outlined in the legislation used to borrow money to fund their construction and upkeep. This is especially significant in that it notes that the system was built, owned, and operated in some form by the commonwealth. By 1834 all five divisions were completed and operational. With such diversity in the modes of transportation used, it is important to describe them in some detail.

The CPR was the first railroad in the United States operated by a government. This railroad was built in spite of the fact that the Union and Schuylkill canals, two privately-owned and somewhat obsolete canals, already conveyed goods and passengers from Philadelphia to Middletown. Although the building of an entirely new railroad was far more expensive and daunting than repairing the canals, the legislature, at the behest of Lancaster County residents who wanted the Mainline to run through their county, went ahead with their railroad plans. The reason that a railway line was settled upon rather than another more expansive canal is that the land set aside for the project was far too hilly to make a canal tenable. The railroad had two inclined planes and a 984-foot viaduct to compensate for the elevation changes of 90 and 187 feet. Among other features added to the line were lateral extensions, one of which went as far as Gettysburg. Initially, farm horses were expected to haul the cars, on which canal boats or sections of canal boats would be placed. This quickly proved ineffective because there was too much traffic on the line to be adequately handled with horses. To remedy this, the state ended up buying steam locomotives to pull the cars. To travel on the CPR, much as on the subsequent Mainline segments, one had to pay a toll. The toll collection was the commonwealth’s only official duty with regard to the railroad after building it because it “was considered a public highway.” Toll amounts were divided between freight, which was four cents a mile for every ton; passengers, who were a penny a mile; “wheel toll[s],” which were levied at two cent a baggage car and a penny a mile for each pair of wheels on a passenger car. With the implementation of locomotives came yet another toll on so-called “motive power.”

The Eastern Division Canal started in Columbia and paralleled the East Shore of the Susquehanna upstream past Harrisburg to Clark’s Ferry and across to Duncan’s Island, just off...
the mouth of the Juniata River. Incidentally, this is the modern site of the Route 22/322 Bridge over the Susquehanna. Canals boats passed from the Eastern Division to the Juniata Division via a towpath bridge over the Susquehanna such that the canal boats were pulled against the current of the river. Six locks, the only major technical innovations on this portion of the mainline, were fashioned to account for the nearly 250-foot depth differential from one end of the canal segment to the other.\textsuperscript{11}

The Juniata Division was a nearly 130-mile long canal that straddled the Juniata River while passing through the mountainous terrain of the Appalachians on its way to Hollidaysburg. It would prove to be one of the more difficult Mainline segments to build because of the craggy nature of the terrain through which it would flow.\textsuperscript{12} Yet it would be among the most financially lucrative sections, finally closing in 1889 due to flood damage.\textsuperscript{13} At Hollidaysburg the canal boats were split apart and put on railcars to be carried over the APR.

The APR was arguably “an even greater engineering miracle” than Horseshoe Curve.\textsuperscript{14} Although it was the shortest segment of the Mainline at 36 miles, it took four years to build at a cost of $1,600,000. Initially a four and a half mile long tunnel through the mountain was proposed, but this was deemed infeasible. Few engineers thought constructing such a tunnel with contemporary technology was possible while at the same time the ability to supply water to a tunnel at the suggested elevation was doubtful.\textsuperscript{15} Instead, engineers devised a series of ten inclined planes (five on each side of the mountain) that would carry canal boats on rail cars up one side and down the other. The cars would be moved by way of pulley systems that would be operated by two-cylinder stationary steam engines that could move “three or four cars in each direction simultaneously.”\textsuperscript{16} As the ropes used on the inclined planes had a history of breaking while pulling the cars, a special brake device was attached to the back of each car so that if the rope gave way, the car would stop rather than crash. To further remedy this problem, wire ropes began to be used in 1842. Between the inclined planes were flat stretches, along which were some of the other engineering achievements of the APR. “The most conspicuous part of the line was the Conemaugh Viaduct, which, at the time, “was considered the most perfectly constructed arch in the United States.”\textsuperscript{17} Completed in the Spring of 1833 at a cost of $54,562.54, the purpose of this 80-foot single arch span was to carry cars over a winding section of the Conemaugh River. The viaduct was used until it was destroyed in the Johnstown Flood of 1889.\textsuperscript{18} The Staple Bend Tunnel, “the first tunnel built in America,” was the other
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After traveling the APR, the boats were reassembled and started their journey on the Western Division Canal. This section ran 105 miles from Johnstown to Pittsburgh, following first the Conemaugh River and then the Allegheny. Among its many architectural features was the Pittsburgh aqueduct, the longest and most troublesome aqueduct on the mainline. It was a wooden aqueduct about 1,140 feet long and served to locate the western terminus of the Mainline in Pittsburgh and not in Allegheny, even though the latter was actually a more logical terminus. Pittsburgh then “virtually monopolized the canal business” in the Three-Rivers vicinity, which allowed the city to expand greatly during that time in comparison to Allegheny. The aqueduct, and with it the actual terminus of the Mainline, would play a role in the industrial developments that made Pittsburgh ‘the Steel Center of the World,’ and that would eventually give it leverage to absorb Allegheny in the early 20th century. With its western terminus in Pittsburgh and its Eastern end in downtown Philadelphia, the Mainline of Public Works spanned a distance of about 395.19 miles across the commonwealth, not including lateral extensions jutting from it.

As it ran through the middle of the commonwealth, the Mainline affected people of all walks of life for different reasons. The two most common groups, passengers and canallers, came in contact with the system usually only temporarily, but their memories and experiences stayed with them for years to come. Two of the Mainline’s most noteworthy passengers were Philip Nicklin and Charles Dickens.

Philip Nicklin, writing under the pseudonym Peregrine Prolinx, produced an account of his 1835 travel from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh via the Mainline. His candid account gives us insight into what the trek was like in the early stages of the system. His first experience with the Mainline system was the CPR, which he considered to have “[had] some great faults.” He felt that “the curves [were] too numerous, and the radii generally too short,” meaning that the trip took much longer than it needed to. He also commented on the locomotives, which were apt to throw cinders at the passengers and had a reputation for catching cars on fire. While aboard a canal boat, he commented on the crowdedness of the quarters as being comparative to “a microcosm that contains almost as many specimens of natural history as the Ark of Noah.” As part of his trip he stayed at the Duncan Mansion on Duncan’s Island, an
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experience he thoroughly enjoyed. This house is an example of one of the many inns along the Mainline route that benefited tremendously and which in some cases were established specifically for passengers who were traveling and not near a town at nightfall. Another such inn that was popularized on the Mainline was the Lemon House at the summit of the APR. In sum, Nicklin saw the Pennsylvania Mainline as having good qualities such as picturesque scenery and great commercial prospects, but also the negatives that are associated with travel in the Early Republic, especially by train and canal boat. He contended “that the State does not afford the public as good a commodity of traveling, as the public ought to have for the money paid.” In this way, he alludes to the fact that the project came in well over budget. He suggested that to boost ridership, and thus profit, that daytime-only runs should be offered because he felt that people would pay to just see the beautiful Pennsylvania scenery.

In 1842, Charles Dickens, the preeminent novelist whose popularity in America at the time was second only to that of his native England, visited the United States on a long-awaited trip to gather material for his books. He traveled the country for about four and a half months, during which time he took a trip on the Pennsylvania Mainline of Public Works. Dickens traveled from Harrisburg to Pittsburgh on the Mainline, detailing vividly his experience. His first impressions of the canal boat, on a drearily rainy day, were by no means positive, as he felt his “three or four days” trip onboard would not be “by any means a cheerful one.” He called the boat “a barge with a little house in it” when “viewed from the outside” and like “a caravan at the fair” on the inside. When it came time to sleep, Dickens talked of “three long tiers of bookshelves” each of which had “a sort of microscopic sheet and blanket.” To his bewilderment these were, in effect, bunk beds and constituted the sleeping space onboard a canal boat. He found it so difficult to get into his bunk that he ended up lying on the floor, since it was a bottom bunk, and rolling into bed. Like Nicklin, Dickens found the quarters cramped as well. In terms of dining, he talked of all the meals being exactly the same. Many of his other recollections of his trip suggest that he found his journey quite enjoyable. Walking along the towpath, admiring the sky while laying on the boat deck, and listening to the gentle movement of the water as the boat cut through it were all things that he found pleasant on his trek. He was amazed at the innovative nature of the towpath bridge at Clark’s Ferry because of its twin deck design that allowed two boats to cross the Susquehanna at the same time. He also enjoyed the mountain scenery as he rode on the Allegheny Portage Railroad. In sum, Dickens found certain amenities of the canal unusual and ridiculous, but on the whole he seemed to like the technology, surroundings, and overall course of his trip on the Mainline.
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Beyond specific Mainline passengers, there were groups of people greatly affected by the canal. Probably the most notable of these were the workers, called canallers. These people were the ones who embodied the hard work and dedication needed to make the Mainline a success as they were the ones who, with their own sweat and blood, built the canal. Most of the canal workers were young single men of Irish ancestry. A typical canaller community was usually nothing more than a “temporary settlement of ramshackle huts” a short distance from the actual worksite. They were completely dependent on their contractors who even had the power to acquit those accused of murder on the grounds that the defendant was a faithful servant of the project. This atmosphere worked hand-in-hand with the drinking often associated with canallers, giving local townspeople the impression that worksite shanties were nothing more than “dens of iniquity” filled with “debauched, depraved inebriates.” Still the workers and bosses had some ties that kept order in the camps and a steady work ethic. The two sides worked well together because of their common economic needs as well as their Irish ties, both being in one way or another Irish immigrants. Marriage among canallers was a major issue as the Mainline was being built. Of those canallers who were married, few spent much time during the year with their families, mostly during the winter months. Families who decided to live in the worksite shanties lived in what amounted to “male-dominated temporary communities” because of the disparate male to female ratio in the camps where women held a role completely dependent and subordinate on men. The women often served in domestic roles where they usually catered to the needs of the whole camp, not just their family. This helped to provide some stability in a camp whose “social arrangements were by necessity makeshift and temporary” which in turn would have helped productivity. In some ways, these two family situations served to dissolve the nuclear family structure among canallers. Although the life of canallers was harsh in some respects it did offer a functional employment opportunity to immigrant workers and was a way of life in which there was some commonality of goals among all of those involved.

The Mainline had a great effect on the development of the towns along its route. Nicklin observed that the towns were “all rapidly increasing in wealth and population, in consequence of the great amount of business done on the canal.” This is clearly shown by the system’s impact on Saltsburg, Alexandria, Pittsburgh and, Philadelphia, which all saw change, both positive and negative, because of the canal.

Saltsburg was laid out in 1816-17 at a bend in the Conemaugh River in Indiana County, about thirty-one miles from Pittsburgh. It began as a small, sparsely populated town
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with “primitive means of access;” those being overland and by navigating the river. Yet it was strategically located near some of the most important resources of the day.

First and foremost was salt, the town’s namesake. It became such a central product of Saltsburg that the town became “the center of the salt trade of the county.” Salt was found in lowlands along the river and was extracted by drilling holes in the ground and then using horses to pump it out with water. Later, steam engines would be used for pumping and drilling, making the process faster and more efficient. Then this salt water was boiled off until only the briny byproduct remained. As salt was used “as a food preservative, seasoning, and as a tanning ingredient,” it was of great importance to the citizens of the Early Republic and often sought after in commercial trade because of the difficulty involved in mining and processing it. The Conemaugh as a salt source came into its own with the War of 1812 and the subsequent British blockade of Lake Erie, which was the usual trade route for salt from New York to Western Pennsylvania and the Midwest. This led to an overall increase in the salt trade in the region and the establishment of salt as the predominant resource of Saltsburg.

There were other resources, though, that were of just as much importance to the general public as salt and thus to the business interests in and around Saltsburg. Timber was significant as building material as were some of the types of stone indigenous to the area. The Saltsburg area was “part of the fourth great coal basin West of the Allegheny Mountains.” Iron ore and limestone were also prevalent in the area. Saltsburg’s proximity to these resources and its location on the Conemaugh made it an ideal port for the canal.

The canal was built eastward from Pittsburgh and westward from Blairsville, leaving Saltsburg in the middle. On May 15, 1829, the canal became operational in Saltsburg, and changed the cultural and commercial climate of the borough forever. What was once just a sleepy town in the wilderness East of Pittsburgh became a major port on the Western Division of the Pennsylvania Mainline of Public Works. There was an almost immediate increase in the amount of salt and coal exported from the town and surrounding area. During the canal’s heyday roughly twenty-one salt works were running in the Saltsburg area. This increase in salt production was made even easier by the fact that “all the [salt] wells were directly on the line of the canal.” This made the transporting and transferring of processed salt even easier and cheaper for the works’ owners who otherwise would have had to have paid hauling fees to get their salt to the canal docks. Indiana County, for which Saltsburg was one of the biggest
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ports, went from producing 7,000 tons of coal in 1820 to approximately 31,000 tons in 1838, just four years after the whole public works system was opened.\textsuperscript{54}

Not only did the canal enhance the standard Saltsburg industrial operations, but it also facilitated and in some cases necessitated new ones that sprung up because of Saltsburg's prominence on the canal. Many of these were directly related to the canal such as inns, eateries, passenger-packet services, and boat building shops.\textsuperscript{55} These businesses brought lucrative jobs and revenue to the town of Saltsburg and greatly developed its importance on the Mainline of Public Works. It was also influential in bringing "large grain and flour businesses . . . that began to tap the agricultural resources" of the area, which needed an outlet to the Eastern markets for their goods.\textsuperscript{56}

This business boom caused many domestic changes in the town as well. Before the canal came the only religious denomination in town was Presbyterian, befitting the region's mostly Scots-Irish settlers. The town had just twenty houses and few other buildings besides the church and two taverns. After the canal was built, Roman Catholics and Baptists started to move into town. By 1840 the town and surrounding area had five schools, and by 1851 classes were being held in the town's first high school because of the influx of people brought to Saltsburg by the canal.\textsuperscript{57} This made Saltsburg a more diverse and cosmopolitan town in comparison to its frontier-like days before the canal had been built.

Saltsburg's whole dynamic and existence were transformed because of the canal. It gave them a more efficient means to ship their goods to the major cities and opened the town to the outside world. This in turn caused the population and the demographics of the town to surge. What was once a sleepy little Presbyterian town gave way to the hustle and bustle of the Market and Transportation Revolutions, bringing all sorts of different people to Saltsburg to help establish new businesses and to seek employment. Thus the canal had a positive impact on Saltsburg.

In Huntingdon County along the Juniata River is located the borough of Alexandria. The town was first settled in 1793 by mostly Scots-Irish Presbyterians, just as Saltsburg had been. It did not actually grow enough to be incorporated until 1827. Most of Alexandria's early business was "designed for local production and consumption."\textsuperscript{58} Iron forges began to open nearby and so this became the leading local industry. By 1810 "Alexandria's population was 751."\textsuperscript{59} Although it was a relatively small borough, it did have its own stagecoach office, showing that even early on it was of some importance to east-west travel in Pennsylvania.

By 1833 the Juniata Division of the Mainline had come to Alexandria and was operational. The route of the canal, unlike in Saltsburg, went right through the heart of Alexandria.
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The canal commissioners had simply found the flattest land in town that also allowed them to build the canal in a straight line parallel to the river, without regard for the private property affected. While in Saltsburg all the residents needed to do was build a few bridges over the canal, some of the Alexandria’s residents lost much of their land, with the only recourse being to file a damage claim with the commonwealth.60

The land losses were greatly offset by the canal’s economic impact, which was felt immediately after it opened. Warehouses and businesses began to crop up in town as a trading boom began, particularly in iron. Among the other businesses that established themselves in town were tanneries, mills, and a brewery. Much as in Saltsburg, the canal brought all sorts of people to Alexandria. By 1851 the town had not only Presbyterians, but a sizeable number of Methodists and German Reformists as well. A school board was elected in 1842, which coincided with the opening of public schools in Alexandria.61 As these people came to work, learn, and live in Alexandria, the town became a more diverse community.

In spite of the property loss incurred by some of its residents, Alexandria was transformed into a trade center because of the canal. Just as in Saltsburg, the canal brought with it an influx of commerce and different groups of people that all helped to enhance to borough and made it a major commercial center in Central Pennsylvania. During the canal years, Alexandria enjoyed great success and growth, in a way that it would never see again. Therefore, with one exception, the canal was beneficial to Alexandria.

Pittsburgh, located at the confluence of the Allegheny, Monongahela, and Ohio Rivers, was a natural trade center for goods traveling to and from the western United States as well as New Orleans, making it in many ways Pennsylvania’s gateway to the West. Much of the city’s efforts prior to the Mainline went into “market expansion and development of home industries.”62 This economic motive gave them reason to petition for the Mainline. Pittsburgh’s trading capabilities increased considerably after the system was operational. By 1835 the city was shipping 101,725 barrels of flour from the West went Eastward, with some of it going to Europe. Pittsburgh also shipped a wide variety of other products in large quantities via the Mainline, including butter, bacon, cheese, feathers, and wool.63 The city was also a large importer of goods shipped over the Mainline. In fact, Pittsburgh became such a large importer that “merchandise shipped to Pittsburgh in 1835 was the largest item in any class carried over the State System.”64 Befitting the city’s more sophisticated nature by this time, furniture was among the major imports, 1,390,767 pounds of which was imported by Pittsburgh in 1847 alone.65
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Industrially speaking, Pittsburgh began to develop greatly with the opening of the Mainline. “To the Pittsburgh iron interests, the mainline was a lifesaver.”66 The iron manufacturing capacity of the city was realized at this time, as was exhibited by the high amount of iron imported during the Mainline years.67 Much “of the iron was sent to Pittsburgh for manufacture and then transported east again,” showing that the Mainline served not only to bring iron into the city, but also provided the principal means for exporting finished products.68 In an effort to further increase this business, Pittsburgh supported the building of the Cross-Cut Canal, an extension of the Mainline into Ohio, which would allow for a better trade connection with Cleveland. Soon after the Cross-Cut Canal opened, huge shipments of iron were exported to Ohio.69 This trade became so lucrative that George Hutton, a local canal agent, “estimated that about one hundred tons of iron...and Pittsburgh manufactured articles passed weekly to Cleveland throughout the summer of 1840.”70 In having connections to Cleveland, Pittsburgh was also able to tap into the Great Lakes trade and profit from commercial relationships with cities such as Detroit. Therefore the Mainline was in some ways instrumental in advancing Pittsburgh’s commercial capabilities through connections with Philadelphia and later Cleveland, which in turn benefited its industry, particularly in iron manufacturing.

Philadelphia, the commonwealth’s largest city and Atlantic port, had agitated for years for a more efficient transportation route to Pittsburgh so that the city had access to the Western markets. With the building of the Erie Canal, this urgency became greater as shown by “many of Philadelphia’s largest financial institutions went into bankruptcy” because the city was unable to attract business.71 Where in 1795 Philadelphia exported 40% more goods than New York City, by 1825 the city was at a 45% deficit to its Northern neighbor.72 Philadelphia was also losing ground to Baltimore at the time. “Historically Philadelphia had prospered as the ‘bread basket’ of the colonies,” but this had started to change.73 By 1825 Baltimore was exporting 216,000 more barrels of flour than Philadelphia.74 Philadelphia desperately needed a new trade route to remain economic viable.

With the completion of the CPR and the complete system opening soon thereafter, Philadelphia finally received this route. Philadelphia was able to quickly use the Mainline to export large quantities of manufactured goods to the West.75 The system also allowed goods to be shipped much more cheaply from western trade centers than from the Erie Canal. For example, it cost $1.30 per hundred pounds to ship goods from Cincinnati to Philadelphia,
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while it cost $2.40 to ship them from Cincinnati to Albany using the Erie Canal. This allowed Philadelphia to cut into the Western trade that often utilized the Erie. The cheap fares also helped Philadelphia to gain an edge over Baltimore and its National Road trade. The coalfields of Northeastern Pennsylvania could be more easily tapped into after the Mainline and some of its lateral extensions had been completed, enabling Philadelphia to develop its anthracite iron industry and the city's other profitable coal markets. Thus “Pittsburgh and Philadelphia controlled the bulk of the commerce to and from the rich Ohio Valley.”

After becoming fully operational in 1834, “the mainline soon did a very considerable business, though it never became a strong competitor of the Erie.” For example, in 1847 the Erie hauled 1,661,575 tons of goods compared to a mere 234,229 tons that traveled via the Mainline. In the same year, Baltimore exported roughly $9,000,000 worth of goods to Philadelphia’s $8,000,000, showing that the Mainline could not compete with the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal either. For one thing, there were constant delays caused by the changes from canal boat conveyance to rail car, as well as the need to split up boats and cargo when traversing the APR; these made the Mainline rather infeasible in comparison to the Erie Canal, which was an all-water with no change over of transportation modes. Beyond that, it had no real speed advantage and only a slight climatic advantage over the Erie. In fact, by 1839 it became apparent to some shippers that it was more efficient “to send [goods] down the Mississippi to New Orleans, then by ship to Philadelphia, than to use the mainline.” By not attracting business via the Mainline, Philadelphia was unable to benefit as much from western trade. This meant, “The great business boom which Philadelphia anticipated did not mature.” This was not the only factor to cause the Mainline’s demise. As “no attempt was ever made to relate toll charges realistically to canal maintenance and amortization requirements,” the commonwealth simply never accumulated the money it needed to make operating the Mainline feasible. The debt from the system became so immense that the legislature had to enact an entire tax bill in 1840 to help pay it down, a move that was unpopular with taxpayers. By 1842 the commonwealth was unable to meet the interest payments on the Mainline loans, which by that point totaled over $33,000,000. Finding the Mainline to be a financial sinkhole, the commonwealth attempted to sell the system in 1844 for $20,000,000, but no one wanted it because it was earning less than three percent of its original cost. Finally in 1857 the Pennsylvania Railroad, which
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had been usurping business from the Mainline since it opened in 1852, bought the system for $7,500,000, which had by that point cost the commonwealth $58,000,000.90 “Pennsylvania had spent more on new canal construction than any other state,” and had not reaped anywhere near the benefits, especially when compared to the Erie Canal.91

In hindsight, it would appear that the commonwealth would have been better served by building an unbroken railroad to Pittsburgh, rather than the multi-modal monstrosity that was developed. A “movement for a continuous railroad began only four years after completion of the mainline,” showing that some had seen early on the error of building the Mainline of Public Works.92 Even before the Mainline was built one of its engineers, who had examined canals and railroads in England, suggested that rail line be constructed instead.93 A railroad would have given businesses and passengers an all-weather alternative to the Erie that could have run year-round and that would not have been dependent on water levels, which could be easily manipulated by floods and droughts. Oddly enough, at the time deliberations over the Mainline were brewing, the British were involved in some rather extensive trials that by 1829 had determined the bright possibilities for railroads.94 Had Philadelphia become involved in these trials, the city might have been able “to take immediate advantage of advances in railroad technology.”95 This in turn might have allowed Philadelphia to take the lead in the East Coast trade rivalry, causing the commonwealth to grow and develop as well. To that end, it could be postulated that had a railroad been built across Pennsylvania, the commonwealth would have potentially received the new industries, businesses, and immigrants that went to New York because of the Erie Canal’s success. As it was, Philadelphia became disgusted with the apparent failure of the Mainline and took a disinterested stance toward further internal improvements in Pennsylvania.96

Although the Pennsylvania Mainline was a long-term fiscal disaster for the commonwealth, the system had a positive effect in that “the benefits resulting from their development of the resources of the Commonwealth, from the opening up of extensive sections of country which otherwise would have been shut out from a market, and from the impetus given to trade and industrial pursuits of all kinds.”97 In this way, the Mainline brought about an “outward-looking and expansionist mentality [that] can be said to be the . . . single most important contribution that the canal era made to the synergy of 19th-century urban life.”98 The Mainline caused businessmen to think about developing cities into modernized manufacturing centers
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that catered to a more national and global market as opposed to the local industry they were invested in before the system’s existence.

The Pennsylvania Mainline of Public Works served to increase trade and commercial development in the towns and cities of the commonwealth. Small boroughs such as Saltsburg and Alexandria boomed while Pittsburgh found the system advantageous for developing its iron industry, which would lead to its dominance in steel. The Mainline also served as the conveyance of many notable people and the text setting for writings such as Dicken’s American Notes. Its purpose in securing western trade and bolstering local development as well as its impact on canallers was typical of canals during the mid-19th century. Yet the Mainline’s unique design combined canals and railroads to solve for well-known geographic obstacles, but ultimately prevented it from becoming profitable because of the constant delays inherent in such a system. In this way, the commonwealth would have been better served with a continuous rail line. Yet without the Mainline of Public Works such engineering wonders as the APR, Conemaugh Viaduct, and Staple Bend Tunnel would have remained ideas instead of becoming the reality that they were. It is unlikely that Governor Schulze could have envisioned in 1826 the course that the Mainline would take and the role that it would play in Pennsylvania’s future. During its run the Mainline of Public Works did indeed greatly affect the municipalities and individuals that became involved with it, thus influencing in some way much of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the United States as a whole.
The Editors ‘Will Little Note Nor Long Remember’: Ohio’s Newspapers Respond to the Gettysburg Address

Brian M. Jordan

It was simple: 272 words, woven together into an appropriate poem and meant to dedicate both a cemetery and a nation to a cause. Its words are now eternal; they are sacrosanct lines that have left an indelible mark on the foundation and ideals of America. When selecting a subtitle for his 1992 Pulitzer Prize winning volume *Lincoln at Gettysburg*, Garry Wills called the Gettysburg Address “the words that remade America.”

On the other hand, the humble Lincoln, within his address, suggests that “the world will little note nor long remember what we say here.” Quite the contradiction: one, simple speech being unworthy of a mere thought from posterity, yet at the same time being the words that gave a nation “new birth.”

If these truly were the words that remade America, then it is appropriate they were made on Pennsylvania’s soil. Pennsylvania, from the conception of the America, has been the place where that nation has been saved. In 1776, at Philadelphia, Thomas Jefferson wrote the words that Lincoln lived by: the words of the Declaration of Independence. It was the document that saved thirteen ragged colonies from Britain’s oppression. In 1787, fifty-five delegates met in that same Pennsylvania city and reached numerous compromises that helped form a living Constitution that continues to perpetuate this nation. In 2001, the passengers and crew of hijacked Flight 93 rushed the terrorists that had seized the plane, crashed it into a field near Somerset, and most likely saved either the White House or Capitol building. Today, adding Lincoln’s 1863 utterance at the dedication ceremony for the cemetery at Gettysburg to this list of noteworthy dates would occur without thought; however, the Gettysburg Address’ importance would not have been as obvious to the editors of contemporary newspapers reporting the event for the first time. The contradiction previously revealed between Wills’ conclusion and Lincoln’s own interjected reflection of the speech comes into an even clearer focus when the newspaper coverage of the dedication ceremony is analyzed for a particular geographic region. This paper will analyze contemporary newspaper reports from all corners of one of the most politically important states for the Lincoln administration – the state of Ohio. In addition to analyzing papers from different regions of Ohio itself, it will also look at Democratic and Republican papers and compare their reactions, even though the difference between their respective coverage is often subtle. Before any analysis is done or any conclusions are made, the reader must first understand Ohio during the Civil War.

Ohio’s Role in the Civil War

If Pennsylvania was the soil on which the nation was continuously saved, then Ohio was the breeding ground for greatness in the American Civil War. Ohio provided leadership to the Union cause both politically and militarily, in addition to supplying over three-hundred thousand fighting men. In proportion to state population, this contribution of fighting men was ranked first among all Union states. The Buckeye State was home to two influential cabinet secretaries: Treasury Secretary Salmon P. Chase, who eyed the presidency, and War Secretary Edwin McMasters Stanton, who managed the war from 1862 onward. Brilliant military commanders Ulysses S. Grant, William Tecumseh Sherman, Phil Sheridan, George A. Custer, and Quincy Adams Gillmore, capable leaders that delivered victories in multiple theaters, were also native Ohioans. Many historians argue that without the contribution of these generals, most notably Sherman’s capture of Atlanta, Lincoln would not have won re-election. One of the most influential wartime members of the U.S. Senate, Benjamin Wade, hailed from the Western Reserve.

Ohio was important beyond its supply of able leaders and fighting regiments of men, however. Politically, Ohio was one of the most important states for Lincoln because of its size and own internal political situation. Only Pennsylvania and New York had supplied more regiments to the Union cause; in addition, as one of the largest and most populated Union states, it was a prize in terms of electoral votes and had become a virtual requisite for presidential nominees to carry in order to win the White House.

But although Ohio contributed so much to aid the cause of the Union, it was not without divided sentiments. Although the Western Reserve and some areas along the Ohio River were alive with a frenzy of Underground Railroad and abolitionist activity, other areas were opposed to interference with slavery and were certainly against emancipation. Clement Laird Vallandigham, a Dayton lawyer, was the most rabid “Copperhead,” a term used to describe a Southern sympathizer during the war. One of Lincoln’s sharpest critics, he gave an impassioned speech that denounced the war and called for the removal of the president. This fiery invective led to his arrest and conviction by military tribunal. Ohio was certainly divided. According to James M. McPherson, this division could be explained through Ohio’s composition as a “microcosm of the North itself,” with the southern portions of the state being populated by Southern immigrants and the Western Reserve being populated by Puritans and New Englanders naturally opposed to slavery. This dichotomy of values created a continuous, political power struggle that animated the Lincoln administration.

---

3 George W. Knepper, Ohio and Its People (Kent: Kent State University Press, 1989), 251-52.
6 Dictionary of American Biography, s.v. “Vallandigham, Clement.”
With the situation on the battlefield becoming increasingly trying for the Lincoln administration, and with the 1862 election of Democrat Horatio Seymour as New York governor, Lincoln knew that the political climates of both Pennsylvania and Ohio were crucial to his own re-election in 1864. He watched the 1863 Ohio gubernatorial election with extreme caution; Republican John Brough, a talented public speaker, was running against Vallandigham himself. Lincoln was well aware of the ramifications of Vallandigham’s election. “The President says he feels nervous [about the returns in Ohio],” Navy Secretary Gideon Welles wrote in his diary.\(^8\) Lincoln was so nervous that he sent the color-bearers of the Republican Party in Ohio, including Secretary Chase and Senator John Sherman, home to campaign for Brough.\(^9\) In the end, Lincoln carried the day and Brough won the election in a landslide. After this reassuring victory for his administration, Lincoln proclaimed, “Glory to God in the highest: Ohio has saved the Union.”\(^10\)

Thus politically, Ohio was “ground zero” during the American Civil War. As noted by George W. Knepper, the eminent authority on Ohio’s history, Ohio was a state that “no party or leader could afford to ignore.”\(^11\) It was still ensconced in military dynamics, though. In 1863, Confederate raider John Hunt Morgan plundered his way across the southern and southeastern counties, giving Ohioans a taste of war’s privations and giving rise to a small battle at Buffington Island in July. Morgan’s foray into Ohio was the culmination of the longest raid of the Civil War.\(^12\) And, of course, every family, hometown, and local newspaper in the state anxiously awaited news from the frontlines where brothers, sons, cousins, residents, and readers were fighting.

**Ohio Responds: An Overview of Findings**

Not only was Ohio a “microcosm” of the political sentiments of the North, it was a geographic microcosm of the nation, as well. Ohio had it all: western rural farmlands, which included Wyandot County; major cities of industry and commerce activity, such as the capital Columbus, Cleveland, Toledo, and Cincinnati, and smaller towns and rustic county seats with often sharp political consequence, such as Steubenville, Fremont, Canton, Akron, and Dayton.\(^13\) Cincinnati was the largest and most significant Ohio city during the Civil War era, known as the “cultural capital of the west.”\(^14\) Despite the often stark contrast between these areas, each of their newspapers had a similar reaction to the delivery of the Gettysburg Address. Generally, the editors of Ohio’s Civil
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War newspapers were more concerned with the activity on the battlefield, the progression of the armies and the progress of the war, and local, newsworthy events and people that directly affected their lives. Perhaps the question that most editors were asking in Ohio was something along the lines of “how could two-hundred and seventy-two words be important enough to warrant coverage?”

Of course in Lincoln’s time, newspapers were instruments of political parties. Whenever analyzing the newspaper coverage, it is important to look at the paper’s partisan persuasion. Republican newspapers in Ohio gave far more attention to the dedication ceremony in Gettysburg than Democratic newspapers; furthermore, these pro-administration papers placed greater emphasis on Lincoln’s presence, attentiveness, and remarks than their Democratic counterparts did.

**FIGURE 1. LOCATIONS OF NEWSPAPERS ANALYZED**

1 – Summit County Beacon, Akron
2 – Ashtabula Weekly Telegraph
3 – Ohio Repository, Canton
4 – Cincinnati Daily Times
5 – Cincinnati Daily Enquirer
6 – Cleveland Plain Dealer
7 – Ohio Statesman, Columbus
8 – Ohio Democrat, New Philadelphia
9 – Dayton Journal
10 – Fremont Journal
11 – Hardin County Republican, Kenton
12 – Stark County Republican
13 – Steubenville Daily Herald
14 – Toledo Blade
15 – Democratic Union, Upper Sandusky
16 – Wyandot Pioneer, Wyandot County
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When a transcript of the speech appears in print, it is only within a Republican paper. There exists a significant and sizeable disparity in the coverage of Lincoln’s remarks by Republican and Democratic newspapers; however, once again, the coverage as a whole does not suggest the importance of the address that is today seen as one of the divine discourses of American history.

The in-depth survey of the original newspaper coverage that follows provides the evidence supporting these conclusions.

**Making Sense of the Coverage**

*What was important to newspaper editors and the community at-large?*

According to Reid Mitchell in his 1993 volume *The Vacant Chair*, Northern soldiers could only make sense of the Civil War if they saw it in relation to the domestic components of their lives. The Northern soldier had to realize that the war he was fighting was a war for the Union; it was that Union that was the manifestation of his own home, community, family, and moral sense of self. Because of this manifestation, the Northern community provided both the impetus for his continued devotion to the principles of liberty and the adhesive that united the Union forces in the face of increasingly horrific challenges.16

The intertwinement of home, community, and the continuation of the war was a significant factor in the lives of Northern soldiers continuing the struggle. As Mitchell points out, Northern communities never lost their authority over their troops. One of the most important ways for the community to exert their continuing authority was through newspaper coverage. In a sense, newspapers monitored the behavior of the troops and actively informed attentive family members and neighbors at home of movements and setbacks on the battlefield. Therefore, any military telegraph, battlefield news, soldier letter, officer’s report, administration policy or battlefield map was of crucial importance to readers. Likewise, the news of the war had political motives for both the Democratic and Republican presses. News of sluggish armies and incompetent generals created worries that motivated anti-administration factions. On the other hand, news of the war and a continual focus on the importance of an unconditional victory bolstered the administration’s proponents. It is reasonable, then, to conclude that the “few, appropriate remarks” of Abraham Lincoln, conceived as nothing further than “dedicatory remarks” by the *Ohio Statesman*, were not as important as military news or a policy speech.17

The latter is evidenced through the overt emphasis on the war itself and the queer, bizarre, and often dark human-interest stories that it created. For example, the *Ohio Repository* placed the cumbersome reports of Secretary of War Stanton and Secretary of the Navy Welles
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prominently on the front page of its December 16, 1863 issue. These reports lack poetic flourish and the panache that would denote them as memorable pieces of writing, so the assumption can be made that the legal-sounding, militaristic content was of great importance. These banal, “important” reports provide quite a contrast to the utterly poetic Gettysburg Address, and they also make a strong statement of the contemporary interpretation of the Gettysburg Address as a document meeting its specific dedicatory purpose only.

As with the reports of Stanton and Welles that found an important place on the front page of the newspaper, other military items dominated the prominent columns. The Stark County Republican was diligent in updating readers on the activities of the 107th Ohio Volunteer Infantry. Large battlefield maps, depicting the troop positions at both Chattanooga and McMinnville, Tennessee graced the front pages of the Cincinnati Daily Times in late November 1863. Reappearing columns in most of the papers, titled “Telegraphs” and “Dispatches,” were given priority on the page with bold typesetting as they divulged updates from the front lines.

One instance of a human-interest story also originates in the Cincinnati Daily Times. Just one week after they covered the Gettysburg Address and dedication ceremony with a generic, seventy-seven word report, the paper gave 137 words to a “shocking accident” at Gettysburg. According to the report of this accident, a man was observing a boy in the streets who was playing with a live shell, probably from the battlefield. The man decided to remove the charge from the shell for the boy’s safety, and when he did so, it exploded, consuming them both. It was certainly an ironic tragedy that was a direct extension of the horrors of battle; however, it is more significant to this study that the paper gave more attention to a seemingly random incident than it did to Lincoln’s address. It showcases the address’ general lack of importance to contemporary news editors and the importance of militaristic reporting.

But of course Lincoln was commander-in-chief of the Union armies, and he was certainly a military figure in that role. Likewise, when he acted in that role as one of his many presidential duties and responsibilities, he received coverage. The lavish attention given by papers of all persuasions to his Third Annual Message to Congress and corresponding Amnesty Proclamation supports this argument tenably. The Annual Message was a policy speech the president was expected to provide to Congress once a year; appropriately, the newspapers and readers came to expect the text of it as well. On a bipartisan level, the newspapers anticipated Lincoln’s Annual Message in the same way certain publications and media releases are anticipated today.
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The Dayton Journal, a Republican paper running opposite the Dayton Empire, a bastion of Copperheads, appeared most anxious. On December 7, the paper noted, “We expect the President’s Message by telegraph.”

If the House organizes without trouble we shall have it this afternoon. We would defer the publication of our Weekly in order to circulate it quickly, but the arrangement of the mails is not favorable to such an operation. We shall, however, print an extra number of dailies, so that the demand for the Message can be readily supplied.22

The next day, another paragraph appeared suggesting the anticipation of the Message. It noted that extra copies would be available, and even speculated as to how many columns the message would consume.23 Subsequently, on December 9, an afternoon dispatch discusses what is “important and interesting” in the message, providing a primordial outline of the speech.24 After three such days of growing anticipation and preparation for its release, the Third Annual Message consumed the entire second page of the paper on December 10.25 It was followed the next day by a short piece that noted the “tribulation” the message caused the publisher; more importantly, it suggested the message was widely read and important enough to warrant analysis and editorial comment.26

The message warranted the use of the front page of the Ohio Statesman, Ashtabula Weekly Telegraph, Cincinnati Daily Times, Democratic Union, and numerous other papers.27 The Steubenville Daily Herald accompanied its complete coverage of the message with a piece similar to the remarks of the Dayton Journal, conveying the importance of the message and the newspaper’s own lack of space for necessary analysis.28 The Wyandot Pioneer was perhaps the most direct and representative of the newspapers, calling the message an “important document.”29

The Third Annual Message certainly was an important document in terms of administration policy and the course of the war; it was Lincoln looking to the future, envisioning peace, amnesty, and reunion. The newspaper editors in Ohio realized just that, and thus anticipated and worked tirelessly to ensure the proper release of the message because they knew the readers recognized this as well.

Unlike the coverage of the Third Annual Message, there was no great “anticipation” of the Gettysburg Address. In all of the papers analyzed, the only article preceding the actual coverage is a generic wire report delineating the names of the “principal dignitaries” making their way by train to Gettysburg. Unlike the excitement that radiated from the articles antici-
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pating the arrival of Lincoln’s message, this generic piece is a simple divulging of names. The only reference to Lincoln is the dignitary train’s anticipated connection with Lincoln’s train at Hanover Junction.30

The Gettysburg Address was also dissimilar from the Third Annual Message in that it was not an overt policy speech that had annual antecedents. Or at least it did not have the appearance of a policy speech. As the Wyandot Pioneer quite simply described the Third Annual Message, most papers also easily labeled Lincoln’s 272 words at Gettysburg. The Ohio Statesman, in introducing the text of the speech, identified it as a “dedicatory speech.” The Hardin County Republican used the same descriptor, considering the speech as nothing more than a banal sermon consecrating a cemetery. As the report of the ceremony continues, the rural paper also labels Lincoln’s speech as “brief remarks.” Nevertheless, the paper did describe the ceremony itself in an elegant way, suggesting that the service itself was worth memory.31

The Daily Toledo Blade repeated this description of the address as simple “remarks,” with the connotation of insignificance.32 Edwin Stanton’s hometown paper in Steubenville at least labeled Lincoln’s words as a speech; according to its account of the ceremony, Lincoln delivered “a brief speech, well to the purpose.”33 Most papers were quick to point out the chief oration was given by Edward Everett, and often included excerpts from his speech. Furthermore, these papers appropriately recognized Lincoln’s subordinate role at Gettysburg, and thus gave generally primordial coverage to the president’s words. In doing so, they missed the mark; what they failed to realize was that Lincoln’s speech had in content gone well beyond simple “dedicatory remarks” for a cemetery. It was certainly a dedicatory speech, but it was dedicating a nation to the new banner of emancipation that would save the Union. As Menahem Blondheim has noted, Lincoln was “speaking to the air,” utilizing the platform at Gettysburg to speak to the nation.34 For Lincoln, the 272 words he uttered at Gettysburg had meaning far beyond their time, place, and beauty. He was giving a policy speech; the content was tantamount to any other directive he had given or would give on the course of the war. He had gone far beyond the “few, appropriate remarks” by addressing his nation in place of his audience. Had the newspapers realized this, perhaps they would have given Lincoln the same coverage they gave him when he offered an overtly recognizable policy directive.

Yet to generalize and say all news coverage of the ceremony was primitive is to overlook the great partisan disparity in the coverage. Even though almost all papers agreed on the so-called “limited” focus of the speech, Republican papers were quick to give far more column inches to Lincoln and the ceremony than Democratic presses. It is not difficult to understand and justify
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this disparity; as instruments of their own, respective ideology, each persuasion developed its own color-bearers and pariahs. This development was often colorful and ardent. Republican readers wanted their standard-bearer celebrated and covered; however, Democratic readers often wanted the president derided and alternative leaders such as Clement Vallandigham hailed. For example, the fiery, Democratic *Cincinnati Daily Enquirer* on November 19, 1863 gave no mention to the events occurring in Gettysburg that day; rather, they gave lavish, front-page coverage to an address by Vallandigham given several days prior. In similar fashion, the *Ohio Repository*, a Republican paper, printed a speech by the pro-administration governor-elect John Brough in early November that was not covered by the Democratic journalists. The absence of Vallandigham’s speech in Republican papers and the reciprocal absence of Brough’s speech in Democratic papers illustrate the partisan desire of editors to give little press coverage to the addresses and activities of the opponent. It also provides a convenient, demonstrative parallel to the coverage of the Gettysburg ceremonials.

**Partisan Disparity**

Although the coverage of the ceremony was only solid, complete, and most descriptive in Republican papers, perhaps the reporting of the *Fremont Journal* on November 27, 1863 was paramount. Under the sweeping title “Dedication of the National Cemetery at Gettysburg,” the paper describes the event as “a great day for the nation” in which the ground was dedicated “to valor, to patriotism, and to freedom.” In describing the cemetery itself, the paper calls the site “commanding.” Interpolated between these descriptions is the text of both the dirge, presented at the ceremony and written at Gettysburg by B.B. French, and Lincoln’s remarks, including notations of “immense applause.” The news reporting itself is nearly a minute-by-minute recounting of the proceedings, suggesting the significance the Republican editor placed on the event as a whole.

Ironically, in a paper that was extremely detail-oriented, only the most general summary of Edward Everett’s keynote oration appears. Unlike the *Cleveland Plain Dealer* and other urban, Democratic papers that included extracts from the principal speaker, the emphasis of the *Fremont Journal* and other Republican papers seems to be more on the ceremony as a whole and Lincoln’s presence at Gettysburg. Lincoln is closely monitored in the *Fremont Journal* report, well beyond the simple inclusion of the text of his address. His attentiveness is thoroughly documented and applauded by the report, which cites the president as “perhaps the most attentive and appreciate listener.”

He seemed to be absorbed in attention profound, till the spell was broken by a mistake of the orator in saying General Lee, when he should have said General Meade,
which mistake caused the President to turn to Seward with a loud voice [,] say[ing,] “General Meade;” but the orator seemed not to hear it. At this time the orator made the same mistake, but the President corrected it loud enough to secure a correction by the orator.38

An elegant picture is painted with these words of both the abstract and the literal. The detailed, superior description expressed in the Fremont Journal is notably mirrored in almost all other Republican papers. The Summit County Beacon, for example, provided the same detailed descriptions of the cemetery, ceremonial, and Lincoln. Perhaps this newspaper comes closest to recognizing the lasting importance of the words imparted at Gettysburg, noting that November 19 “will long be remembered as the day the National Necropolis at Gettysburg was dedicated.”39

Beyond this striking contradiction to one of Lincoln’s own sentences, the Summit County Beacon also provides a moving anecdote that truly describes the importance of the Gettysburg Address far beyond the power of the historian to reflect and analyze. Immediately following the text of the speech, the report notes that “the President’s calm, but earnest utterance of this brief and beautiful address stirred the deepest fountains of feeling and emotion, in hearts of the vast throng before him; and when he had concluded, scarcely could an untearful eye be seen, while sobs of smothered emotion were heard on every hand.”

At our side stood a stalwart officer, bearing the insignia of a captain’s rank, the empty sleeve of his coat indicating that he had stood where death was reveling, and as the President, speaking of our Gettysburg soldiers, uttered that beautifully touching sentence, so sublime and pregnant of meaning – “The world will little note, nor long remember what we say here...” the gallant soldier’s feelings burst over all restraint; and burying his face in his handkerchief, he sobbed aloud while his manly frame shook with no unmanly emotion.40

The inclusion of this moving description of the “stalwart officer” at the ceremonials suggests that the Summit County Beacon recognized almost immediately that the brief, poignant words of Lincoln had exceeded Everett’s protracted remarks. It is plausible to conclude that all Republican papers reached this same conclusion, because they all felt compelled to print the speech, much unlike their Democratic counterparts.

For Democratic papers like the Cleveland Plain Dealer, it was Edward Everett that was most important, or at least more significant. Much unlike the Ohio Repository, which printed Everett’s speech a full week after it made Lincoln’s speech available, the Plain Dealer eschewed
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any coverage of Lincoln and extracted remarks solely from Everett. The Ohio Democrat offered its readers a reprint of the New York Herald coverage, and although this report noted the distinct character of the ceremonies, it gave only a passing reference to the President. For the Democratic papers, exceptional coverage was non-existent. The same generic wire report the Cleveland Plain Dealer provided to its readers was transmitted by the Cincinnati Daily Enquirer, only buried on the third page. The Cincinnati Daily Times followed suit with the simple wire story, and the Wyandot Pioneer only provided a one sentence summary of the ceremony in its “Latest News” column. The Democratic Union of Upper Sandusky didn’t carry the ceremony at all.

Of course, a ceremony graced by the President’s presence, celebrating martyrs for Lincoln’s cause, was certainly beautiful to the Republican press and at the same time not worthy of comment from the Democratic press. Even though the speech was rarely recognized beyond its inferior position that day, it was still imparted by Republican papers because these were the words of Lincoln, and Lincoln was the embodiment of the struggle for reunion and unconditional surrender. Still, the Republican papers did not anticipate the address with the ebullient and frenetic energy that preceded the distribution of the Annual Message. They did not proffer much in the way of analysis, and didn’t allow the coverage to consume the front page or an extra. Beyond these trivial details, however, the more complete and attentive coverage of Republican papers evidences the important partisan disparity in the Civil War era press.

Coincidence?

The partisan disparity in the coverage has already been revealed and explored, but one perplexing coincidence remains to be investigated. Placed in the column immediately to the left of the paramount coverage of November 19 in the Fremont Journal is a sound, preliminary endorsement of the re-election of Abraham Lincoln to the presidency of the United States, reprinted from the Carlisle [Pennsylvania] American. “When the life of a nation is at stake, there is no time to consider difference of opinion,” the endorsement proclaims, subsequently noting the firmness and practical leadership of the president. Likewise, in the Summit County Beacon, the paper that had most closely mirrored the Fremont Journal coverage, a laudatory ode to Abraham Lincoln adjoins the Gettysburg report. Written in Brattleboro, Vermont, a month before the Gettysburg Address, author J.H. Elliot hails Lincoln as the determined captain, looking cautiously forward, at the wheel of the ship of state.
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It is ironic that these two detail-oriented, Republican papers would chose to print such meaningful encomiums to Lincoln the very same day they presented his Gettysburg Address to their constituency in Ohio. Is this a coincidence, or is this evidence that the editors of these two papers had recognized the true power of Lincoln’s words at Gettysburg by choosing to link those words to such lofty, praiseworthy, and partisan pieces? Only the editors can provide the answer to that question. If the answer the editors provided negated the coincidence, then those editors were among the first of a very selective contemporary group that immediately recognized the significance of Lincoln’s remarks.

The Mystic Chords of Memory

Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address has taken its place in American history as one of the divine discourses; the lines of the speech are so sacrosanct that they are embedded into the collective memory of America as words “far beyond” simple, dedicatory remarks setting apart a plot of blood soaked battlefield land as a burial ground. Today, we remember Lincoln’s words as the words that dedicated not only a cemetery, but the words that dedicated a nation to the unfinished work of reuniting a fractured nation. We remember Lincoln’s words as the words that dedicated a nation to the cause of freedom and emancipation. We remember Lincoln’s words as the words that dedicated a nation to an ultimate victory through the remembrance of those that made the initial sacrifices.

But all of this was not as apparent to the editors of contemporary newspapers in Ohio, a state whose politics, leaders, and fighting men were of the utmost importance to the Lincoln administration. Buckeye newspaper editors from both political parties were generally more concerned with military advances, the progression of the war, and local events that had direct impact and immediate meaning in the lives of their readers. As a result, battles, regimental news, and administration policy became a focus for newspaper coverage in Ohio during the Civil War. Lincoln’s Third Annual Message to Congress and corresponding Amnesty Proclamation, an overt policy speech and war directive, fit nicely into this mold. The policy directives and course of the war as defined by Lincoln in this document would directly affect the lives of readers as citizens and suppliers of fighting men, and therefore was covered thoroughly by papers of all persuasions. Papers eagerly awaited the arrival of the document, and once they printed it, recognized its importance through analysis. Energy radiated from the anticipation of the message and the coverage itself, which usually bridged all of the columns on the front page.

The same was not true of coverage of the Gettysburg Address, which was generally primordial and without flourish or lavish treatment. Much unlike the coverage of the Third Annual Message, there was no coverage of Lincoln or the Gettysburg ceremonials in the days preceding November 19 beyond a banal wire report describing the dignitaries on a special excursion train making its way to Hanover Junction. In stark contrast to the descriptions of
significance and importance attached to the Third Annual Message, the Gettysburg Address was described by most papers as simple dedicatory remarks, implying that the speech had little significance beyond its immediate purpose.

The print media made a grievous error in failing to recognize these seemingly mundane, dedicatory remarks as something beyond the “few, appropriate remarks” David Wills had requested. What Lincoln did at Gettysburg was to form an idea, much larger than the cemetery he was consecrating, that represented any and every Civil War battle. The idea was a merger of the “event” with the “place.” The immediate event was the three day Battle of Gettysburg, although in reality, it was any and every engagement since the bombardment of Ft. Sumter. The immediate place was an emerging, crossroads town in south central Pennsylvania that awoke to unprecedented horrors just months before, although in reality, it was any and every like community that grappled with similar devastation and disorder. By merging the two, Lincoln attempted to engage the nation in deep self-reflection; he seized the sacrifice of the slain to provide his nation with direction, inspiration, and a meditation on values. The ramifications of these simple words were not immediately recognized; as a result, Lincoln’s words were bestowed with the marginal coverage explored above.

Despite this general coverage, a great disparity existed between Republican and Democratic newspaper responses. Understandably, as virtual extensions of their political party, newspapers on both sides of the aisle had different priorities and pariahs, and therefore chose to cover the Gettysburg dedication in their own, distinct ways. Democratic newspapers – in this study – placed more of an emphasis on Edward Everett, the chief orator, and never included a transcript of Lincoln’s remarks; nevertheless, Republican papers almost always carried a transcription of the speech and paid close attention to the attentiveness of the President and the propriety of the ceremony. Republican papers, with more detailed and diligent reporting of November 19 as a whole, confirmed their allegiances to the cause of Union and the cause of Lincoln, yet still fell short of recognizing the divinity of the address that is apparent today.

Needless to say, it is much easier to make conclusions about the importance of various historical events, persons, and speeches after scores of years have elapsed. The ultimate disparity, then, exists not in the differences between Republican and Democratic responses, but truly between the historians and the makers of history: the same contradiction explored in the introduction between Lincoln’s own words and Garry Wills’ humble historical analysis. As years pass, interpretations change. “The mystic chords of memory” that Lincoln described in his First Inaugural Address certainly do stretch from every battlefield and patriot grave, and they touch a new generation. Those chords, ultimately because they were touched by Lincoln’s steady focus, political genius, and skillfully crafted language, continue to swell the chorus of Union. In doing so, they allow history, much like the nation Lincoln described at Gettysburg, to have new birth.
Voices of Moderation: Southern Whites Respond to Brown v. Board of Education

GARETH D. PAHOWKA

At the shining apex of racial reform in the civil rights era stands the historic 1954 Brown v. Board of Education Supreme Court decision. Recently passing its fiftieth anniversary, the ruling struck down legal school segregation which had been upheld by the same court some fifty-eight years earlier in the Plessy v. Ferguson ruling. Brown is highly revered today as a sacred document and cornerstone of American race-relations, but the ruling initially garnered widespread shock, outrage, and defiance in the bedrock of segregation, the deep South. At least that is what we have been told. A closer analysis of southern public opinion regarding Brown reveals a multitude of views ranging from pure racist condemnation to praised acceptance and affirmation of racial equality. There were indeed voices of moderation in the South. In the summer of 1954, reaction and response to Brown v. Board of Education in the deep South was not unanimous; there were clear voices of racial moderation that called for a calm rational response, compliance and respect for the ruling, and eager acceptance of integrated education.

The Brown ruling struck a decisive fatal blow at a fundamental tenet of southern society, segregation. Naturally, then, this society was shaken to its core and widespread controversy exploded throughout the region. Historian Michael J. Klarman writes that in 1954 “segregation of public grade schools lay near the top of the white supremacist hierarchy of racial preferences. For the Court to invalidate it was certain to generate far greater controversy and resistance than had striking down the white primary or segregation in interstate transportation.” The headlines of the region’s major papers on May 18 exuded a palpable sense of utter shock and dismay. When the sun rose on that day, southerners waking up to their morning coffee found that nine men in a marble building hundreds of miles away had radically altered the structure of their society and turned their way of life upside down. After reassuring themselves that it was not a dream, they quickly found that most of their elected officials were united in their opposition.

Georgia Governor Herman Talmadge exemplified the southern attitude of defiance adopting a position to resist the ruling and vowing to maintain segregation in his states’ schools. He and many other southern politicians advocated openly disobeying the supreme law of the land. Talmadge vowed that “the full powers of my office are ready to see that the laws of our
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state are enforced impartially and without violence.” He called for the creation of a special State Education Commission meeting “to map a program to insure continued and permanent segregation.” Talmadge was not a stubborn renegade. That fall, eight of the nine candidates in the gubernatorial primary race campaigned to preserve school segregation. One such candidate was the Lieutenant Governor, Marvin Griffin, who declared that “I will maintain segregation in the schools and the races will not be mixed, come hell or high water.” These voices dominated the headlines and have come to shape the popular conception of southern white reaction to Brown.

The historical paradigm on the subject is perhaps best succinctly put by Charles T. Clotfelter who writes that “the region’s predominant attitude was racial horror and hysterical jeremiad.” Historian Jeff Roche concurs and adds that the ruling created a “frenzied opposition throughout the South.” This traditional consensus has long held that the overwhelming majority of the region was uniformly opposed to Brown, swarming with hysteria, and fought it with bitter resistance. But a growing number of historians have disputed this view, contending that public opinion was not as cut and dry as was once thought. Southern governors such as Talmadge assumed they were diligently representing the voices of all their constituents. They were not. According to James T. Patterson, “even on the sensitive subject of race relations, [the South] was not a monolith.” He argues that “the notion that the ‘white south’ was uniformly racist was a flawed, often self-gratifying northern notion.” J. Harvie Wilkinson III agrees and argues that “some southerners, led by a gritty band of newspaper editors, recognized segregation’s immorality and sought its demise. But theirs were not generally the voices the nation heard.” There were whites—parents, school board members, principals, community leaders—who did openly support the Court.

This work supports these views and offers a balanced and objective bottom-up analysis of public opinion in the South immediately following the Brown v. Board decision in the summer months of 1954. This is accomplished by a detailed analysis of the main instrument of public thought, the newspaper. Prior to the maturation of twenty-four hour cable news, newspapers provided the most effective forum for public debate. To achieve a regional balance, this inquiry utilizes six papers that represent a basic cross-section of the South: The Atlanta Constitution, The Jackson Daily News, The Times-Picayune of New Orleans, The Nashville Tennessean, Arkansas Gazette, and the Miami Herald. Based upon the evidence gathered from this research, many voices of moderation were to be found in this period and their views tended to assume three broad categories. The first urged calm and cooperation while speaking out against rash action.
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The second group went further and advocated full compliance with the law. The third category of response went the furthest and openly praised the morality of Brown and whole-heartedly supported the concept of integrated-schools. These moderate and even liberal reactions do not comfortably fit within the aforementioned racial paradigm and deserve further attention.

As Talmadge and other leaders vehemently condemned Brown and spouted fierce rhetoric calling for brazen disobedience of the law, there was another group, albeit a less prominent one, that issued soothing pleas for peace and reasoned cooperation. Indeed newspaper editors took the lead in this regard, and there were many who “urged calm and avoided talk of defiance,” Klarman writes. There were a number of leading newspaper editors who steadfastly stuck to this message, including Ralph McGill of The Atlanta Constitution, Hodding Carter II of Delta Democrat Times (Greenville, Mississippi), Jonathan Daniels of Raleigh News and Observer, and Harry Ashmore of Arkansas Gazette. From the desk of Hodding Carter came an editorial that warned against listening to “professional politicians and hotheads” and urged fellow southerners to use the upcoming months “for fairness and adjustment, not in angry and fearful debate.” Carter attempted to reassure his readers of the legitimacy of Brown by noting that the ruling “came from men of varied social background, beliefs and political outlook” who were “completely convinced that morality and Democratic tradition were on their side.” He further offered praise for the decision by writing that it would raise American standing “especially in a world of brown, yellow and black peoples.”

Other major editorials shared Carter’s sentiments as well. Immediately following the ruling, the New Orleans Times-Picayune steered away from the hysterical response when it wrote that “neither cavil nor just complaint at the court’s action helps to solve our problem.” The Times implored its readers to “work soberly to redirect their educational effort along lines that will be acceptable to all and at the same time will preserve its vitality.” Similarly, on the morning after Brown came down the Atlanta Constitution offered its opinion, which did not align with the actions of Governor Talmadge. The Constitution also urged calm:

It is not time for hasty or ill-considered actions. It is no time to indulge demagogues on either side nor to listen to those who always are ready to incite violence and hate. What is needed most in all the states affected is a calm, rational approach. Panic and the losing of tempers will solve nothing, but cause more harm than good. Extremists and hotheads on either side neither can change the Supreme Court decision nor reach any practical solutions. It is a time for Georgia to think clearly. Our best minds must be put to work, not to destroy, but to seek out constructive conclusions. . . . Let us not do anything for which we will be sorry later. . . . Let us all think clearly and be calm.
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These words certainly do not mesh with Clotfelter’s assessment of “racial horror and hysterical jeremiad.” Clearly, the opinions of major southern newspapers can be characterized by anything but hysteria and frenzy; they called for calm and disdained any rash action. These responses did not come only from the pen of major editors.

Calm sentiments and voices of reason were shared by everyday readers as well who wrote to their papers to offer an alternative message. Elsie Brown of Nashville wrote on May 28 that “it is a time for calm, judicious thinking, and fair judgment and understanding—not for hysteria and jumping to conclusions that the whole idea is bad and bound to bring trouble.” She continued, sounding like a wise grandmother chiding rowdy children: “There will be no trouble if everyone uses his head, and wants to be cooperative and a law abiding citizen, instead of using his emotions and bringing in age-old prejudice.” In New Orleans, J. Simon pointed out to his fellow citizens that those who were lashing out against Brown and demanding majority rule and states’ rights might keep in mind that blacks outnumbered whites “in at least one southern state.” He echoed Mrs. Brown’s sentiments and added: “In the question of segregation we are dealing with problems involving fundamental rights and which cannot be solved by emotional thinking. We must realize that this is a time for cool heads and clear judgment.” In addition, it seems that portions of the religious community adopted a similar belief in this initial period after the decision. For example, the South Georgia Methodist conference drafted a statement calling on its members to “bring up all our reserves of faith, forbearance and good will in relation to this problem; to strive to be calm and dispassionate in our search for solutions to our perplexing problems.” The statement goes on to implore Methodists to “seek above all things to gauge our actions by the will of God.”

Governor Talmadge certainly did not represent the unanimous opinion of all southern governors and officials. Others, including Tennessee Governor Frank Clement, resisted this furious approach and offered a more mature and civil tone of which many southerners approved whole-heartedly. N. S. Holiday of Nashville commended Governor Clement in the Nashville Tennessean writing that “when comparing the reactions of other state officials to the recent Supreme Court announcement barring segregation in the public schools, it was gratifying to note the cool, calm and deliberate reactions of our own governor, our mayor, and other high officials.” Clement had previously gone on record urging “calmness,” saying that “this is no time for snap judgment, quick decisions, or demagogic excitement.” Mississippi State Representative Sam Johnson agreed with the Governor when he broke with party consensus and publicly opposed a state constitutional amendment which would have abolished public schools in order to circumvent the ruling. Johnson stated: “Drastic action at this time is likely to do more harm than good.”
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These feelings were also shared by Florida’s Superintendent of Schools Thomas D. Bailey who called for “sober and careful thinking, together with planning untainted by hysteria.”\(^{22}\) Directly to the south of Tennessee, in Mississippi, the *Tupelo Journal* gave similar praise to its Governor, Hugh White, who maintained “a statesman-like attitude that school problems can be worked out to the satisfaction of thoughtful parents of both races through conferences between white and colored leaders.” The editorial feared the adverse results of other officials who looked as if they were prepared to act “in a fit of anger without a thought of the consequences.”\(^{23}\) Although fierce and defiant rhetoric may have garnered more attention in the summer of 1954, there were certainly numerous high-profile leaders throughout the deep South that greeted *Brown* with calm heads and a spirit of cooperation.

There is some indication even that northerners were indeed surprised by the existence of this moderate white element within the southern political atmosphere. Perhaps they had assumed that the south would unite in bitter hysteria and march off with pitchforks to the Supreme Court. This was of course not the case observed Axel A. Gravem, a northerner who wrote to the *Atlanta Constitution* to share his thoughts:

> Georgians are to be congratulated and admired for their lack of resentment, rancor and indignation...and for the spirit of calmness, acceptance and cooperation at a time when rash action, indignation and annoyance might occupy smaller minds. Georgia has thus stood fast in its adherence to its highest ideals under considerable difficulty.\(^{24}\)

Even the high Court itself may have been taken aback by the level of civility that prevailed in the region. Court insiders alleged that the Justices were “surprised that more stormy reactions did not take place after the ruling.”\(^{25}\) Perhaps most surprised was Justice Hugo L. Black, an Alabaman who at the time of the ruling conjectured that the South “would never be a party to allowing white and negro to go to school together” and that there is “no more chance to enforce this in [the] Deep South than prohibition in N[ew] Y[ork] C[ity].”\(^{26}\)

Justice Black may have fallen out of his seat flabbergasted when he read the reactions of some southern political leaders in the immediate aftermath of the ruling. A wide swath of the South, including government officials of all levels, diverse denominations of the religious community, newspaper editors and journalists, and everyday citizens spoke out in favor of compliance with *Brown*. Although the reactions of this category did not go so far as to openly embrace unconditional equality in education, they did however advocate compliance with the ruling as a matter of obeying the law. It seems these dignified and principled voices were often drowned out by their firebrand counterparts, but they could be heard nonetheless.
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At the top of the southern hierarchy of power stood the state governors. According to Patterson, several state governors, including Francis Cherry of Arkansas and “Big” Jim Folsom of Alabama, supported adherence to the new law instead of lashing out in defiance as some of their colleagues were doing. Cherry's first official statement after the decision was passed down was clear and unequivocal: “Arkansas will observe the law. It always has.” He added that the matter of desegregation “already has received a good deal of thought” and that the state would not “approach the problem with the idea of being outlaws.” Cherry was not alone. Governor Phil M. Donnelly of Mississippi issued a similar statement declaring that “the citizens of Mississippi are a law-abiding people and I am confident that they will always endeavor to uphold the Constitution of the United States, which is the supreme law of the land.” Cherry and Donelly were joined by yet another colleague who shared similar beliefs. The official position of Governor Lawrence W. Wetherby of Kentucky was reported to be “readiness to comply with the Supreme Court’s ruling” and a willingness to do “whatever was necessary to comply with the law.” These moderate voices stand in stark contrast to the radical rhetoric of Georgia's Talmadge. But a candidate in the upcoming September 8 democratic primary election hoping to unseat Talmadge was Grace Thomas, an Atlanta lawyer. Mrs. Thomas made headlines when she entered the crowded primary field as the only candidate to openly endorse “peaceful compliance” with Brown. “It is good citizenship. As a lawyer, I think we should obey the law,” she stated. At a lower level of the political spectrum, Nashville Mayor Ben West fell in-line with this thinking. He stated: “The Supreme Court has declared the law. Our people are law-abiding citizens. We have no other thought except to conform to the law of the land.” Without a doubt, southern state governments and officials were in no way unanimous on Brown. Many favored compliance.

In addition to state governors, some high-ranking education officials also shared this respect for Brown as law. Arkansas State Education Commissioner Arch Ford was “confident that Arkansas would be able to meet the problem” and comply with the law. To the east, a school board in North Carolina announced its intention to comply with Brown only two days after it was passed down. Adopted six to one, the Greensboro City School Board passed a resolution to “let the community, the state, the South and, if necessary, the nation, know that we here propose to live under rule of law.” Calls for observance of the law were also heard in Florida where Hollis Rinehart, chairman of the Board of Control, began preparing his state for “the integration of Negroes into our institutions of higher learning and our elementary schools.” Rinehart felt that integration could be accomplished without litigation by blacks as long as
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“white leaders take the necessary steps” to oblige. But perhaps the most significant evidence of high-level inclinations of compliance in the field of education occurred at a conference of the National Education Association held in July. Delegates from every state in the union adopted a resolution “asking that segregation end in the nation’s public schools.” Only two southern states cast a dissenting vote (South Carolina and Mississippi) meaning that even the deep South states of Georgia and Alabama voted in favor of the resolution. Thus even those most intimately connected with leadership of the schools, school boards and administrators, could offer no undivided message of condemnation following the historic ruling. Many representatives of this community called for immediate adherence to Brown.

A portion of the southern religious community also called for compliance with the school desegregation ruling in the summer of 1954. Their language and action belong to this broad middle category of response to Brown which advocated respect for the law but avoided glowing endorsement of racially equal education. Historian Jeff Roche writes that the decision “caused great consternation among white southern churches” which found themselves in an often precarious position. He argues that some congregations were torn between loyalty to local sentiment and the urgings of national governing organizations. Memberships were often divided over the issue and ministers were forced to tread lightly or risk dissolution of their flock. Some privately urged worshippers to support integration while maintaining a neutral stance in public. Whatever its message and viewpoint, organized religion would have been a particularly significant influence due to its central position in southern life. Gallup polling conducted in the summer of 1954 suggested that 85% of all southerners belonged to a church. Accordingly, Roche writes, “church support was very important to the open school movement; for many people their minister was the only voice of authority speaking in behalf of public education.” Indeed there were such voices, emanating from pulpits all across the South and exhorting all those who would listen to heed the word of the Supreme Court.

Examples are numerous of religious supporters of Brown, and they vary both geographically and by denomination. Just one day after the ruling, Rev. Harold A. Gaudin, speaking on behalf of Miami Catholics, announced that the city’s parochial schools would voluntarily abolish segregation even though they were not bound by the new law. Speaking of the decision, Gaudin stated: “I am very, very glad it has come.” Across the Gulf of Mexico in New Orleans, Loyola University President Rev. W. Patrick Donnelly, “an authority on racial and labor matters,” delivered a commencement address in early June which unambiguously encouraged adherence to Brown: “We should all understand that the Supreme Court’s decision to end segregation in the schools is an American decision and should be accepted by us Americans.”

37 Roche, Restructured Resistance, 53-5.
39 Roche, Restructured Resistance, 55.
40 Adon Taft, “Catholics May End Segregation,” Miami Herald, 19 May 1954, 1A.
41 “Cleric Asks Gradual Integration,” Miami Herald, 3 June 1954, 2C.
Later that month, the General Assembly of Presbyterian Churches met in Dyersburg, Tennessee and passed a resolution approving the segregation decree and calling on its churches to assist in the integration process. The five-hundred delegates representing sixteen southern states agreed on the following statement: “Be it resolved that the Cumberland Presbyterian Church express itself as approving the decision of the Supreme Court. Also, we recommend that the Board of Missions and Evangelism be instructed to prepare and distribute materials which will aid in churches on how to meet the issues arising from the decision.”

In Georgia, similar discussion and activism was taking place. There less than a week after the ruling, a meeting of the Georgia Education Commission was interrupted by a conglomerate group of United Church Women committees, Georgia League of Women Voters and B’nai B’rith representatives. Led by Mrs. Robert MacDougall, the united organizations stormed the meeting and demanded that officials comply with Brown instead of seeking ways to circumvent the law and maintain segregation as they were busily planning strategies to do. They advised the commission not to “disobey or circumvent the supreme law of the land.”

This instance provides an excellent example of moderate southern voices resisting the racist currents that were swarming the region.

But perhaps the most vocal pro-Brown religious group were the Methodists. Throughout the South they quickly enacted official positions backing the law. The Florida Methodist Conference followed suit declaring that the ruling “enhances the position of the church and our nation in their search for world peace.” They added: “We realize that far reaching implications of this decision for our economic and social relations and recognize that it may take many years to work out a solution for the intricate problems it intends to solve.”

Likewise, the 134th Kentucky Conference of the Methodist Church concurred on an analogous decree: “We call upon all our people to seek to have the mind of Christ with respect to any social adjustments which this decision may necessitate: and to maintain a Christian attitude in all actions and public utterances concerning the same.”

Finally, the North Georgia Methodist Conference joined the others on the same note. The resolution adopted by this body reminded readers that “the highest court in our land has spoken,” and that “our tradition as a Methodist people includes an article of religion which, when interpreted, makes it the duty of all Christians to observe and obey the laws and commands of the governing or supreme authority in the country.” Though clearly in favor of banning school segregation, this group of religious moderates did not openly employ language celebrating racial equality.

Newspapers and the press provided another effective means of disseminating messages of moderation and urgings of compliance. Speaking on the Atlanta press, Roche writes that
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editor Ralph McGill of the *Atlanta Constitution*, an “outspoken opponent of segregation,” led this effort in his city. He argues that the city newspapers helped the integration cause by offering a “lucid alternative to the impassioned racial fears of the massive resistance politicians and their newspapers” and by emphasizing to their readers the importance of a “racially clearheaded focus” on the issue.47 The *Miami Herald* published similar sentiments stating that “we feel that so far as this state is concerned the adjustment to [desegregation], when the time comes, will be sanely, judiciously and humanely carried out.”48 Akin to this pro-compliance position was that of the *Nashville Tennessean*, which spoke with confidence on May 18 that the ruling would be implemented and the law respected: “The South is and has been for years a land of change. Its people—of both races—have learned to live with change. They can learn to live with this one. Given reasonable amount of time and understanding, they will.”49 On the day after the ruling was passed down, the *Tennessean* quickly interpreted it as the “law of the land” not to be interfered with: “The existence of extra-legal difficulties, however, cannot become a permanent excuse for disregarding the legal principle. That principle has been unequivocally enunciated as the law of the land. To flout it would not only bring discredit to a great section but would merely delay what have now become inevitable decisions.”50 The columns of Harry S. Ashmore, executive editor of the *Arkansas Gazette*, also encouraged citizens to obey the law and accept integration as inevitable. He wrote: “This is a great time of testing, a time when democracy has to protect the right of a minority. I think in the end our free institutions will meet the test and be strengthened by it. . . . Integration will come—more slowly in some areas than others—but it will come.”51

In addition to the opinion column, editorial cartoons were also effective tools employed by Ashmore, McGill, and others to influence public opinion with messages of moderation and support for *Brown*. The following three cartoons were printed within one week of the ruling and were designed to exude a calm rational response and acceptance of the decision. They each acknowledged the complexities and difficulties of school desegregation but were not framed in outrage nor did they promote disobedience or circumvention of the law. The first, figure 1, appeared in the *Arkansas Gazette* just one day after the ruling. A stoic and well-dressed bearded man is portrayed as the South. Perhaps as a sign of respect he holds his hat in his hand and serenely faces forward to the gentle encroaching ripples representing the anti-segregation ruling. He does not turn his back on the law. This idyllic scene conveys feelings of calm acceptance and respect for the Court, as the paper was intending to articulate. Most importantly, the image is titled “A Time For Greatness,” implying that Arkansas and the South should seize this historic occasion to finally establish equal justice for all in education.52
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The second cartoon (figure 2) appeared in the same paper exactly one week later. Implying that it would have curative or healing effects, here the ruling is portrayed as a prescription or remedy, not a poison. But the core intent of the drawing points out to uneasy readers that Arkansans would have the necessary time to address the issue of school integration, as the Court intended for them to have. It does not in any way contain racist overtones or messages, even subliminal,
advocating defiance of the law. The final editorial cartoon (figure 3) was printed in the *Times-Picayune* on May 19. Resembling a classroom, the setting features a man representing state officials who informs the public that Louisiana would do what was necessary to comply
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with the law. The writing on the board reads: “We’ve solved major problems before—with the will we can solve them again,” suggesting that the law would be obeyed in Louisiana schools. The images and the columns that accompanied the cartoons each stressed that despite the dif-
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difficulties and complications, the law would be obeyed and the schools integrated in the South. This category of moderate response certainly did not align with the frenzied hysteria that some were engaged in or that many historians now assert occurred nearly unanimously.

Clearly, many southerners intended to obey Brown when it was handed down. Patterson writes that when the ruling was announced there were “promising signs of compliance” that even surprised many blacks. But these moderates were not limited to select Governors, education officials, religious leaders, or newspapermen alone. Everyday citizens also favored conformity with the law. H.D. Bollinger wrote the *Nashville Tennessean* to express his views and urge readers to “act constructively and go about the business of making the accommodation to the law as promptly as possible and with the intent of being fair to all concerned.” Tom Cowan of Heber Springs, Arkansas offered similar thoughts when he wrote in to the “From the People” section of his local newspaper. Speaking on the court decision he stated: “The idea of segregation is a natural residue of slavery in the South. It just had to take the course it took.” Cowan regarded the impending task of integration as a “state problem and a state obligation.” “Our responsibility is to meet our obligation. I believe it can and will be done,” he said. Cowan and Bollinger each viewed desegregation as a duty and obligation. They were also confident it would be done successfully, as was Mrs. P. M. Ruleau who asserted “I am serenely confident that the integration of children in the grade schools will be brought about with equal smoothness and lack of fuss and fireworks.” She also shared that she had attended school as a child with black children and that “it did me no harm.” Additionally, John K. Baringer of New Orleans also took to pen and paper to urge his fellow citizens to comply with the law. He wrote:

The point I wish to make is that it is senseless, if you will, to quarrel with the court’s decision; to rail against it or complain about ‘Nine Old Men.’ It will soon be the law of the land, and like all good Americans we should and will abide by it and make it work. I don’t see how any other decision is possible—not in the Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave.

Bollinger, Cowan, Ruleau, and Barringer were everyday people who had the courage and will to express their beliefs even when they belonged to the minority.

In Atlanta, Mary Cooke and G. Lewis Chandler offered additional reasons why they felt Brown should be obeyed. Cooke declared that “it would be a very wise decision to adhere to [Brown] and thereby prevent a greater catastrophe, that of civil strife.” She added: “Throughout the nation, the South has been famous for its loyalty to government and its graciousness toward the fellowman, therefore if the South is the first to accept the nonsegregation law it would be
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more fitting and favorable at a time when solidarity is most important.”  

Chandler spoke more directly on the subject of adherence to law: “It is expected that, once a court decision or a law is made, all parties will obey and abide by it. This, all law-abiding citizens know; and our public and private schools teach our children this lesson every minute of every school day: To obey the law.” He also lashed out vehemently in his letter against resisters to Brown who aimed to defy the law, comparing them to “bootleggers” and “gangsters:”

If certain Southern governors and leaders really mean to lead their constituents to circumvent or disobey the recent decision of the Supreme Court, shouldn’t their citizenship and right to leadership be seriously questioned—even challenged? Aren’t they operating on the same principle as that off bootleggers and gangsters—to beat the law and decency at all cost?

Thus, not only did white moderates support compliance, they criticized those that did not.

Even white school students, those most affected by the decision were not unanimously opposed to it. An informal survey of students at Miami Senior High School, which was slated to be integrated the following fall, found many students who favored the change. Vicki Miner, 18, reportedly responded “I believe students should go to the nearest school to their home, regardless of race.” Sally Staudt was less enthusiastic in her support, stating “I guess maybe it’s all right.” Perry Shafton was not ambiguous when he replied “I like the decision. I think it’s about time they started getting some rights.” These were the voices of whites, young and old, in the South immediately following Brown; white moderates were vocal and active. Sizable segments of the population backed immediate and full compliance with the law even if they did not vociferously celebrate the underpinning moral values of integrated education.

Perhaps the most valuable, helpful, and reputable evidence of all in exploring the response of white moderates is polling data from this period. The Gallup Poll organization conducted a series of formal polls on July 12, 14, and 16 throughout the South. The results further support the notion that the region was not at all monolithic on race relations. When asked if they approved or disapproved of the decision, 24% responded in the affirmative while 71% were against the decision and 5% had no opinion. This means that nearly one-in-four southerners were in favor of Brown v. Board of Education. When the data were classified according to education-level of the respondent, it was found that 38% of college-educated southerners supported school desegregation. This is no insignificant number. Nineteen percent high school-educated and 23% of grade school-educated respondents endorsed integration. Furthermore, when classified by age it was found that 21-29 year-olds backed the decision in the highest numbers—31% (other age brackets measured 24% for 30-49 year-olds and 23% for 50 plus
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year-olds). Finally, when asked if they would object to having their children attend a majority-black school, the percentage of favorable responses shrank to 15%.

These numbers are astounding. Depending on the category, as many as four-out-of-ten whites in the South supported Brown. This broad and diverse middle group of white moderates pushed for more than a calm and rational approach to the issue but for full and complete compliance with the law. A year-long study of Brown and its impact and reaction in Georgia was conducted by The Journal of Negro Education and concluded that “certainly, many Georgians are happy about the Court’s decision and are ready and eager to work for its implementation.” Yet there was still a third group of white response, those who fully agreed with the decision on all levels and who whole-heartedly embraced the concept of integrated schools, even applauding and praising the Court for its work. A Washington columnist pontificated on the moral acceptance of desegregation in the South: “It is surmised that most Southerners expected the kind of decision that was rendered, which may help explain the restrained reaction. It is suggested that they foresaw it because, deep in their hearts, a great many must feel that it was the right decision.” Although they may not have all agreed with total racial equality in every situation, this “great many” southerners did however approve of integrated education.

A diverse assortment of churches and religious bodies throughout the South took the lead in this effort to promote the ideological underpinnings upon which Brown was based, in addition to encouraging a basic calm compliance. These groups were composed of whites and led by whites. In Little Rock, Reverend Colbert S. Cartwright of the Pulaski Heights Christian Church delivered a stirring sermon on May 23 in which he emphatically declared that “God is the father of all men and is not a respecter of persons because of skin color. All human beings are brothers because God is the Father of all.” He reminded his congregation that “the spirit of love which we must embody as Christians is a God-like love which does not know how to segregate.” Rev. Cartwright concluded by praising the ruling and further denouncing segregation: “The decision has brought our nation’s laws to a closer conformity with Christ’s spirit... [There is] a basic incompatibility of the practice of segregation with God’s will. The practice of segregation is morally indefensible.” Cartwright’s approach to the issue illustrated the basic pattern most in his profession followed in the summer of 1954. Religious leaders typically denounced segregation as contrary to Christian principles, praised the virtues and values of the decision, and called on the churches to take a lead role in the integration struggle.

Just five days after Cartwright spoke those words from the pulpit, delegates of the Southern Presbyterian Church met in North Carolina and approved a resolution affirming racial equality. By a vote of 236 to 169, delegates agreed that the “only division the Scripture knows is the difference between saints and sinners and believers and unbelievers.” In the “fellowship of

faith,” they said, “we worship, work, and live together, regardless of color,” noting that “enforced segregation of the races is discrimination which is out of harmony with Christian theology.”67 Reaction to this position was favorable in Arkansas. One minister called the resolution a “wise one” and said segregation “cannot be Christian.” Another quipped, “thank God we’re in Arkansas instead of Georgia.”68

There were indeed however similar sentiments being voiced by organized religion in Georgia as well. The state’s Episcopalians met as a body in June and pronounced that they were in accord on the integration issue: “We agree as a group that the decision of the Supreme Court outlawing segregation in public schools is just and right.”69 In the following month, a council of seven Atlanta ministers representing the Lutheran, Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist and other denominations declared Brown to be “in harmony with Christian principles.” The Methodist representative stated “there is no place in the Methodist Church for racial discrimination or racial segregation.” The Atlanta Constitution, reporting on the meeting, wrote that “in general, the ministers agreed that the segregation pattern cannot be defended on the basis of Christian principles.”70 Single churches often banded together in this way, conceivably to achieve a sense of strength and power, and possibly for safety purposes as well.

Such was the case in New Orleans and Florida also, where religious authorities also voiced sentiments of moderation and sought cooperative measures to advance the cause of integrated education. The Florida Council of Churches passed a resolution supporting the desegregation ruling: “We as a Council of Christian churches do not recognize the artificial standards of race, nationality or class which exist in society, but only that we are the common children of one Heavenly Father.”71 The Rabbinical Council of New Orleans adopted a similar statement: “As spiritual leaders and teachers of the Jewish people, we strongly affirm our belief in the biblical injunction that all men, regardless of race, nationality, color or creed, are children of God and therefore equal in His sight.”72 To be sure, women were not passive or complacent during this period either. Representing fifteen southern states, the Southern Church Women’s Association also authored a declaration in which they “affirmed [the] belief in human brotherhood and the inclusiveness of Christian fellowship. . . . [and] Accepted with humility the Supreme Court decision as supporting the broad principles of the dignity and worth of human personality.”73

Still, among the most vocal religious supporters of Brown and integrated education in the South were the Methodists. A council of bishops met in Sea Island, Georgia and pronounced approval of the decision and stated that “we believe that this decision is consistent with the spirit and teaching of Jesus Christ.”74 Similarly, a conference of south Texas Methodists adopted a resolution calling on its people to “abide by both the letter and spirit of anti-segregation.” This is
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a key distinction that indicated moral acceptance of integration, not simple dutiful compliance. Accordingly, the resolution stated: “We believe the teachings of Jesus would have us establish a relationship with one another upon the basis of character, achievement and inherent worth and not upon the basis of some physical characteristic.” The language is decidedly unambiguous. With relative diversity both geographically and denominationally, a considerable sector of organized religion in the South agreed with the moral basis of Brown. Many of its moderate leaders criticized segregation as contrary to Christian principles, and lauded the principles of the decision. But the audiences of these messages were not passive sponges either; a significant portion of everyday southerners also fully approved of the ruling and favored school integration.

In the weeks and months after May 17, 1954, an immeasurable number of moderate white southerners wrote letters to their editors to express their embrace of and contentment with the ideological core of Brown v. Board of Education. Patterson writes that pro-integration people often first needed the encouragement and approval of influential community members before they made their beliefs known on this divisive issue.76 Perhaps Patterson is referring to individuals like the Savannah Rotarians, one member of which stated upon hearing news of the decision, “It’s a good thing. We can now practice the true Christian principles of brotherhood.”77 But an examination of major southern newspapers reveals no dearth of pro-integration letters from everyday people.

In Nashville, Mary Anne Black wrote of the ruling, “It will be beneficial to all. . . . It isn’t constitutional to bar a student from a public school because his skin is darker in color than the skin of another student. There are qualified persons among us that can’t enter a particular school or job because his skin is darker.”78 Two days earlier, Nelson Fuson, also of Nashville, wrote to his paper and reflected upon imminent integration: “The sooner we can put the new way into practice the sooner we will eliminate ‘second class citizenship’ in education from our community. The benefits will not be one-sided only, for those of us who are in the majority group will also gain by this great new freedom to consider children as children, regardless of color.”79 About a month later, Adde Schweid of the same city also spoke out for children: “I am a mother and know how it would hurt me if my own children were ever the victims of prejudice or discrimination. . . . Our children are ready for this change; we should not let them down.”80 Perhaps the most emphatic and verbose of the Nashville letters was that of S. Simon. He first sought to clarify that he was indeed a “True Southerner,” noting that he was descended from two slave-owning grandfathers, before getting to the crux of his message:

In the whole world there is only one species of man. . . . Each individual should be judged on the basis of what he is as a person and that each individual ought to have the
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opportunity for the fullest development of which he is capable. To segregate people not on the basis of what they are as persons but on the basis of what they look like or who their ancestors were does violence to both of these principles. . . . Brains are a matter of individual, not racial, endowment, and manners and morals are largely a matter of social, cultural and educational opportunities. Give the Negro children a chance and you will find them good, bad, and indifferent—just as white children are.  

Of course Nashville was not the epicenter of this line of thinking. Similar sentiments could be heard throughout the entire South. In Miami, R.C.S. and Dr. N. S. Hanoka each drafted letters both affirming and praising Brown. While Hanoka stuck to the latter, R.C.S. supported the law with Biblical evidence: “The Bible says all men are born equal; and I have been unable to find any place where he classifies them by race, creed, or color.”

Even more evidences of racial moderation could be found in the Arkansas Gazette. There some citizens chose to use the ruling as a means to criticize society and its institutions. A “housewife” wrote into the Gazette eleven days after the ruling and pondered, sarcastically, “I wonder if God will have a ‘white’ heaven and a separate entrance and resting place for Negroes? Or doesn’t a Negro have a soul?” She continued: “A baby is born without prejudice. Without assuming his parents line of thought, he would look equally on Negro, Indian, Japanese, German, English, or what have you.” Felix Arnold also admonished the racist elements of southern culture: “It seemed to me then, and no less now, that any institution which calls itself ‘Christian’ and preaches the good Stoic doctrine of the brotherhood of many, has a moral obligation to start practicing, however belatedly, what it heretofore professed to believe.” An unnamed reader did however profess what he or she believed when they wrote to the Gazette, providing some insight into the thoughts of those who responded affirmatively to the aforementioned Gallup poll question on integrated education. The reader wrote: “I honestly can’t see how it will hurt my children to sit next to colored children in school, or to play ball with them, or to eat lunch with them. . . . If they are left to their own unspoiled devices I imagine they will know Joe as a friend who can pitch good ball, rather than as a Negro.” In addition to nullifying the notion of a monolithic South on race matters, these letters indicate among other things that southerners were willing to denounce racism, embrace integrated education, and set aside personal ideologies for the betterment of schoolchildren. To be sure, this thinking was not limited to border states alone—even in the deep South where racism ran the hottest, overtures of racial egalitarianism could be heard.
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One such overture came from A. B. Street who wrote the New Orleans *Times-Picayune* to note that blacks had “always given the same measure of devotion to this nation, in times of peril as well as in times of peace.” Street avowed that “the Negro in the United States is just another citizen, and not a problem.” In Atlanta the opinion of Bettie E. Stokes was published in the “Pulse of the Public” section of the *Constitution*. She wrote: “For almost 100 years the Negro of the South has tolerated the demeaning penalties of segregation. . . . And now the highest court of our land has lifted one band of segregation; soul and mind may soar a little higher.” Several weeks later Frank J. Toland wrote the same paper to call for a “cooperation of the races” in the wake of *Brown*. He asserted that school integration would not harm either whites or blacks and that the ruling was “the best thing that could have happened to the South.” Even in Jackson, Mississippi pro-integrationists used the press to influence public opinion. Avis Brown drafted a letter that turbulent summer to share her thoughts. Her writing trembles with the trepidations of a woman who was genuinely distraught and disturbed by the radical rhetoric of racist demagogues. “It’s between midnight and dawn and I’ve not been able to sleep tonight, as well as many other nights when my soul is heavenly burdened,” she wrote. Several paragraphs later and after blaming Satan for creating segregation, from her burdened soul Mrs. Brown offered her personal feelings on race:

I have several good real Christian colored friends that I would fight the Devil himself for, and they would do the same for me and I know it. When I meet a born-again person, it matters not the color of their skin, whether it be in the South, West or anywhere, we can talk together of our Lord, or with Him and fellowship together. I am just as proud to see the colored person prosper as I am any white person.

In perhaps the most thoroughly segregated and racist state in the South, the words of Avis Brown transcended the issue of school integration and *Brown* to embrace the greater issues of racial harmony and equality.

Whether they advocated basic compliance with the law or they morally agreed with racial integration, many southerners, including politicians, educators, editors and journalists, and everyday people alike, were motivated in there support for *Brown* by factors relating to the Cold War. The reaction and response of many racially moderate pro-*Brown* southerners in the summer of 1954 was framed in Cold War motives. Klarman calls this the “Cold War imperative for racial change.” According to Klarman many people regarded American racism and segregation as a major weakness in the ongoing struggle against the Soviets: “In the ideological contest with communism, U.S. democracy was on trial, and southern white supremacy was its greatest vulnerability.” He argues that the international spotlight and scrutiny coupled with the desire
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to maintain the moral high-ground caused some Americans, especially southerners, to adjust their racial outlook on the broad range of civil rights issues accordingly. In regards to Brown specifically, there is evidence that the reaction of some southerners was indeed motivated by the Cold War imperative in the weeks and months after the ruling. The responses took three basic forms.

First, some viewed Brown as a positive step in reforming American democracy, the values of which were being promoted to the world. The anti-school segregation decision was a wake-up call that America must first practice what it preaches before endeavoring to spread its model elsewhere. This thinking was conveyed by R. C. S. in a letter to the Miami Herald: “One thing is sure: we can’t talk democracy to other people unless we are willing to practice it,” he wrote. Many miles away in Nashville Adde Schweid shared these thoughts in her treatise on the new law: “It seems to me that the international aspects of this decision have been most neglected. Since we are attempting to sell democracy to the rest of the world (most of whose peoples happen to be colored) we must make ours as model a democracy as possible.” It is unknown whether this rationale was a major motivating factor in Ms. Schweid’s support for the ruling, but it clearly affected her thinking.

A second category of Cold War reasoning that influenced southerners appeared to be the simple fact that the ruling raised American prestige and moral authority in the eyes of the world. S. Simon of Nashville concurred on this notion: “The Supreme Court action has raised our prestige enormously and might prove a more powerful weapon than the atomic bomb.” Similarly, the editorial opinion of the St. Louis Post Dispatch reflected this thinking as well when it stated that Brown provided “affirmation in the eyes of millions...that the pledge in the United States of the worth and dignity of the humblest individual means exactly what it says.” The paper concluded by again citing the decision as a major weapon in the Cold War: “Nine men in Washington have given us a victory that no number of divisions, arms and bombs could ever have won.”

Finally, some southerners viewed Brown v. Board of Education as a major victory against the anti-American Communist propaganda machine. George A. Miller articulated this interpretation when he wrote a letter to his editor asserting that ruling “struck a damaging propaganda blow against international Communism.” He continued: “Outlawry or segregation in public schools will be an effective weapon in counteracting the vicious Communist lies and half-truths.” Obviously international motivations found some traction in the South for encouraging white southerners to support Brown; many viewed the historic decision as key
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weapon in the arsenal of the ideological struggle against Communism. Respect for the law and commitment to compliance, moral acceptance of integrated education, and the Cold War imperative for racial change all serve to illustrate the point that the South did not universally unite in bitter hysteria and defiance in the summer of 1954, and that there were indeed white moderates who spoke out for racial reform.

In certain cases however, impassioned pleas for compliance and words of support were followed by action. Some communities that fateful summer saw white moderates in government and religion launching concrete action to integrate the schools, first by naming committees and panels to study the transformation and then by breaking down the racial barriers forever. Just three days after the ruling, Arkansas proclaimed itself the first state in the South to take action in accordance with *Brown*. Initiated by Governor Cherry, a statewide citizens’ council was formed as a direct branch of the state legislature in order to study the massive logistical maneuvering and restructuring required by the new law.98 In Davidson County, Tennessee the local school board authorized in mid-August the creation of a bi-racial committee to “work out problems that might arise over the elimination of segregation in the county public schools.”99 Statewide, Tennessee officials had begun considering a variety of plans for commencing integration of its schools—serious discussions intended to fully comply with the letter of the law. Further, the State Attorney General Richard Ervin ordered members of a special advisory committee to survey all school districts as to the projected course and impact of integration.100 Similar efforts were underway in Florida as well, where researchers and scholars at Florida’s state universities were engaged in the task as early as June. In Dade County, the *Herald* reported, leaders had been “quietly planning for many months to meet the situation which they felt was inevitable.”101 Careful planning and studies of the impending school integration were the first steps for most southern locales that intended to speedily enforce the ruling.

Although *Brown* did not require immediate integration in time for the fall 1954 school term, some school districts in the South decided on their own to waste no time and move ahead anyway. While some politicians and officials in the deep South lashed out at the ruling and aggressively vowed to defy it, others quietly commenced integration. Most early integration efforts were found in border states, where by the 1955-1956 school year over seventy percent of classrooms were integrated. Kansas City, St. Louis, Oklahoma City, Louisville, Charleston, West Virginia, and Baltimore all moved to desegregate immediately.102 In fact, Klarman argues that most of these cities probably wanted to integrate before the ruling but were bound by state
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law to maintain segregation. On May 22, Fayetteville, Arkansas was reportedly the first city in the South to announce plans for integration. The school board encountered little opposition to the move, and of the flood of letters received the proportion approving integration to those that did not was seven to one. Charleston, Arkansas also opened integrated schools in the fall of 1954. Black primary students there had previously attended an all-black elementary school while secondary students were educated at nearby Fort Smith, with tuition and transportation paid by community tax dollars. Some southern Catholic schools also complied with Brown in the summer of ’54 and swiftly threw open their doors to all students, regardless of race. In late June, Reverend William L. Adrian, bishop of the Nashville Catholic diocese, announced that diocese schools would be integrated in the fall. He ordered that all-black elementary and high schools be closed and the properties sold. In August, Bishop Albert L. Fletcher of the Little Rock diocese made the same announcement. Southern white moderates largely supported Brown, and some, such as Adrian, Fletcher, and the school boards of Fayetteville and Charleston, took immediate action to fulfill it.

There were many reactions to Brown v. Board of Education among white southerners in the summer of 1954. Some bitterly opposed the ruling and vowed to defy it at all costs. This cannot be overlooked. But among white moderates there was a range of response, generally assuming three categories. Some denounced hot headed rhetoric and rash action and called for calm sober thinking. Others openly advocated complete compliance with Brown as a law of the highest court of the land. And some white moderates fully accepted integrated education and the moral underpinnings of the ruling. As polling data showed, these moderates were not the radically liberal few but rather a considerable portion of society from government and religious leaders to everyday people. The President of Fisk University acknowledged the diversity of views in a speech to the American Missionary Association. In his opinion, the decision was “breaking up the solid South on race issues,” and “two new categories of political and public attitude” were emerging. The Arkansas Gazette also commented on the varied response in an editorial appropriately titled “today, the south has many voices.” The piece referred to a recent speech of Mississippi Senator James Eastland in which he urged the South to greet Brown with “stern resistance and lawlessness.” The Gazette pronounced that Eastland “did not, as he proclaimed, speak for the South as a whole,” and that the ruling had demonstrated in fact that “the South is no longer solid in any meaningful way.” The editorial continued: “The final testing of the peculiar institution of racial segregation which has bound the region together in the past has
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produced a wide variety of reactions. . . . The great majority of southerners, those in positions of responsibility as well as private citizens, have received the Court ruling calmly.” On race relations and reaction to *Brown*, the South was not in any sense monolithic or solid; the region did not unite in “horror and hysterical jeremiad” as some suggest it did.
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What Is an ANZAC?  
An American Response to Australian Warriors

Brandon P. Roos

Rarely, in the annals of historical memory does one find a story as compelling and depressing as the narrative of the ANZACs. Never have men fought so bravely and ultimately so futilely to protect a land they only knew from history and geography books. With a deep sense of responsibility and youthful nationalism, these Australians and New Zealanders volunteered for service to the British Crown. Few knew their actions and the actions of their comrades and enemies would result in the war to end all wars, World War I. Few Australians knew their engagements would be covered in many of the major newspapers of the day. The New York Times was one of these papers. Through their coverage of Australian maneuvers, American’s were, for the first time, exposed to Australia and its people.

On January 1, 1901, the Earl of Cornwall publicly announced the formation of a sovereign Australia. After one and a quarter century of colonial rule, the British government removed the shackles of colonialism and allowed the Australians to pursue self-rule. Thus, the Federation of Australian States was born. With this self-government came more responsibility to the Empire. The first test of initiation came with the Boer War of South Africa in 1900. The combined Australian expeditionary force served as reinforcements to the British in their fight of Dutch settlers. Their actions while in South Africa, foreshadowed their role later in the first World War and their desire to prove themselves in battle.

As diplomacy deteriorated in Europe and Britain declared war on Germany, the Australians were also in preparation for war. Joseph Cook, the Prime Minister at the time, was quoted as saying, “If the Old Country is at war, so are we,” He remarked later that, “Our duty is quite clear – to gird up our loins and remember that we are Britons.” This statement rang true as the Crown soon called for volunteers. The Federation, much like the Americans during the Civil War, took to the streets in a massive recruiting effort. It was said that teenagers falsified documents in order to gain admission and men roamed towns, all the while gathering recruits like sheep from the fields. With the massive recruitment effort in full swing, the Australians were able to exceed their original pledge of twenty thousand and field an army totaling three-
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hundred and thirty thousand men.\(^4\) New Zealand also contributed a total of one-hundred and ten thousand troops over the course of the conflict.\(^5\) Both of these forces were combined to form a unit entitled ANZAC, or Australian New Zealand Army Corps. The ANZAC’s first major engagement would also serve as their greatest defeat.

The Turks, an enemy of the Triple Entente, had to be defeated in order to cut off the Entente’s main European enemies. A strategic plan was drafted and carried out on April 25, 1915.\(^6\) Gallipoli was the target of this plan, leaving the ANZACs and their British and French allies to carry the supposedly insignificant Turkish force. However, the Turks were in much greater number than previously anticipated and, much like D-day during the Second World War, every foot of ground was hard fought and narrowly won. The New York Times, much like today, was one of the most read papers of the era. It published numerous articles on the subject of the Gallipoli campaign. The tone of these articles follows a curve similar to the morale and casualty numbers of the allied forces. As the armies prepare for battle, the tone is rather upbeat, but this soon changes as the conditions worsen in Gallipoli and in the Dardanelles in general. Unfortunately, many of the articles only make mention of the ANZAC army as part of the British force. However, this trend changes as the engagement drags on and the ANZAC force encounters stiffening resistance. In an article dated September 3, 1915, the correspondent talks at length concerning the Australians maneuvers and battle results.\(^7\) Interestingly, the subtitle of the Australian column reads, “Colonials’ Reckless Bravery,” which would be incorrect considering that Australia was no longer a colony.\(^8\) Despite the lapse in terminology, the correspondent writes a rather thorough account of the ANZAC movements against the heights surrounding Gallipoli. Throughout the article he mentions the “gallant” nature of the men form the Antipodes. As a reader of this piece one might, for the first time, here of the Australian fighters and their travails. This glowing account of their actions would stick out against the dim background of British and French defeats and withdrawals. Even though the ANZACs were eventually overwhelmed and routed, the initial praise of their actions would cement itself in the minds of American readers. Trench warfare soon took hold on the Gallipoli peninsula and casualties mounted. The Allies fought bravely, but rarely held on to conquered lands for any length of time. There are quite a few contingencies that caused the withdrawal of the Allied troops. However, none were as important as logistics. Simply said, the Turks had reinforcements and supplies close at hand and the Allies did not. One article from the Times expresses this quandary simply by divulging the troop numbers. The title gives much
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of the story away by stating, “Gallipoli outlook gloomy 7 weeks ago.” The article compares the troop movements and effectively describes the grueling task the Allies faced by saying,

Allies have landed in the Anafarta region about 115,000 men, a large part of which force has already been used up. It is safe to say that they are opposed by about 135,000 Turks, who are actually entrenched, with about 80,000 effectives in reserve. Every advantage in terrain is held by the Turks . . .

American readers, through this article and others like it, were beginning to see how this battle was playing out and the overwhelming odds that the Allied troops faced. This would help champion the ANZACs prowess in the minds of Americans. As reports continued to circulate about the “gallant Colonials,” Times readers would be able to use the aforementioned statistical data to critically analyze the articles and form an opinion of the Australian warriors. So far, in the news media, the ANZAC troops had been portrayed in a positive light. Thus, it would be easy to surmise that the average American’s opinion would be positive.

Not only was there increasing coverage of the Australian troops, but also news trickled in about their home front. In an opinion piece simply entitled “Australian Women and the War,” an Australian born woman offers an argument against mounting pressure. Apparently, it had been said that Australian women would vote unanimously against conscription because it would detrimentally decrease the male population of marrying age. This obviously outraged many women. The writer goes even further attacking America for its apathy in the conflict. She continues by stating, “it is assuredly not our women who will vote ‘No,’ and cast Australia into a slough of shame and ignominy from which it will be hard for her to ever rise . . . and we, thank God, have never been ‘too proud to fight!’” This piece serves as a great testimony to the Australian women. As the modern world was exiting the Victorian era, many of the notions and ideologies were still firmly entrenched. One of these ideologies included the place of a woman. So, when one reads this article and finds that it is a woman writing, and in turn reprimanding a gentleman of the day, it strikes one as telling. This piece reveals the strength, suffering, and ultimately the character of Australian women. Through the text one can also glean where the Australian loyalties were. Nowhere in the text is Britain ever mentioned, hinting at their self government. Furthermore, it shows how determined they were not to have their integrity impugned or that of their fighting men.

As the time dragged on at Gallipoli, the situation grew even more desperate. Eventually over the winter of 1915 the allied troops withdrew without casualty from the peninsula. After the successful withdrawal, the allies assessed their losses. The ANZACs lost twenty-six thousand men at Gallipoli. Five hundred of the remaining troops were soon sent to the United States

---

10 Ibid.
for furlough. They traveled the country, but spent a large portion of their time in New York City before having to ship back to the European front. The *Times* has left a lengthy account of their perceptions and activities while in New York. The physical account of these men from the Antipodes must have been of great interest to the reader, since it was covered in most of the articles. One article date May 6, 1918, describes the ANZACs as “rugged, sunburned” men.\(^{12}\) Another article describes the men in greater detail when it states,

Five hundred long-legged, broad-shouldered Australian soldier lads in khaki, with jaunty slouch hats on their heads, marching with long, easy, rolling swing. . . . At first glance they might have been mistaken for a regiment from Wyoming or Arizona . . . they had the Anglo-Saxon frontiersmen written upon them – but at second glance there were some differences. Their faces looked round and ruddier, and their heads were set closer down on their shoulders, in more British fashion, than those of the lean-jawed, lanky Westerners. . . .\(^{13}\)

This rather anthropological description continues for the remainder of the article, defining every detail of their figure as they march down Broadway. This rich description, for the first time, allows many Americans to see an Australian with their mind’s eye. Thus, it is paramount in the shaping of an Australian profile and stereotype in American culture.

After the ANZACs layover in New York, they were once again shipped to the front. This time they were bound for France and the Somme. While in France they served with distinction. Once again, they made a regular appearance in the *New York Times*. This time, they were not alone, but linked to stories of American units. In one article entitled “Yanks and ANZACS fought As Comrades,” the writer explains how gruff, leather-faced Aussies take green Yankees under their proverbial wings and help them through their baptism-by-fire.\(^{14}\) Other stories swirled about the now legendary Australians. One story tells of an Illinois regiment, turned away from the battle by their European superiors, returned in ANZAC uniforms.\(^{15}\) These men were then able to participate in the engagement.\(^{16}\) Tales like these, no matter how outlandish they may seem, cemented the growing legend of the Australians.

As the war drew to a close, the ANZAC members counted their losses. For Australia, which had a population of approximately five million, fifty-nine thousand troops had been killed.\(^{17}\) New Zealand, with an approximate population of one million people, had lost one hundred and twenty-eight thousand men.\(^{18}\) These staggering losses also serve to promote the legend of the ANZAC.

\(^{12}\) “ANZACS Find This Is Not A ‘Cold City’” *New York Times* (May 6, 1918) <www.godfrey.org>
\(^{13}\) “500 ANZACS Here On Way To Front” *New York Times* (May 3, 1918) <www.godfrey.org>
\(^{14}\) “Yanks and ANZACS Fought As Comrades” *New York Times* (July 7, 1918) <www.godfrey.org>
\(^{16}\) Ibid.
\(^{17}\) “The Anzac Story” <http://www.anzacs.net/AnzacStory.htm> March 8, 2005
\(^{18}\) Ibid.
Due to the consistent coverage of the ANZACs at Gallipoli, the Somme, and beyond, the American populous was able to, for the first time, meet an Australian. Through tales of bravery and courage against all odds, the average American could have heroes, even though their government was isolationist. With the addition of physical details, one could sketch a picture of an Aussie in their own mind. When all of these factors were added together, the legend of the Aussie warrior was given life. So too, was the stereotype of Australia born through the American newspapers. These forces shaped the American perceptions during the conflict and still do the same today.