



5-2013

## **Composing, Remembering, and Performing Identity at Charles Towne Landing, 1966 through 1971: Rhetorical Identification as Defensive and Antagonistic Strategies**

Deidre Anne Evans Garriott

*University of Tennessee - Knoxville*, [devans7@utk.edu](mailto:devans7@utk.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_graddiss](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss)

 Part of the [Rhetoric and Composition Commons](#)

---

### **Recommended Citation**

Garriott, Deidre Anne Evans, "Composing, Remembering, and Performing Identity at Charles Towne Landing, 1966 through 1971: Rhetorical Identification as Defensive and Antagonistic Strategies." PhD diss., University of Tennessee, 2013.  
[https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk\\_graddiss/1724](https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/1724)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact [trace@utk.edu](mailto:trace@utk.edu).

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Deidre Anne Evans Garriott entitled "Composing, Remembering, and Performing Identity at Charles Towne Landing, 1966 through 1971: Rhetorical Identification as Defensive and Antagonistic Strategies." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in English.

Michael Keene, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Janet Atwill, William Hardwig, James Stovall

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

Composing, Remembering, and Performing Identity at  
Charles Towne Landing, 1966 through 1971:  
Rhetorical Identification as Defensive and Antagonistic  
Strategies

A Dissertation Presented for the  
Doctor of Philosophy  
Degree  
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Deidre Anne Evans Garriott  
May 2013

## **DEDICATION**

I dedicate this work to my husband, Todd Garriott. You are the reason I rediscovered Charles Towne Landing. Thank you, Todd, for your love and support through these five years of writing and research while we discovered our own love.

And to my parents, the Reverend V. Creighton Evans, Junior, and Nina Evans. I never would have pursued a PhD in English if you hadn't provided me with an endless supply of novels, blank notebooks, and pens, and if you hadn't encouraged me to be weird.

And to my grandmothers, Joan Welsh Evans, and the late Frances Grimball Ash. Together and separately, they taught me the best aspects of Southern culture.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to all the staff at the South Carolina Department of Archives and History for pulling boxes of documents, for copying hundreds of pages of letters, memos, and reports, and for always being cheerful when I submitted *yet another* request for more boxes and more copies.

## **ABSTRACT**

This dissertation contributes to the growing body of research in rhetorical studies of identity theory. In this dissertation, I look at alternative texts that seek to construct and forward communal identities. In particular, this dissertation investigates Charles Towne Landing, a historical state park in Charleston, South Carolina, to study the ways historical sites of public memory are sites of rhetorical identification.

The State of South Carolina's legislature authorized a body called the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission to plan and execute a celebration of South Carolina's three-hundredth anniversary, which would take place in 1970. The commission planned and built three parks in South Carolina as exhibition sites for the Tricentennial Celebration. Charles Towne Landing is the only one that still exists. The commission intended Charles Towne Landing to represent colonial life in South Carolina, focusing on the years between 1670 and 1770. They decided to build Charles Towne Landing on a piece of land called "Old Town" in the West Ashley-area of Charleston on Highway 171. They chose this site because several historical documents suggested that it was the first British settlement in South Carolina. Upon breaking ground at the site in 1969, construction workers and archeologists discovered artifacts from the Kiawah who had originally lived at this site. This discovery caused a crisis about identity and memory that pervaded the local and state media.

In this dissertation, I conduct archival research of official documents from and related to the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission (1966-1970) to compose a narrative of how the park was built. I then analyze these documents considering their rhetorical nature, focusing on the implicit and explicit arguments of identity. I also analyze photographs of historical performances and celebrations of historical memory. Using this park and the methods of identity construction that the commission used as a case study, I argue that to analyze rhetorics of identity, rhetoricians must acknowledge and study their inherently defensive and antagonistic natures.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Chapter One: Introduction .....  | 1   |
| Analyzing Charles Towne Landing as a Site of Public Memory and Rhetorical Identity .....   | 4   |
| The Arguments of this Dissertation .....   | 5   |
| Outline of the Introduction.....   | 8   |
| Historical Introduction: The Formation of the Tricentennial Commission and the Conditions of South Carolina, Post-Civil Rights Movement..... | 8   |
| The Brief Summary of the Conditions South During and After the Civil Rights Movement .....   | 9   |
| Charles Towne Landing as a Rhetorical Text and the Tricentennial Commission as Rhetors .....   | 16  |
| Methods.....   | 21  |
| Intersecting Rhetorics of Identity, Materiality, and Place/Space as a Theoretical Frame .....  | 24  |
| Terminology.....   | 29  |
| The South (and the Southerner) .....   | 29  |
| Experiential Rhetoric .....  | 30  |
| Regionalism (Rhetorically) .....   | 31  |
| Dissertation Outline .....   | 34  |
| Chapter Two: Literature Review .....   | 37  |
| Rhetorical Theorists and Theories .....  | 40  |
| Kenneth Burke and Identification.....  | 40  |
| Sites of Rhetorical Education and Identification .....   | 45  |
| Material Rhetoric .....  | 48  |
| Rhetorics of Display .....   | 49  |
| Rhetoric of Space and Place .....  | 52  |
| Theories of Identity.....  | 55  |
| Memory and Identity.....   | 58  |
| Strategies of Identity Construction .....  | 60  |
| Southern Identity.....   | 62  |
| Performance Studies .....  | 67  |
| Conclusion .....   | 68  |
| Chapter Three: The Rhetoric of Identity Using British Heritage, Pedigree, and Prestige in Charles Towne Landing.....                         | 73  |
| Chapter Outline.....   | 75  |
| The Shaftesbury Papers, Proprietary History, and British Identification and the Conflict with American Nationalism .....                     | 76  |
| The Shaftesbury Papers.....  | 76  |
| Proprietary History as Racism .....  | 80  |
| Hybrid Nationalisms .....  | 85  |
| Courting the Earl of Shaftesbury the Queen of England: Making South Carolina a British Colony in the Twentieth Century.....                  | 90  |
| Negotiating Nationalisms: Integrating the South into the National Identity .....   | 101 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Conclusion .....   | 103 |
| Chapter Four: Scapegoating Academia, The “Problem” of the Kiawah in Charles Towne Landing, and the Threat of a Pre-European History through Archeological and Historical Research..... | 106 |
| Chapter Outline.....   | 108 |
| Researchers’ Roles in the Rhetoric of Identity: Archeologists and Dramatists as the Supporting Cast in the Drama of the South Carolina Tricentennial .....                             | 110 |
| History as a Serious Endeavor to Construct a Serious Identity .....  | 119 |
| A Break in Identification: the Clash between the Goals of Discovery and the Goal of Commemoration in Correspondence about the Archeological Discovery .....                            | 124 |
| Not Anti-South but Anti-Tricentennial and Anti-South Carolina: The Media Handling of the Archeological Discoveries.....  | 130 |
| Keeping Research Discoveries Secret: The Conflict of Academic Integrity and Identification .....   | 139 |
| Seeking Redemption: The Researchers’ Apologies as Strategies of Identification....   | 149 |
| Conclusion .....   | 152 |
| Chapter Five: Celebrating the Seventeenth Century: Common Places in the Rhetoric of Identity through Charles Towne Landing and South Carolina’s Tricentennial Celebration .....        | 153 |
| Chapter Outline .....  | 156 |
| How the Tricentennial Commission Used the Past to Define the Present .....   | 157 |
| Historical Investigation, Evidence, and Reenactment as Arguments of Degree: Who Is More Deserving of Commemorative Representation? .....   | 172 |
| Rhetorical Nostalgia in Places of Public Memory .....  | 176 |
| Reenacting 1670 to Revive Values .....   | 177 |
| Recovery and Heroism.....  | 186 |
| Reenacting the 1670, the Cultural Exemplar and Performing History .....  | 188 |
| The Tricentennial Parade .....   | 194 |
| The Lords’ Ball .....  | 199 |
| Conclusion .....   | 215 |
| Chapter Six: Conclusion: Toward a Theory of Identification as Negotiation, Not a Binary .....  | 217 |
| Implications.....  | 226 |
| Works Cited .....  | 232 |
| Vita.....  | 249 |



## LIST OF FIGURES

- FIGURE 1.1 An image of the article “300 Years of Fashion Seen at Lords’ Ball” written by Betsey Moye with a photograph attributed to “Jordan.” .....200
- FIGURE 1.2 An image from *News and Courier* published April 11, 1970, of costumed guests at the Lords’ Ball.....209

## Chapter One: Introduction

During the 1970s and early 1990s, many school-age children in Charleston, South Carolina, were exposed to the remnants of the educational influences of the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission. The South Carolina Tricentennial Commission worked from 1966 through 1970 to plan and produce a year-long celebration of South Carolina's three-hundredth anniversary, and some of the commission's work affected South Carolina's public school system. Because Charleston is the oldest city in the state, it is full of historical tourist sites. Schools often took (and likely still take) advantage of these sites by frequently taking their students on field trips to historical buildings like the Old Exchange Building and to parks like the Battery and Charles Towne Landing.

Charles Towne Landing is park located in West Ashley, a suburb of Downtown. It is located on Highway 171/Old Town Road and on Old Town Creek, which is a creek off of the Ashley River. It is constructed on a site originally called Old Town. Some primary historical documents, most importantly a collection of legal documents called the *Shaftesbury Papers*, claimed that the first British colonists who came to present-day South Carolina initially settled at Old Town. The Legare-Waring family owned and lived on the Old Town property until they sold it to the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission in 1968. The Tricentennial Commission worked with Dr. Waring, the former owner of the property, to turn it into Charles Towne Landing as the crowning achievement of their long-term projection, the Tricentennial Celebration to celebrate South Carolina's three-hundred years of history. The Tricentennial Commission intended to construct a park in Charleston that would commemorate and memorialize South

Carolina's colonial past. Charles Towne Landing opened to public in April 1970, kick-starting the state-wide Tricentennial Celebration that the state had planned since 1966.

The Tricentennial Commission, the first public entity responsible for Charles Towne Landing, initially intended the park to complement its narrative of three-hundred years of South Carolina history. This span of time focused mostly on European colonists. Because of this, the narrative would often neglect, both implicitly and explicitly, the contributions of indigenous populations, particularly the Kiawah who inhabited the Old Town site for hundreds of years before the British colonists arrived. In 1969, archeologists Doctor Robert Stephenson and Stanley South discovered artifacts at the Old Town site consistent with what they knew about Kiawah Great Houses, structures intended for spiritual rituals. Newspapers in both Charleston and Columbia covered the discovery. In response to the coverage and the commission's decision to move forward with the plan to build the pavilion on this archeological site, several South Carolina residents, mostly from Charleston, petitioned the commission to preserve the site and to include the discovery in the park's historical narrative. When the commission publicized their decision to progress as planned and not to preserve the Great House site, some of these petitioners filed a lawsuit against the commission to save it. Records from the South Carolina Department of Archives and History reveal that the petitioners eventually dropped the suit. The commission built Charles Towne Landing according to their original plans, for the most part. The commission allowed the archeologists a few months to excavate what they could before bulldozing the dig and beginning plans to erect the park's pavilion on the site. Furthermore, it also neglected discussing slavery and the

Africans who came to South Carolina via Barbados with British settlers who spent ten years at the Old Town site.

By the 1980s, Charles Towne Landing housed a space-aged pavilion that included a collection of artifacts and narrative signage, a zoo showcasing indigenous animals and habitats, the historic Legare-Waring house, a ship called the Carolina that replicated the kind of ship on which the British settlers travelled to the New World, and finally a village of reconstructed colonial homes and businesses. In the village, costumed employees reenacted and discussed colonial life in South Carolina with the tourists. The structures in the village were supposed to depict various aspects of colonial life. At least one building was fashioned to look like a home, where reenactors showed children how to make candles. One building was supposed to look like a smithy.

Charles Towne Landing remained a popular place for elementary school field trips, but that was perhaps the extent of its popularity. Public interest waned in the 1980s and 90s, particularly after Hurricane Hugo in September 1989 devastated the park's zoo and structures. According to Laura Bradshaw, reporting for *The Evening Post*, Charles Towne Landing would remain closed until the spring of 1990 for extensive repairs (1A). The damage and closures impacted Charles Towne Landing's relevance in Charleston for years following Hugo. During this time, the park's purpose and role in Charleston and in South Carolina came into question both in newspapers and among park administrators. The public and administrators struggled with maintaining the Tricentennial Commission's original vision of the park—to showcase the best of South Carolina history.

Little information about the park made its way into the papers until a 1996 study indicated that South Carolinians were ashamed of it. Tony Bartelme's article "Ugliness Found at Landing" reports that the study's authors found that "Charles Towne Landing lacks focus" and that its buildings "are eyesores" (1A). Bartelme then lists the park's shortcomings, noting only third that "[t]he historical exhibits were of poor quality and appeared to lack a solid research base" (9A). The study's authors recommended a renewed focus for the park as "the site of the first permanent European settlement in South Carolina" (9A). However, it was not until 2000 that the state invested once again in Charles Towne Landing, releasing \$13 million for revitalization ("Renewed Charles Towne Focus" n.pag.). The revitalization included new archeological research with the hope of finding evidence of the 1670 English settlement that eluded archeologists in 1969 ("Renewed"). The new park manager, Ron Fischer, is recorded telling the *Post and Courier* that the park's new focus would address concerns found in the 1996 study: "We're using the real time line of Charles Towne Landing. People have lived on this point here for 10, 000 years. What we find down there could literally change our perception of what happened here" (qtd. in "Renewed" n. pag.).

### **Analyzing Charles Towne Landing as a Site of Public Memory and Rhetorical Identity**

While the material of Charles Towne Landing illustrates a state identity grounded in white cultural history, the rhetoric describing the park's initial conception, progress, and controversy indicates two problems for rhetorical identification, generally, and for identification by Southern states in particular: the difficulty coping with Southern identity and the unstable identity defined in terms of unity rather than division, even though

outsiders may initially interpret the system of symbols that the South uses as symbols of division. The state's investment encouraged and allowed archeologists and historians to discover a more accurate account of South Carolina's history, one that was both more inclusive and perhaps more honest.

This dissertation is an archival project of the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission's activity to produce the Tricentennial Celebration and Charles Towne Landing. I focus on their activity from 1966, when Governor Robert McNair activated the commission, through 1970, when the celebration began and Charles Towne Landing opened. I chose to focus on these years because of my interest in the way rhetorics of identity that use historical representation result from deliberate decisions about historical narratives. The documents that record the deliberations, discoveries, plans, and decisions for the celebration are, in fact, rhetorics of identity that shape a public site of rhetorical identity—Charles Towne Landing and reenactments that complemented its opening. I have collected letters, minutes of meetings, reports, newsletters, and newspaper articles from South Carolina's Department of Archives and History in Columbia, South Carolina.

### **The Arguments of this Dissertation**

I also find historical parks to be particularly interesting and robust rhetorical texts because they are living archives that the public can easily access and experience. Not only can scholars analyze both the actual park but also its formal archives. Most scholars of place and space, such as Gregory Clark, S. Michael Halloran, and Carole Blair, usually limit their discussion of a site's rhetoricity to the material structures and landscape of a physical site in the present. They rarely combine the physical place with archival research

to understand how and why a place was carved out. This is what I do in this dissertation. I intersect the sub-fields of rhetorics of identity, rhetorics of space and place, and material rhetorics in this case study to understand why physical sites are so important to people responsible for commemorating history, how the parks are shaped by a rhetorical narrative, and how performances related to these events and sites are rhetorics of identity. Finally, I seek to understand the civic and social effects of these sites, their events, and their performances on the way a social group understands and conceptualizes itself.

Furthermore, this dissertation offers scholars of rhetorics identity additional ways to talk about and analyze identity construction, particularly when their texts are written, physical, material, and performative. Discussing the rhetoricity of texts that are not constructed only with words is difficult. One difficulty is that it is a new subject area for rhetoricians, as Carole Blair notes in her chapter “Contemporary U.S. Memorial Sites as Exemplars of Rhetoric’s Materiality.” Blair notes that until recently, “[m]ateriality, however, has rarely been taken as a starting point or basis for theorizing rhetoric, despite the frequent cues in our language about its material character” (18). She also argues that because rhetoric has dealt mostly with “symbolicity” (18), rhetoricians who study materiality “lack an idiom for referencing talk, writing, or even inscribed stone as material” (17). In other words, we lack a lexicon and point of reference.

This absence of terminology and absence of a reference point create problems for rhetoricians who study the intersections of the word, materiality, and space/place as rhetorics of identity. It is difficult to argue how these complementary texts make arguments about who communities are, how individuals within communities should act as citizens or people of a place, and what they know about themselves, the place, and

each other, and how this creation of knowledge and sharing of knowledge constructs identity. This is because rhetoricians have often talked about textual (or written) rhetoric in formal, classical ways, but they do not do the same when analyzing material and spatial rhetorics. In this dissertation I make the following arguments: rhetorics of identity, particularly those that use historical representation, are inherently defensive and antagonistic. I argue that rhetorics seeking to remember and constitute a singular, definite identity are defending themselves against a perceived attack. Additionally, these rhetorics are antagonistic because they seek a response, sometimes a response that seems like an attack, to validate the exigence of the rhetoric.

Secondly, I argue that the Tricentennial Commission's mediocre success with their rhetoric of identification stems from the absence of a concrete antagonist. Because I argue that first we must understand that rhetorics of identity, no matter how they materialize, are inherently defensive and antagonistic genres of argumentative discourse, I resituate these rhetorics in a more classical sense. To do this, I identify a rhetor (the commission) and various perceived or real opponents. Additionally, because rhetoric of identity must seem to address an attack, I suggest that scholars should also identify either an actual or perceived counter-argument to the rhetor's goal. I can appropriate rhetorical terminology from classical rhetoric—such as *topoi*, common places, and rhetor—and use them along with modern terminology like consubstantiation, identification, and division. If we understand rhetoric of identity as an interaction between parties, and that one party must be seen as an enemy or foe, as a threat, then we have a better way of discussing how rhetorics of identity *create* identification. I intend my case study of Charles Towne Landing and the Tricentennial Commission to demonstrate first that rhetorics of identity



are in fact defensive and antagonistic and, second, that we can use the language and theories of classical rhetorical theory with modern idioms from rhetorics of identity, materiality, place/space to better understand the process of identification.

### **Outline of the Introduction**

I begin this introduction with a history of the Tricentennial Commission and Charles Towne Landing. I summarize the commission's purpose, mission, and most important activities and goals. I focus mostly on its work in Charleston, although a future monograph project would include its activities in Columbia and Greenville, South Carolina, as well. After providing a historical overview, I discuss why I have chosen to analyze Charles Towne Landing and the Tricentennial Commission's work in Charleston rather than the activities across the state or other Southern historical parks. Next, I summarize and describe my methodologies. Then, I discuss and define important terminology. Finally, I provide an outline and summary of the following chapters.

### **Historical Introduction: The Formation of the Tricentennial Commission and the Conditions of South Carolina, Post-Civil Rights Movement**

I will focus the majority of this section on summarizing the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission's activities starting in 1966, when it was activated by the South Carolina governor and state legislature. However, I will begin this section with a brief overview of the conditions of the 1950s and 1960s, because the commission was affected by the political and social changes and challenges. Furthermore, I argue that the historical narrative that the commission constructed was, in part, a response to the

criticism that Civil Rights activists justifiably and appropriately levied at Southern states, including South Carolina.

*The Brief Summary of the Conditions South During and After the Civil Rights Movement*

By the 1950s in the United States, violent and tumultuous race relations in many Southern states made the national news as African Americans fought against the “Separate but Equal” imperative that had continued to oppress them politically and socially. Although *Brown versus Board of Education* (1954) overturned “Separate but Equal,” many white Southerners<sup>1</sup> found ways to perpetuate segregation. Additionally, these Southerners often expressed a sense of injustice because of mandatory desegregation because they felt that the African American community was seeking entitlements with their demands for equal and desegregated access to businesses and public institutions. Many white Southerners argued that their history, their culture, and their race constituted the entirety of the South. According to this assumption, anyone not white was excluded from claiming to be Southern. Many white Southerners felt that their skin color and history legitimized their claims to possessing the only authoritative history of the South and, furthermore, their claims that the histories of other ethnicities and other cultures were not only questionable but frankly fictional.

These white sensibilities affected the public industry of commemoration that emerged in the South in the early to mid-twentieth century during the Progressive era (Brundage 113). As Southerners in positions of power (generally, white Southerners)

---

<sup>1</sup> I would note that racism in the United States was not limited to the states in the South or to Southerners.

actively took on the work of archiving their history, they made conscious decisions about what was authoritative history and what was not. When Southerners started to commission structures and sites to commemorate history, this work of legitimating some history and dispensing another extended beyond the archives

These conditions sometimes resulted in often contemptuous conditions in Southern states. White supremacists groups, more or less organized, burned African American churches, homes, and business. Police in Alabama assaulted peaceful protestors by targeting them with water from fire hoses. African American children died. Civil Rights leaders were assassinated. But still the world changed, and the federal government passed the Civil Rights Act in 1964, which criminalized institutional segregation, voter intimidation, and other forms of racial discrimination. The passage of the act, however, did not settle the volatile feelings among many white Southerners who felt that their ways of life, their traditions, and their voices had been violated. It was in this post-Civil Rights Act era that the Tricentennial Commission constructed its history of South Carolina.

Moreover, I think it is important to pay attention to other cultural, social, and political changes in post-World War II America that also impacted or could have influenced the commission. The 1960s, in particular, staged serious cultural changes that we now often refer to as the “cultural revolution.” This revolution included those challenges to institutionalized racism that the Civil Rights Act criminalized. It additionally allowed for broader challenges of traditions, including the nuclear family, ideas of patriotism, women’s roles, the purpose of education, and the scope of the government’s authority.

During the 1960s, the landscape and image of America quite literally changed. Some of the changes could be attributed to new media and technology. The increasing numbers of televisions in American homes allowed more people to see images and reports of protests against racism or the Vietnam War. More exposure to alternative politics and ideas—alternatives that questioned the status quo—in music, in magazines, and on the television helped to influence and shift support from tradition.

The result was change, some changes more drastic than others. No concept, authority, or history was exempt from questioning. In this era of challenges to authority, growing unrest, skepticism, and disillusionment, tradition began to lose its power. However, that did not mean that entities that supported traditional views bowed gracefully, or at all, to the social pressure to change. I read the commission's activation in 1966 with its goal to celebrate a history that looked and sounded like the ones being challenged by social revolutionaries as a response to the changes sweeping the nation. I read it particularly as an attempt to solidify an authoritative narrative as a means of preserving a history and culture that the South Carolina government perceived as threatened and in need of defense.

That said, I additionally read the commission's activation and activities as responsive to some of the criticism leveraged during the 1960s. In particular, the commission seems to acknowledge that South Carolina's national (and perhaps international) reputation had diminished. The commission intended the Tricentennial Celebration to repair that image. I suggest that it did so by seeking to silence controversy through tactics of avoidance rather than engaging in direct attacks or explicit responses to the criticism that the commission would like to discredit. I read the commission's

negligence of under-represented groups as a way to focus on a positive history and image to avoid the criticism about South Carolina's history of social injustice toward various populations, including African Americans and First Nations. By avoiding using certain symbols and the history of slavery, ethnic extinction, and war, it seems to me that the commission tried to avoid giving critics ammunition. A positive history, it would seem for the commission, is a controversy-free history.

I am not suggesting that the commission's move addresses criticism about racism on the part of the Tricentennial Commission or the state. It also does not indicate any kind of political or cultural sensitivity toward or guilt about a past mired in a history of oppression and abuse. Instead, I suggest that the silence signals recognition of the criticism circulating in the nation and seeks to avoid instigating more. This is reparation not through admission of guilt but through silence so that potentially critical parties might not levy attacks. This is, in part, the defensive and antagonistic nature I observe in rhetorics of identity.

### *The Tricentennial Commission, 1966-1970*

In the mid-1950s, the South Carolina state government formed the Tricentennial Commission (*Final Report* 9). Its purpose was to plan, construct, and host events celebrating South Carolina's 300-year anniversary that would occur in the 1970. Most notably, however, the legislature intended the commission

to plan an overall observance of the 300<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the founding of the state. The celebration was to commemorate the landing at Charles Towne in April 1670 of the small group of English settlers from which

South Carolina traces its beginnings—even though there had been earlier settlements by the Spaniards and the French within the present borders of the State. (*Final Report* 9)

The focus on a solely English origin, even with evidence and acknowledgment of previous settlements, began in 1956, and it would persist through the completion of the Tricentennial Celebration in 1970. This is the beginning of the rejection of certain historical narratives. It seems noteworthy that this coincided with the growing voices associated with the Civil Rights Movement during the 1950s and through the 1960s, who demanded that the all the states recognize their history, their contributions, and their rights equally. The plans for the Tricentennial Celebration as early as 1956 set precedence for the commission of engaging in methods that excluded two groups of people, two histories, and two voices from the history to create a completely white, completely Anglo-centric history that suited the way they would prefer the Western world to operate. I do not think these were intentional attempts at exclusion, but when the commission was presented with opportunities to include other populations, it chose not to do so. Their methods, I would argue, reflect internalized ideologies of “appropriate” history, memory, and culture.

This first commission never completed any activity and was essentially dissolved (*Final Report* 9). In March 1966, Charleston representative Joseph H. McGee petitioned the state legislature to amend the 1956 act that created the Tricentennial Commission (*Final Report* 9). McGee’s request resulted in a 1966 act to activate a new commission, and he later served as the vice chairman of the committee. The act also selected certain government officials to work as commissioners, including “the Governor of the State,

three representatives, ten members by the Governor, and five members representing the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, the South Carolina Historical Society, the South Carolina Historical Association, the South Carolina Library, and the Confederation of Local Historical Societies” (*Final Report* 9). In the months between March and August 1966, the state governor, Robert McNair, appointed members to the commission, including attorney Thomas O. Lawton, Junior, who served as the chairman for the duration of the commission’s activities. The commission met for the first time in August of 1966. In the *Final Report*, it is noted that “programs and projects were planned so that the commemorative year would provide an increased awareness for all South Carolinians of their heritage and an enlightened and expanded image of South Carolina for the people in other states and countries” (10). This interest in enlightening South Carolina’s reputation suggests that the event was meant to repair an image that the state and the commission perceived as damaged. This event was meant to restore that reputation to a previous state. One way was by creating a compellingly positive historical narrative with implications for the present because that narrative reconstructed the state’s identity.

Although both the report and the commission’s focus signal that the history of Charleston’s Old Town site is the most important features of the Tricentennial Celebration, the commission attempted to engage the entire state in anniversary. The commission activated committees in each county to coordinate local events that would bring the celebration to everyone. However, only three cities could boast the honor of hosting “permanent exhibit centers” (*Final Report* 10). The commission planned to build these centers in Charleston (the Low Country, but even the *Report* refers to it as Charles

Towne Landing rather than by the regionalized name), Columbia (the Midlands), and Greenville (the Piedmont) (11). The commission planned that “[e]ach of the three centers [would stress] a particular century in the existence of the State” (*Final Report* 11). However, the writers of the *Report* admit that “[f]rom the beginning the Commission set as its most important goal the purchase and development of the original settlement site, known as Old Town Plantation, in the City of Charleston” (*Final Report* 11). The commission planned to rename Old Town Plantation Charles Towne Landing, which would house the Low Country exhibit center and feature the state’s origin story starting with the arrival of English colonists, or settlers, as the report calls them, on the land in April 1670. Rigorous execution of these plans began in 1969 with groundbreakings for three parks, and celebrations began in Charleston in April 1970 with the opening of Charles Towne Landing, a parade, and a series of events that included several costumed reenactments. The commission was deactivated in June 1971 with the publication of the *Report of the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission: South Carolina Tricentennial, 1670-1970*, which has been a useful archival source for this dissertation.

These parks were city-owned at first. Today, Charleston’s park, the only one of the three exhibit centers still operating, is owned by the state. Charles Towne Landing’s planning, construction, and opening incited controversy and court hearings after archeologists discovered remnants of a Kiawah Indian<sup>2</sup> Great House in the spot where the Tricentennial Commission intended to build a space-era pavilion. While the Tricentennial

---

<sup>2</sup> Here, I deliberately use the language of the newspaper articles from the 1960s when I refer to the Kiawah tribe. While I am more comfortable with the terms Native American or Indigenous People, editors and the commission did not use this language when discussing the artifacts.



Commission intended to build and promote places that symbolized a distinct South Carolina identity, they found this construction of history and identity mired by their own choices as well as voices of dissent. While the commission's actions may appear, on the one hand, to indicate a struggle to maintain (white) power, another reading of the rhetoric of Charles Towne Landing and the discourse surrounding the park suggests a more complicated struggle with Southern identity and, in particular, how this regionalized, localized identity put them in opposition with the nation.

### **Charles Towne Landing as a Rhetorical Text and the Tricentennial Commission as Rhetors**

I chose to study the archives of a park in South Carolina for a few reasons. South Carolina is one of the “original” thirteen colonies of the United States. Because of this, it has a long history that extends before the Civil War. However, when scholars like Rebecca Watts and Scott Romine discuss South Carolina<sup>3</sup>, they usually refer to the long-standing controversy of the Confederate flag flying over the South Carolina state house in Columbia. The flag flew over the state house for nearly half a century before its removal. The removal of the flag to its new site at a memorial to South Carolina's dead Confederate soldiers<sup>4</sup> by “Two cadets from The Citadel, one black and one white” (Graves and Hicks) in 2000 inspired The Citadel Conference on the South the same year and its subsequent collection of papers, *Warm Ashes: Issues in Southern History at the Dawn of the Twenty-first Century*. Because the issue of race relations has yet to be resolved in South Carolina and because the Confederate flag's public position makes it a

---

<sup>3</sup> Or other Southern states.

<sup>4</sup> This memorial is on the state capitol grounds.

symbol of the ongoing problem, most of the scholarly literature about the South that uses South Carolina as an exemplar of identity struggles focuses on the debate of the Rebel flag.

This controversy has dominated most of the scholarly discussions about South Carolina and even the South, generally. The Confederate flag, it seems, is the predominant way to talk about white Southern identity. But this creates two problems in the discourse: first, by focusing on the flag, scholars continue to give it power, and second, more complex symbols that could problematize the Southern identity that has been established and pieced apart are ignored. In other words, scholars risk breaking down the identity based on the binary conflict between white Southerners and non-white Southerners. Looking at other symbols of Southern identity, like the way different localities utilize colonial or early American historic reproductions, allows scholarship to talk about the rhetoric of silence and omission in terms of identity construction. These seem to be important and complicated features that have been absent or neglected in discussions of the South.

The Tricentennial Commission did not limit its activities to Charleston. However, Charles Towne Landing seemed particularly mired by controversy, particularly because of the discovery of the Kiawah Great House. Also, the commission frequently invoked the origin story in Charleston as a reason for the celebration when critics challenged them about the money they spent, the decisions they made, or the relevance of the celebration. Charleston and Charles Towne Landing were sites that seemed to disconnect South Carolina's identity from the most commonly used images of the South, like the Confederate flag, and sought to use other pre-Civil War imagery to repair South

Carolina's image. In fact, with the exception of a Confederate flag raised over Fort Sumter, the commission seemed to avoid any connections with the Civil War or with the South's recent conflicts with the Civil Rights Movement. In other words, Charleston, Charles Towne Landing, and their combined histories were sites of identity crises and negotiation that were more observable and robust than the other exhibition sites.

This does not mean that the other sites were not subject to criticism. The Greenville exhibit center was never fully completed as planned. Meanwhile, the Columbia exhibit received little if any criticism. Most media coverage of Columbia's exhibit occurred when it opened, but by then, Charleston had already opened the celebration, and the newspapers seemed to indicate some Tricentennial Celebration fatigue. Greenville's coverage often focused on the problems with the exhibit site and nothing else. Because I intended this project to focus on how history was archived, materialized, and communicated, Charleston's site with its controversies about history seemed the best one on which to focus.

I want it clear what I am *not* arguing: I am not arguing that the Confederate flag is not a powerful rhetorical product. I am also not arguing that we do not need to continue discussing the problem with how most of the white South has tried (and has often succeeded) to exclude Southerners of other ethnicities from this identity. In fact, researchers must continue to talk about that second point. But I am making two arguments that have led me to look at South Carolina: to better understand the rhetorical construction of identity in Southern states, we need to look at all the various ways that identity is articulated and simulated rather than only at Confederate iconography; secondly, if we want to move beyond acknowledging that the South is not monolithic,

then we need to consider identity a problem that is negotiated and handled at local levels and not a stable descriptor of all places and people. Because South Carolina has a history before the Civil War and the Confederacy, it is an ideal place to examine other sites of public memory and identity. South Carolina is one of the most important Southern states—it was a state that signed the Declaration of Independence, it participated in ratifying the Bill of Rights, and it was the first state in the Confederacy to secede from the Union. It is influential in discussions about the South and about the nation. It is a state that has struggled openly with its identity and its role in the United States. It is a state that has struggled in many ways, not only symbolized through the Confederate flag.

Charles Towne Landing is one of the ways that South Carolina has tried to negotiate a rhetoric of identity. The Tricentennial Commission intended to use the park “to commemorate the landing at Charles Towne in April 1670 of the small group of English settlers from which South Carolina traces its beginnings—even though there had been earlier settlements by the Spaniards and the French within the present borders of the State” (*Final Report* 9). What makes Charles Towne Landing a compelling site for rhetorical identification is not just the focus on SC’s colonial history but the timing of this decision, concurrent with the growing Civil Rights Movement and the decision to raise the Confederate flag over the statehouse. So at a time when SC’s public officials—all white—were making it clear that African Americans were not welcome or invited to participate in government, they also constructed a park that avoided the hot topic of slavery and the Confederacy.

This move, its timing, and the span of years between 1966 and 1970, during which the debate about the park raged, suggest that South Carolinians understood that the

common perceptions of their identity were intrinsically tied to perceptions of the South: that this identity was limited to the Civil War and the Confederacy. The move to focus the most important part of the Tricentennial celebration on colonial history indicates a conscious attempt to detract critics and residents from the negative discussions about the South and Southerners. Instead, the park directed attention not to the South but to the long and more positively-reconstructed history of South Carolina. This way, South Carolina attempted to distinguish and distance itself from the contemptuous rhetoric of the Civil Rights Movement.

However, the discovery of the Kiawah artifacts made room for debates about identity and historical narratives of identity. Furthermore, it allowed residents and critics to engage in discussions of race, history, and identity through the media, namely newspapers, and in public forums like state senate and Tricentennial Commission meetings. Although dead Kiawah were discussed rather than living African Americans, this park and the discovery of the Great House created a rhetorical site for discourse about historical narrative as a power structure.

Because I am not writing about the South in general but writing about this specific way of creating experiential archives and the rhetoric of the decisions involved, I did not feel it necessary to research the archives of other Southern parks like Stone Mountain. Parks like Stone Mountain, Colonial Williamsburg, and Jamestown would benefit from a rhetorical analysis of their archives, their construction as historical parks, and their origin stories, but that is project for the future and not for this dissertation. Focusing on Charles Towne Landing allowed me to spend time becoming familiar with one archive and to

make cogent claims about rhetorics of identity through historical parks that act as archives using the this site and its history as evidence of my claims.

## **Methods**

The bulk of this project analyzes the rhetoric and context of the primary sources to understand the process of identity construction in places or cultures that have been regionalized. I have relied on critical theory (identity theory, semiotics and signs, and contemporary rhetorical theory) to explicate the rhetorical work of the Charles Towne Landing and the media frenzy. I also use these sources to argue for localizing the discussion of the South rather than globalizing it. Because I am concerned with alternative ways South Carolinians handled identity concurrent with the Civil Rights Movement, I will utilize historical primary sources from the archives at the South Carolina Department of History and Records in Columbia. This is where the records and documents from the Tricentennial Commission and Charles Towne Landing have been stored. I will also consult the archived articles in the Charleston County Library in Charleston and the records stored at the College of Charleston. I will discuss newspaper articles, minutes from meetings, published decisions, marketing materials, and other related materials.

When I started this research, I did not know where the archives were located. My work with the archives at the University of Tennessee had taught me that many major libraries house archives. The original paper that resulted in this dissertation required me to go to Charleston to study the landscape of the park. During this trip, I went to the Charleston County Library in Downtown Charleston. I worked with an archivist at the

library to exhaust their resources on Charles Towne Landing. I initially used “Charles Towne Landing” as my search term. This search helped me locate a small collection of newspaper articles that archivists working for the Charleston County Library had clipped from the local papers. The archivists had collected these clippings in manila folders in a filing cabinet. The articles were not arranged by year or any other kind of category besides “Charles Towne Landing.” During this research, I learned that the Tricentennial Commission had conceived of and built Charles Towne Landing. The archivist at the Charleston County Library also told me that the archives for the Tricentennial Commission and for the park would be in the South Carolina Department of Archives and History building in Columbia, South Carolina.

I created a list of search terms to help me sort through the collections at the Department of Archives and History. These search terms included Tricentennial Commission, Tricentennial Celebration, Charles Towne Landing, and Kiawah Great House. Before my trip to the Department of Archives and History in May 2012, I searched their online catalog SCArchCat and discovered a collection entitled the SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. I recorded the series numbers for collections that I felt would be the most useful, including the chairman’s correspondence, commission meeting minutes, advertising files, and director’s correspondence and project files. I specifically focused on series that I thought would include references to Charleston and Charles Towne Landing. I also asked for series containing a single item, such as the final report and a parade video. Also before going to the archives, I reviewed the primary sources I already had to locate important dates, noting that the newspapers

published during the summer and fall months of 1969 reported the most on the Kiawah Great House. I decided that I would pay close attention to records from 1969.

At the archives, the archivists pulled boxes from series for me. I started with series S219001, the Tricentennial Commission Correspondence of the Chairman, Thomas O. Lawton. The series contained three boxes. The boxes contained folders categorized by month and year, although some folders spanned months and others simply days in the month. Initially, I browsed every letter and memo of this series, looking for every reference to Charleston and Charles Towne Landing. In 1966, the commission still called the site Old Town or Old Town Plantation, so I added this to my list of key words as I browsed. I requested copies of letters and memos that spoke directly to and about Charleston, Old Town, Charles Towne Landing, and the Kiawah Great House. I discovered that the commission courted British aristocracy to come celebrate the tricentennial, including the Earl of Shaftesbury, whose ancestor was a lord proprietor and after whom the Shaftesbury Papers were named. Because so many letters and memos addressed trying to bring the earl, the British queen, the queen mother, or Prince Charles to Charleston, I realized that the English heritage was an important feature to my analysis of the origin story, so I requested copies of these documents and added these names to my key word search. Because I focused on the Charleston site and activities, I excluded series specifically pertaining to the Columbia/Midlands and Greenville/Piedmont sites. However, I still read documents concerning them in the series I requested.

I brought my laptop and digital camera to the archives. I used my laptop to take notes on documents that I found important for the focus of this dissertation. For documents that were urgent for my writing process, I transcribed letters in Word



documents on laptops. I also requested copies of these documents, but I did not want to have to wait for the copies to be delivered via the U.S. Postal Service. I used my digital camera to take pictures of newspaper articles and photographs. I uploaded these pictures to my laptop. In the course of my archival research, I have created my own digital and paper-based archives images, transcriptions, and paper copies of documents.

### **Intersecting Rhetorics of Identity, Materiality, and Place/Space as a Theoretical Frame**

People do not learn about identity simply through the formal educational process in school. They also learn to identify themselves with and against other people, ethnicities, regions, and nations through material objects and the ways those objects are used. Material manifestations are important texts to study to understand how they can be used to aid in identity construction and dissemination. In “Contemporary U.S. Memorial Sites as Exemplars of Rhetoric’s Materiality,” Carole Blair seeks not to establish a theory of material rhetoric but rather to provide rhetoricians access ways to discuss material objects rhetorically, just as traditional texts are read rhetorically. To do this, Blair argues that even traditional texts have material form: “when we have theorized rhetoric, the ‘material’ or ‘real’ most often has been understood as a characteristic of the rhetoric context—rather than of the text itself” (16). Recognizing that texts often have material or real presence beyond their words allows us a way to talk about other material objects. Most importantly, Blair argues that all texts are material because we approach some kind of material form or manifestation: in book form, in a transcript, in a recording, et cetera.

One form, she argues, is not simply in words printed on the page or recorded as data, but also ideas made material at physical sites, like statues in front of a public

building. Sites that commemorate or memorialize history not only create a historical narrative but also construct an official memory by manifesting the past in the present. The connection between memory and materiality is an important relationship in discussing a physical site's rhetorical possibilities (Blair 38). Locating memory and history in material objects at an actual site indicates a desire to make the memory permanent. While Blair acknowledges the limitations of attaching rhetoric to materiality, she likewise notes that the physical presence of rhetoric because of materiality makes analysis more concrete and timely than analysis if the word (19). The spoken word is ephemeral and captured only in writing or, now, in some kind of audio and/or visual recording: these, however, are material conditions that render analysis possible (Blair 38). She notes, then, that critics cannot analyze the original rhetoric—the speech in the moment. A focus on materiality, however, allows critics and rhetoricians to discuss both the moment of production, the conditions of production, and any reproductions after the performance.

For Blair, materiality's possibility of reproduction is a crucial element to its rhetorical possibilities. She notes, "It seems uncontroversial to suggest that a text [in its original state] and its reproduction constitute different objects or events, yet it is relatively rare that we *practice* a distinction between original and copy....Reproduction is an intervention in the materiality of the text, and it is important to grapple with the degrees and kinds of change wrought by it" (38). In this case, Blair uses the word "reproduction" literally, as in replacing an old text with a copy of itself. The new text, the copy, is meant to simulate and replace the old. However, I see reproduction not simply as

replacing an old text with a new copy but rather as a process of replacing a problematic text with a new one intended to be less problematic.

In this way, I would like to extend Blair's argument here by looking at various points of production and reproduction. Reproduction is not only crucial in studying materiality, but it can be seen as a rhetorical action. With that in mind, I intend to look at the Tricentennial Commission's mission to create the park as reproduction. Furthermore, the meetings and decisions they made regarding Charles Towne Landing, in their reproduced archival state, are rhetorical choices about the nature of the original text—the actual temporary settlement that existed in the late seventeenth century. At stake in the reproduction of colonial history are these features: replacing the problematic text of the Confederate or slave-holding American South with the less-problematic British-owned South in the New World by focusing less on slavery and more on establishing Anglo colonies in what would become America. The reproduction here, then, is not a replica or copy but an entirely new history meant to replace the old. This reproduction of colonial South Carolina was a reaction to the texts of the 1960s, namely civil rights rhetorics and criticism of the South during the Civil Rights movement, which identified the South's history as oppressive and unethical. Looking at the records of these meetings (and realizing that these records are also reproductions) in the context of identity is a way to extend our discussion of reproduction in the field of material rhetorics. It allows us not only to frame the context of the reproduction but also to understand the stakes of reproduction: what is being replaced, what narratives are revised, and what is silenced in the replacement of the original text, whose identity is composed and whose is erased and alienated? For this study, I will argue that the Tricentennial Commission sought to

replace a Southern identity they disliked or feared with one they found less problematic and threatening.

But we also need to understand *identity* as rhetorical and material to justify studying physical sites and their content. Kenneth Burke argues that the difference between classical rhetoric and contemporary rhetoric is the shift in focus from persuasion to identity. For Burke, identity is persuasion, because in identifying with another person, an individual has been persuaded to find common interests. In *Rhetoric of Motives*, Burke asserts that identification acts as “an instrument,” and by using it as such, “we seek to mark off the areas of rhetoric, by showing how a rhetorical motive is often present where it is not usually recognized, or thought to belong” (xiii). Here, Burke argues that by using “identification” as a rhetorical strategy, as persuasion, we can look at other texts that are not obviously rhetorical. Burke also argues that this is not a great departure from classical rhetoric: “substance, in the old philosophies, was an act and a way of life is an acting-together; and in acting together, men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, attitudes that make them consubstantial” (*RM* 21). I would add to this argument that non-traditional texts like parks or statues provide multiple rhetorical possibilities of “acting together”: in the theorizing of the site or object, in the execution or construction, and then in how people’s interactions with the site or object.

I also incorporate Benedict Anderson’s theory of identity as an assertion of “sovereignty” into my framework for the rhetoric of identity. In *Imagined Communities*, Anderson defines a national identity as political and “imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign” (6). In identifying with someone, as Burke describes, person A imagines a connection with person B. That connection is imagined through what Burke calls

“consubstantiation.” I argue that consubstantiation is the act of agreeing that multiple people share similar boundaries. The limits are the places of consubstantiation. Once boundaries are agreed upon, then sovereignty—or ways of identifying one entity against another—occurs. This sovereignty, I argue, is perhaps more rhetorical when regions (such as the South) assert an identity that distinguishes the region from the larger national identity. In the United States, the South is perhaps the most powerful and well-known regionalism.

Political identities are often negotiated, created, and constructed in various ways, but parks are methods of identity construction and persuasion that are not as frequently discussed in rhetorical scholarship. Public parks—local, state, or federal—that *simulate* the past have a unique role in the rhetorical discussion of materiality as a means of rhetorical identification. Jean Baudrillard theorizes that simulations “[substitute] signs of the real for the real” (4). This substituting of “signs of real for the real” seems a particularly astute description for parks that combine historical landmarks with historical acts. The past cannot be retrieved or brought back into existence: it is gone. When the past is re-enacted, the parties re-enacting it attempt to simulate a bygone reality using various kinds of meaningful signs. The signs—of methods of re-enactment—are rhetorical: they can be material and performative, and they are acts of identification using values of that seem to come from past and making them relevant in the present.

I use these frames of “simulation” as a form of material rhetoric. Additionally, I use the theories of identity and material rhetoric to theorize the civic work of state parks in constructing persuasive and consequential identities. Using the theoretical frames of identity and material rhetorics in relationship with each other compliments the study of

the South. First and foremost, the South is an idea that has been commodified. Romine makes this case repeatedly in *The Real South*. Likewise, Baudrillard claims that simulation does not only “feign to have what one hasn’t” but actually “produces” it (5), much as the South is produced but is not real. The South is produced and consumed, and its greatest producer is itself. In an effort to *appear* like the *real* South, states identified as Southern are seeking ways to make their wares—in other words, their culture—consumable. In part, it is this effort of producing the South that makes material rhetoric a better way to discuss identity and its rhetorical practices.

## **Terminology**

### *The South (and the Southerner)*

In *Contemporary Southern Identity: Community through Controversy*, Rebecca Watts defines the South by drawing on Lewis M. Killian’s idea that Southerners perceive themselves (and maybe are) a minority group in the United States. Watts argues that Southerners feel like minorities because of their “sense of grievance” tied with the Lost Cause of the Confederacy (12). She adds to her definition of the South that it appreciates a unique “way of understanding” that differs from the rest of the United States in pace and esteem for traditions (4). W. Fitzhugh Brundage similarly acknowledges a privileging of the past in *The Southern Past: A Clash of Race and Memory* when he argues that Southerners operate as “custodians of Southern heritage” (4).

The connection between the archiving or conserving of tradition and past are two hallmarks of the South /Southerners that I retain in my definition of the South. However, I want to note that I have not, unlike some, limited a Southerner or the South to

geographical terms. Because the imagined South can be manifested in material ways that can be consumed, I argue that the South can extend beyond geographical delineations because the materials can be taken out of the bounded region.

I would additionally argue that a particular appreciation for land and use of land also identifies features of the South. Scott Romine's theory of the South bears similarities to Watts' "way of understanding," but he adds to his definition an appreciation of land (60). Brundage also argues, "Physical space is central to Southern historical memory and identity" (6). Land and space are essential to defining the South because often (and particularly in the case of Charles Towne Landing), physical space was and is at stake: the ownership of it, the use of it, etc. Southerners have often found their claim on the land challenged. Political separation of the land from the U.S. led to the Civil War, and later, the South bristled when the North imposed challenges during Reconstruction. Land is equally important to black and other non-white Southerners, who worked the land as slaves and fought for the right to own the land, to access space, and to feel safe in public spaces. Land substitutes as a symbol for "collective power" (Brundage 6).

### *Experiential Rhetoric*

Experiential rhetoric is not simply "material rhetoric" but a particular material rhetoric that invites participation with the space and the materials that demark the space. First, experiential rhetoric is located at a physical site and is tied exclusively to this space. Spaces that I consider sites of "experiential rhetoric" include museums, parks (public, private, etc.), libraries, archives, religious spaces (churches, mosques, synagogues,

labyrinths, etc.), and similar places. These places require participation to enact rhetoric while simultaneously engaging with material constructions of rhetoric. People can engage with experiential rhetorical in various ways. As rhetors, they can create the sites and narrate the rituals they intend to occur in rhetorical sites. As patrons, they can choose to visit sites and engage in rituals as passive as tourism or as active as historical re-enactments.

Commemoration, which was the Tricentennial Commission's original intention for Charles Towne Landing, is a particular experiential rhetoric of importance to this dissertation. In the case of Charles Towne Landing, commemoration was civic. It involved public funds, public lands, and public voices. Sites of experiential rhetoric and particularly commemoration provide entry for public discourse and public action. They allow for more concrete ways of discussing theories of identity like "consubstantiation" because they allow me to point to material objects that symbolize common places for identification.

### *Regionalism (Rhetorically)*

I did not initially intend this dissertation to focus on regionalism but rather on how physical sites in a specific location resist and create identities. Furthermore, I would like to point out that I am not studying regionalism but the rhetorical process of using landscape in resisting and creating identities instead. Nor am I studying, directly, the South. Instead, what I am studying is how concepts of region can become rhetorical forces in identity construction. Most importantly, in this project, I seek to understand how



places that have been defined by regionalism, like the South, use their land to both challenge and adapt to the identities thrust upon them. I look, then, at regionalism as a type of oppressive force against which populations struggle to assert their own identities. I find the South an intriguing case study for this project because its identity is at once seemingly monolithic but also fractured and contested. It is a label that elicits both pride and shame. It is also rife with controversy, because Southerners alone are not the only individuals to participate in defining the South. Non-Southerners from the United States and globally have all contributed to constructing what the South means. It is a region both restricted spatially by political boundaries but equally unbounded because so many entities participate in making the space meaningful.

In his book *Critical Regionalism: Connecting Politics and Culture in the American Landscape*, Douglas Reichert Powell argues, “The idea of region is in many ways categorically different from other conceptualizations of place, like home, community, city, state, and nation, in that region must refer not to a specific site but to a larger network of sites; region is always a relational term” (4). A region, then, for Powell is a nebulous political entity that is not defined by an isolated location. What Powell notes, and I have tried to address throughout this prospectus, is that a region, such as the South, is a region only because it is in relationship with another entity (e.g., another region, a nation, etc.). Using the term “region” as an identity marker both creates sites for the Burkean consubstantiation as well as division from other political and cultural entities.

Powell continues to define “region” by noting its difference from a nation-state: “The boundaries of a region never have the juridical, insulating force of other kinds of

governmental divisions” (4). While this is a political definition of the South, Powell also argues that implicit in regionalism is a cultural understanding of a region: “Because of its inherent sense of geographical scope, a region can never, ultimately, be an isolated space, withdrawn from larger cultural forces and process. Even when regional definitions are used to isolate, to idolize, or to stigmatize a network of places,...these demarcations are always in relation to broader patterns of history, politics, and culture” (4-5). Regions are at once seemingly isolated or discrete places, but because they are constructed within and by other political entities, they are not independent and disconnected from other entities and cultures. In fact, they are borne from these other groups and shaped by them; likewise, a region recursively influences the other entities that helped create the region.

Douglas Reichert Powell asserts “that regionalism, despite traditionally being used to describe, define, and isolate networks of places and spaces, can provide a rhetorical basis for making claims about how spaces and places are connected to spatially and conceptually broader patterns of meaning” (4). Discussing this aspect of regionalism—regionalism as a rhetorical process—allows me to investigate how people defined by the regional label use it both to create identification and to create division. The South illustrates the relational criteria for a region, both in terms of identification and division. However, the South may be best known for its rhetoric of division, because of its brief existence as a separate nation and later for its ongoing racism and alienation of African Americans.

Scholars have repeatedly noted how the South performs division. What is less studied is the work toward identification and how that work is performed through the material use of land. As Powell acknowledges, “When we talk about a region, we are not

talking about a stable, boundaried, autonomous place but about a cultural history, the cumulative, generative effect of the interplay among the various, competing definitions of that region. And in so doing, we are, inevitably, contributing to the cultural history, participating in the ongoing creation of regional identities” (5). In this dissertation, I will look at the material ways the conversations about the South’s history and identity, about the “ongoing creation” of its identity, manifest and propagate more discourse, more contention, and more sites for identification.

### **Dissertation Outline**

Chapter two provides a review of relevant and influential literature. I discuss significant rhetorical theories and theorists, particularly Kenneth Burke, Gregory Clark, and Carole Blair. I also discuss the role of performance studies to my discussion of the rhetoric of reenactments and their staging. Because I discuss a Southern state, I draw in part from discussions ongoing in Southern studies. I summarize and locate gaps in discussions by Brundage, Romine, and Watts, among other Southern scholars. At the end of the chapter, I explain how this dissertation contributes to these critical conversations.

Chapter three, “Restoring Honor: The Rhetoric of Identity Using British Heritage, Pedigree, and Prestige in Charles Towne Landing the Tricentennial Project,” discusses the importance of Anglophilia and the British origin story to the project. This chapter discusses how the focus on an English association and ancestry was meant to distinguish South Carolina’s identity from the rest of the United States. I use the language of classical rhetoric to discuss the role of appeals of ethos in rhetorics of identity. I pay close

attention to the commission's courtship of the Earl of Shaftesbury to bring him to the state to celebrate the tricentennial.

In chapter four, "Scapegoating Academia: The "Problem" of the Kiawah in Charles Towne Landing and the Threat of a Pre-European History through Archeological and Historical Research," I summarize and analyze the commission's treatment of archeologists Doctor Stephenson and Stanley South. I also analyze how the commission handled the discovery of the Kiawah Great House, namely as a way of negotiating their history narrative of identity when confronted with evidence to contradict their claims. I argue that the commission successfully negotiated this identity crisis by locating a concrete nemesis, namely the archeologists who were asking to spend more time with the discovery. This chapter examines the importance of a real rather than theorized opponent to rhetorics of identity.

Finally, in chapter five, "Celebrating the Seventeenth Century: The Rhetoric of Identity through Conjecture, Degree, and Performative Common Places in the Rhetoric of Identity through Charles Towne Landing and South Carolina's Tricentennial Celebration," I analyze the use of "seventeenth century" as a trope, both in written texts but also as performative texts. I use classical rhetoric language such as common topic, common place, deliberative, and epideictic rhetoric as ways of discussing the rhetorical effectiveness of these terms, images, and performances. In this chapter, I show how experiencing rhetoric through performance, or being excluded from experiencing rhetoric, provide opportunities for identification or dis-identification. The dissertation culminates in a conclusion that seeks to forward a cogent argument about the rhetoricity

of genres of archives, forwarding the claim that archives are rhetorics of identity themselves.

## Chapter Two: Literature Review

Several scholars in a variety of fields have undertaken studies of archives, of parks, and of reenactments. This kind of scholarship is often broadly called “commemoration studies” or “public memory studies.” Rhetoricians have become prominent, vocal figures in this conversation for at least the last fifteen years. Rhetoric scholars such as Gregory Clark, S. Michael Halloran, and Carole Blair have written monographs and chapters and have contributed articles to *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* and *CCCC*, expanding the ways in which scholars can discuss memory. These three scholars, in particular, are noteworthy for adapting Kenneth Burke’s theories of *identification* and *consubstantiation* for scholarship on place, material, and identity. Clark and Halloran consider the way in which prominent national parks, such as Yellowstone National Park, construct the public memory of U.S. national identity. Blair, on the other hand, frequently eschews conversations on national identity; instead, she considers how material and spatial rhetorics construct issues-based or local discourse communities and civic identities.

Scholarship on identity is closely connected to rhetorical analysis of public memory. The academic relationship among theories of material, space, and public memory, alongside theories of identity, reveal the importance of studying individuals’ civic engagement with activities associated with or located at sites of public memory. Thus, even Clark, Halloran, and Blair, as well as their colleagues, return to identity scholar’s Benedict Anderson’s influential monograph *Imagined Communities*. In this text, Anderson defines the word *nation* as “an imagined political community—and

imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow members...yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (6). Clearly, this book informed Clark and Halloran’s scholarship on national parks and the ways they provide citizens with places where they can imagine their fellow members acting together toward a national ethos. However, many scholars, including Blair, are beginning to consider identities that do not fall under a national scope, but that are in many ways equally political, imagined, and socially constructed. This turn toward examining smaller identities has resulted in works on regionalism.

One of the most popular regions for U.S. scholars to study is the South. Prominent Southern studies scholars include Scott Romine, W. Fitzhugh Brundage, Martyn Bone, and James Cobb, to name a few. Romine asserts in *The Real South: Southern Heritage in an Age of Cultural Reproduction* that not only is the South an imagined community but it is also unachievable and exists in relationship and conflict with global and national institutions (4). In other words, this regional identity can be imagined only if larger identifications exist. W. Fitzhugh Brundage, in *The Southern Past: A Clash of Race and Memory*, argues that a cultivated responsibility for archiving history is a way for Southerners to imagine themselves and recognize sameness in others (4). Thus, he engages his readers in an analysis of archival practices in the South. Rhetorician Rebecca Watts has recently created an intersection between the fields of Southern studies and rhetoric of identity in her book *Contemporary Southern Identity: Community through Controversy*. In this book Watts’ analyzes the power of the Southern representative anecdote of “The Lost Cause” as a means of Burkean identification. She argues that

attempts at racial and regional division can be used to create a larger, peaceful, and productive community because divisive symbols can be reappropriated by under-represented social groups.

Meanwhile, scholars of performance studies have recently contributed to how we can talk about the significance of space, scripted performances, unscripted yet solicited performances, and reenactments. Performance scholar Scott Magelssen studies reenactments as kinds of archival practices that preserve memory by historicizing memory to protect it against the threats of time and culture (3). Although many performance scholars study traditional performances—the theater, cinema, et cetera—Judith Butler’s work on performance has opened the discussion to consider daily activity as performance as she argues that performances are not finite acts but rather ongoing discursive acts of identity negotiation that is not limited to the theater or its analogues (xxi). While most of Butler’s scholarship emphasizes gender and sexual performances and identity, other performance theorists emphasize cultural memory in performance, such as Diana Taylor in *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. Taylor considers both scripted and daily performances as kinds of cultural archives that perpetuate, challenge, and adapt cultural identity.

In this chapter, I locate myself in the ongoing conversation about public memory, identity, material and spatial rhetorics, and performances. Specifically, I situate my contribution to this discussion at this intersection. In this chapter, I summarize the research on archives, parks, reenactments, and public memory. I will begin by summarizing and examining rhetorical scholarship on identity, space, and materiality, because I identify myself as a rhetorician, and so these frames, definitions, and theories



are crucial to my own rhetorical analysis of parks as archives that elicit rhetorical performances. Next, I consider scholarship on identity, including Southern identity. This scholarship is important not only because I am making claims about rhetorical theories of identity but because I am using a park in the South as way to forward these claims. Finally, I will turn to scholarship from performance studies. The set-up of this chapter locates a gap in the academic conversation about identity theories and parks, enabling scholars to find better ways of discussing the consequences and rhetoricity of identity construction through sites of public memory.

## **Rhetorical Theorists and Theories**

### *Kenneth Burke and Identification*

Because Kenneth Burke's *Motives* trilogy is so influential on contemporary theories of identity and identification, I must briefly review of Burke's theory developed in these texts. Burke is one of the most influential rhetoricians of the twentieth-century, in part because his theories did not seek to recover classical rhetoric like Perelman's *New Rhetoric*, nor did they perpetuate nineteenth-century rhetorical emphases that separated rationalism from rhetoric. Instead, Burke contributed to the field by re-defining rhetoric that reconciled classical rhetoric's focus on civic engagement and orality with new technologies and forms of communication. In his essay "The Rhetorical Situation," which appeared in *Communication: Ethical and Moral Issues*, in 1973, Burke muses that he never

cease[s] to marvel at the systematic treatment of 'persuasion' in the  
*Rhetoric* of Aristotle. I have in mind his way of listing the 'places...which

a speaker can utilize in the attempt to persuade or dissuade, praise or blame, to build up a character or to smear him, and the like. But the whole process was so deliberate it didn't seem to cover kinds of situations which were not characterized by the clear, formal purposiveness that classical books on rhetoric were primarily concerned with. (268)

For Burke, classical rhetoric was too closely tied to very specific and limited situations, and it was. Aristotle, whom Burke critiques, imagined three species of rhetorical situations as reasons for rhetorical performance: epideictic (in which a rhetor praised or blamed a public figure or mythological character), deliberative (concerning matters of policy and law), and judicial (concerning matters in the court room). Other oratorical discourses or performances were excluded from the study of rhetoric. The New Rhetoric and its advocates, such as Perelman, sought to legitimate persuasion by reconciling the rhetoric with rationalism. In doing so, Perelman and his colleagues retained these restrictions on the rhetorical situation.

Burke, in contrast, argues that rhetorical performances were not limited to these three kinds of stages or situations. Furthermore, he argues that rhetorical situations and rhetorical strategies were more varied in order to allow for less formal and conscious methods of rhetoric. He asserts:

a person may think of himself as 'belonging' to some special body more or less clearly defined (family, race, profession, church, social class, nation, etc., or various combinations of these). In brief, he may *identify* himself with such bodies or movements, largely through sympathetic attitudes of his own. And for associations of this sort I proposed the term

‘identification.’ We might sum things up this way: one’s notion of his personal *identity* may involve identification not just with mankind or the world in general, but by some kind of congregation that also implies some related norms of differentiation or segregation. (“Rhetorical Situation” 25, emphasizes his)

For Burke, *identification* is a means of persuasion and is experienced or felt. In fact, he argues that persuasion was the old rhetoric and “the ‘new’ rhetoric would be ‘identification,’ which can include a partially unconscious’ factor in appeal” (“Rhetoric—Old and New” 63). This is confusing because Burke invokes a “new” rhetoric, but two key factors suggest he is not aligning his theory with Perelman’s New Rhetoric: first, that Burke does not capitalize “new” rhetoric, suggesting his theory is different but not the New Rhetoric, and secondly and most importantly, his focus on the possibility of an unstructured, unconscious rhetoric. The New Rhetoric simply reintroduces twentieth-century audiences to Aristotle’s rhetorical theory, which is the highly structured old rhetoric. Here, Burke aligns the New Rhetoric with “the old rhetoric.”

Thus, for Burke, rhetoric is not simply a method for garnering or detracting support. Instead, it is a sometimes, perhaps even often, unstructured, unconscious effort to align attitudes to create a sense of sameness to achieve a goal. A rhetor’s attempt to construct, invoke, or evoke identification can result in rhetoric, or the effect of this effort. Rhetoric is the underlying motive of creating associations. Identification can be achieved to some effect only when both (or all) parties recognize sameness (consubstantiation) and then accept the sameness to attitudinally incline them toward action.

Important to this theory is the term *experience*. For Burke, “poetics” is the form and material of rhetoric, the product of rhetoric (“An Eye-Poem for the Ear” 25). Burke uses John Dewey to explain that experience is the name for the product and often is a way of life that allows for sharing or consubstantiation:

In it [experience] a body of matters and meanings, not in themselves esthetic, become esthetic as they enter into an ordered rhythmic movement toward consummation...experience is a manifestation, a record and celebration of the life of a civilization, a means of promoting its development, and is also the ultimate judgment upon the quality of a civilization. For while it is produced and is enjoyed by individuals, those individuals are what they are in the content of their experience because of the cultures in which they participate. (Dewey 339)

Experience is the way an individual engages and interacts with the poetic, and it is rhetorical in that individuals can access the poetic through experience in a way that promotes identification or division.

Furthermore, experience is the substance of rhetoric: “substance, the old philosophies, was an *act*, and a way of life is *acting-together*; and in acting together, men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, attitudes, that man them consubstantial” (*RM* 21). When experience is shared or repeated among many people, it is the “acting together” that provides consubstantiation. Finally, and most importantly, Burke argued that rhetoric/identification was a way to transcend the violence of division (*RM* 22). He saw it as a solution to division rather than the opposite of division. He hoped

for a world in which identification would solve division, so that a collective identity could function for the greater good (*RM* 22).

Burke's rhetorical theory expanded rhetoric's scope as a field. Until Burke redefined rhetoric as identification, rhetoricians generally studied the word, spoken or written. Non-verbal communication was off-limits, as were more literary forms. Burke's theory allowed rhetoricians to consider material conditions, space, archives, daily performances, literature, as well as traditional rhetorical performances, as rhetoric. His expanded definition also removed rhetoric from its strictly political confines. Some scholars, such as Carole Blair, have felt that the extent to which rhetoricians have taken this expansion is too far. Blair, for example, argues that while not all rhetorical performances are conscious or political, they must be consequential (23). Blair's work with memorials and parks also suggests that rhetoric must be public and civic. In some ways, Blair's work with public materials and sites helps to carve out a specialized field for rhetoric, while some rhetoricians have expanded it into every discipline. However, Burke's definition did provide more varied texts to the discipline of rhetoric.

Burke's theory of *identification* is my primary frame for this dissertation, and for this reason, I introduce my literature review with explanations of his definitions of rhetoric. I argue that Burke's focus on shifting and aligning attitudes and experience as opportunities to consubstantiate is a necessary feature, for speaking about why parks are important sites of rhetoric of identity. Furthermore, to call parks "archives" is to qualify them as poetic, to give them a textual structure and form with consequences for keeping history. Parks are not simply sites of education but also sites of identification, and that identification has consequences for the present and the future.

### *Sites of Rhetorical Education and Identification*

One way that scholars have adapted Burke to discuss non-verbal texts is to address the rhetoric of sites that are educational, such as national parks. Gregory Clark and S. Michael Halloran are two of the most-referenced rhetoricians of rhetorical education outside of the traditional classroom experience. According to Cheryl Glenn, “rhetorical education enables people to engage in and change American society” (viii). In her introduction to *Rhetorical Education in America*, Glenn traces rhetorical education back to Isocrates, noting that “teachers have tried to define the precepts of a rhetorical education that would enable students to govern knowledgeably and virtuously both their own households and the commonwealth” (vii). Rhetorical education, then, seeks not only knowledge acquisition but also the acquisition of those virtues that would improve society. It benefits both the individual and the community.

With Burke’s influence on the direction and disciplinarity of rhetoric, scholarship on rhetorical education could extend beyond the classroom, the writing classroom in particular. Scholarship of rhetorical education also investigates members of society whose knowledge is privileged and whose is oppressed, and which students have more, less, or better access to education, and who gets to teach. This particular interest extends from sociology, Pierre Bourdieu in particular. According to Bourdieu in *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, formal education is one way for people to obtain cultural capital and to perpetuate culture (13). Education, then, is capital, and students are consumers, hoping to accrue enough knowledge/product/capital to move them into a position of authority. Furthermore, according to Bourdieu, education and access to education perpetuate class, taste, and political dominance (18).

Although scholars of rhetorical education still interrogate the traditional classroom, other rhetoricians are looking at sites other than the school house where the education and acquisition of cultural and academic knowledge happen. Gregory Clark and S. Michael Halloran are noteworthy scholars of rhetorical education and tourism. In both his book *Rhetorical Landscapes in America: Variations on a Theme by Kenneth Burke* and his chapter “Transcendence at Yellowstone: Educating a Public in an Uninhabitable Place,” Gregory Clark explores the kind of knowledge acquired through tourism to national parks. In “Transcendence at Yellowstone: Educating a Public in an Uninhabitable Place” in *Rhetorical Education in America*, Clark states, “A rhetorical education includes many lessons, but prerequisite to them all is the instruction of individuals in a collective identity. Before people can do the practical rhetorical work of determining what they will believe and do together, they need to understand themselves as identified and interdependent with others” (147). Additionally, Clark argues that rhetorical education in schools is superficial at best, and that a “broader education in collective identity informs almost every encounter with public life” (147). He finds encounters with parks like Yellowstone rhetorically educational because

[p]laces, as readily as words, can make these myths public, and they can do so with rhetorical power as they enable people to experience themselves inhabiting that symbolic imagery. Publicly symbolic places like Yellowstone have enabled the generations of Americans who have gathered there to imagine themselves a coherent community despite the unimaginable complexity of their actual collectivity. (153)

Because the same park can be experience by generations across time, they are a-temporal and create a sense of unity, Clark claims, despite division otherwise unconquerable. He emphasizes the need to leave the private homes that divide individuals to congregate in the public place as an imagined collective as the most significant work of a park (157).

S. Michael Halloran's chapter "Writing History on the Landscape: The Tour Road at the Saratoga Battlefield as Text" in *Rhetorical Education in America* speaks to the same issues Clark addresses and frequently refers to Clark's own terminology and interpretations of Burke. However, Halloran adds, "As in the classroom that we associate more readily with the project of education, the first and most crucial fact is simply being together in a place that evokes a certain decorum and calls upon us to attend together to some object of common interest" (130). Common interest, here, can be read as value or belief. In other words, parks are sites that invite and even demand tourists to acknowledge an interest together and through particular ritualized behaviors. Halloran explains that the Saratoga Battlefield is rhetorical because "it foregrounds particular characters and events; it invites us to identify with the heroes, to relive their strivings and inhabit their passions, to become consubstantial...with the people who fought at Saratoga" (130). Furthermore, in asking us to become consubstantial with people in the past, this historical park elevates values of the past and infuses them into the values and realities of the present.

What I find most compelling about Clark and Halloran's work with parks is the focus on how cultural capital can be acquired regardless of temporal boundaries. Although neither scholar focuses much on the commemoration of history at these parks, they both suggest that these are sites where past, present, and future exist with each other



harmoniously. They do not collide but rather come together in the imaging of a collective that transcends time and space. However, this consideration of historical commemoration and time are brief moments for both scholars, and I will spend more time investigating the importance of historical commemoration as epideictic rhetoric.

### *Material Rhetoric*

Material rhetoric primarily attends to analysis of the materiality of a rhetorical product. By material, I mean the conditions of the product, with attention paid to the materials that construct the product, the product's form, and the production of the rhetorical text. While material rhetoricians will also analyze verbal rhetoric, they frequently pay attention to the materiality of rhetorical text as well as any writing or speaking included or associated with the text. Material rhetoric foregrounds the materiality of a text because it is concerned with how the text is made, used, and interacted with by both the rhetor and the audience. Rhetoricians who study rhetoric's materiality are often interested in Burke's theory of rhetoric as identification and are concerned with how a rhetorical product's form invokes consubstantiation toward a unified identity between and among diverse individuals.

In "Contemporary U.S. Memorial Sites as Exemplars of Rhetoric's Materiality," Carole Blair acknowledges that material rhetoric is a slippery sub-field of the discipline. First, she recognizes that rhetoric's materiality is a new and untraditional site of study because it does not fall under "rhetoric's central domain of written and spoken discourse" (17). However she argues that material texts, specifically "public commemorative art" in the forms of memorials, "are unquestionably rhetorical, except perhaps under the most

narrow object characterization of rhetoric—for example, as oral speech....they do the work (often more than the work) that we expect eulogies to do” (17). In other words, she examines them as different genres of the species of epideictic—or ceremonial—rhetoric.

The non-verbal form of discourse, however, is not Blair’s greatest problem with the field of material rhetoric. Although she advocates for the expansion of rhetoric’s work, she concludes, “we [material rhetoricians] lack an idiom for referencing talk, writing, or even inscribed stone as material” (17). She argues that even Foucault, Lyotard, and de Certeau have not developed an informative and useful method for talking about “the rhetorical work” of alternative rhetorical texts and why that materiality is meaningful (17). However, she and other notable rhetoricians, including Jack Selzer, Sharon Crowley, Greg Dickinson, and Brian Ott, have continued to develop the field to discuss rhetoric’s materiality. Ultimately, this scholarship has resulted in various methods to discuss materiality. These methods are often referred to as “rhetorics of display” and “rhetorics of space and place.” These specializations emphasize different ways to discuss the form, production, and interaction with a rhetorical product, and I discuss both of them separately.

### *Rhetorics of Display*

The sub-field of rhetoric of display figures as yet another appropriation of Burkean identification. Lawrence J. Prelli’s book *Rhetorics of Display*, published in 2006, is one of the most important texts that develop the theory. A collection of seventeen essays, it has become a staple text book in both undergraduate and graduate courses designed to discuss material and non-verbal rhetorics. I argue that rhetorics of

display cannot be taught without having first understood theories of material rhetorics, since rhetorics of display are so dependent upon material. However, the theories are often both necessary, because the location and accessibility of display is also crucial for a nuanced rhetorical analysis.

The term “rhetorics of display” describes a sub-genre of rhetorical scholarship concerned with how a text looks, is presented, and is engaged with as a rhetorical interaction. It provides a way of analyzing what I call “experiential rhetoric,” or rhetoric that requires active participation with the audience to make meaning. In “Rhetorics of Display: An Introduction,” Prelli remarks, “‘Display’ evokes commonplace associations about (1) ‘how things look or appear,’ (2) exhibition or demonstration, and (3) showiness or ostentation” (1). Because rhetorics of display often provide theoretical avenues for examining non-traditional rhetorical products, he also defines rhetoric:

“Rhetoric” summons similar commonplace associations: rhetoric is often said to deal with appearances rather than reality; to manifest demonstration and exhibitions of feelings and commitments rather than reason and sound judgment; and to involve exaggerated style or ostentatious self-display rather than sober presentation of substantial matters for impartial consideration. (1)

In this definition, Prelli invokes Plato’s criticism of rhetoric, which he famously levied in his dialogic text *Gorgias*. Prelli uses this critique of rhetoric to construct a relationship between how people think about display and how they think about rhetoric.

Prelli, however, notes that while this comparison of commonplaces is useful in understanding how display is rhetoric, it is not nearly as helpful in understanding the

complex rhetoricity of these texts. In other words, he asserts that relying on this comparison “obscure[s] the full range of ‘displays’ that could be said to operate rhetorically—that is, persuasively—when they engage with those who become audience to them. Nor do they enable consideration of how rhetorical or persuasive acts manifest or display how things appear to those addressed” (1). Here, Prelli touches on a common issue in rhetoric, which is neglect of audience.

Rhetorics of display, then, attend to several features of display. First, they consider the staging and materials of a display, how “displays operate rhetorically and that rhetorics enact display” (Prelli 1). Rhetorics of display also consider the material conditions of display:

Displays are manifested rhetorically through the verbally generated “image” in speeches and literature. Displays appear rhetorically in sketches, paintings, maps, statistical graphs, photographs, and television and film. Displays are manifested rhetorically in the homes we inhabit and in the many places we visit—museums and exhibitions, memorials and statuary, parks and cemeteries, casinos and theme parks, neighborhood street corners and stores. Displays are manifested rhetorically in the “demonstration” of a scientific finding, of a political grievance, of a preferred identity. (1)

The rhetoric of display, finally, “anticipate[s] a responding audience” (1). In short, rhetoric of display emphasizes analysis of how and where a rhetorical product is display, how display is itself a rhetorical product, and how audience interaction is crucial to the rhetoricity of the product.

Rhetorical analyses of parks—historical, commemorative, recreational, and themed—are often categorized as rhetorics of display. This is because the architects, civic engineers, historians, dramatists, and other experts involved in the planning often concern themselves with staging. Staging in a park could include interpretative signage, preserved archeological sites or active archeological digs, mannequin displays, commemorative statuary and signage, preserved or reconstructed historical structures, reenactments, as well as gift shops. Of course, this is not an exclusive list. But rhetoric of displays also emphasizes the work of the rhetor, the rhetor’s attention to the audience, and the audience’s attention to the rhetorical display and even the rhetor’s construction of it.

This focus on the interaction among the three points of this rhetorical situation—rhetor, display/product, and audience—is one especially highlighted in rhetorics of display, and it has affected my own reading of Charles Towne Landing and how rhetorics of display are also rhetorics of identity. First and foremost, this attention to staging and to using resources influences chapter four, in which I investigate the rhetorical use of archeology and history to create an exigence for the Tricentennial Celebration project. I pay particular attention in this chapter to the historians who were featured rhetorically in many discussions of the park’s construction and how South Carolinians received, perceived, and engaged with the discovery of the Kiawah Great House.

### *Rhetoric of Space and Place*

The rhetoric of space and place is a newly emerging study of rhetoric. The body of scholarship on the rhetoric of space is growing, particularly as the more established studies of materiality and display have included thoughtful discussions about how

materiality, display, and place/space are inter-related. Most frequently, the rhetoric of space and place is paired with analysis of public memory. Moreover, while rhetoricians such as Clark and Halloran discuss how space is central to rhetorical education and internalizing national identity, their focus on these sites can be just as legitimately classified as rhetoric of space and place as much as studies of rhetorical education. Like rhetorics of display, the rhetorical study of space and place emerges from the way material rhetoricians have adapted Kenneth Burke's rhetorical studies to expand the definition of a rhetorical text or product.

Broadly speaking, the rhetoric of space and place simply allows rhetoricians to read and analyze how space is used rhetorically and can be considered a rhetorical text because of its use. The rhetoric of space and place, then, is an approach to rhetorical analysis that provides opportunities for more nuanced, productive readings of a text that is situated in a particular location. Even more, it can provide more meaning for texts that are not confined to a location. For example, the rhetoric of space and place allows rhetoricians to account for studying the same text in different locations, such as the same speech that might be delivered in various places during an orator's travels—such as campaign. The rhetoric of space and place assumes that location is part of the rhetorical text. It also accounts for the use of space for virtual, digital spaces as rhetorical places.

Carole Blair, Greg Dickinson, and Brian L. Ott explain in their introduction to *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials* that studying the rhetoric of place is not necessarily a radical departure from or extension of classical rhetorical theory. They recall that place is informative to memory, and that memory is

one of the canons of rhetoric (1). Therefore, studying how place is used rhetorically—particularly, in their book, with public memory—is neither revolutionary nor a-rhetorical:

Rhetoricians also take discourses, events, objects, and practices to be partisan. Rhetoric has understood, in most of its western rendition, that discourses, events, objects, and practices have attitude. They are not “neutral” or “objective,” but tendentious. They are understood as deployments of material signs serving the grounds for various identifications or perceived alignments to take shape. (4)

Land, itself, clearly has no will or partisanship; however it can be associated with the wills and alliances with others. Once someone uses land as a symbol, a stage, a sign, then it becomes replete with meaning of alignments, alliances, and memory. The land becomes a way for the public to know these alliances, to experience them, and to remember them.

The rhetoric of space and place shares similar lexical problems with material rhetoric. Dickenson, Blair, and Ott observe, “Space and place sometimes are used as approximately equivalent terms” (23). They argue, however, that space and place suggest different situatedness of rhetorical use of a location. I use “space” and “place” in this dissertation according to their definitions and implications, thus in the following paragraphs discuss the ways in which they differentiate the two. They assert, “a *place* that is bordered, specified, and locatable by being named is seen as different from open, undifferentiated, undesignated *space*....space is even more typically differentiated from time, often in a dialectical pairing” (23). Place suggests the imposition of identity, memory, and temporality toward a goal.

I use the rhetoric of space and place in this dissertation to talk about the consequence of associating a space with an identity. I also consider how history—which I will discuss more in this chapter when I summarize theories of memory in identity studies—and historical discovery situate a place as a site of contested identifications and identity crisis. I also read space as materiality, discussing how it also becomes a stage for production and memory. The rhetoric of space has allowed me to discuss reasons why Charles Towne Landing was such an important site of memory construction in South Carolina; furthermore, I analyze documents I found in the archives that discuss how to turn the site into a specific place. I analyze the documents to reveal the antagonistic quality of rhetorics of identity.

### **Theories of Identity**

In this dissertation, I seek to provide rhetoricians with new ways to discuss rhetorics of identity. Because of Burke's term "identification," many rhetoricians seek to analyze identity construction. They analyze how communities use and adapt language and other symbols to create methods for members to share the identity, or recognize sameness (consubstantiate) through the shared use of these symbols. However, theories of identification struggle with talking about the process of choosing and adapting symbols. Furthermore, we often neglect the process of teasing apart the exigence for these genres or species of rhetoric. In order to contribute to the ongoing development of rhetoric of identity as a discourse, I consulted many texts that are important to studies of identity, including Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities*, works on memory and history, and finally, scholarship on Southern identity.



This section summarizes some of the scholarship on identity. Not all of the scholarship belongs strictly to the discipline of rhetoric. However, all of these theories are applicable to rhetorical scholarship because they try to make sense of various kinds of texts that rhetoricians, like myself, would consider to be rhetoric or rhetorical products. Furthermore, rhetoric is a discipline that has historically drawn from other disciplines to add theories, vocabulary, and methods. Even Aristotle acknowledged that rhetoric's primary concern was the means of persuasion, but that those means could be applied to other subject areas and that rhetors/orators would need to draw from other disciplines for rhetorical purposes. Finally, because rhetoric has been a tool and subject for political, legal, and social stages, it makes sense that it would draw from those disciplines as much as they draw on rhetoric.

Finally, it is clear that because of Burke's use of the word "identification" and his influence on rhetoric's trajectory into the twenty-first, the rhetoric of how identification happens has become an important academic pursuit. As such, scholars of rhetoric have delved into non-rhetorical theories of rhetoric to enhance and contribute to their ways of understanding efforts to invoke *consubstantiation* and, later, its effect of *identification*. Scholars have identity, particularly Benedict Anderson, have informed the way rhetoricians discuss identity. I am one these scholars affected by these non-rhetorical studies. They have informed my reading of the park, and because of this influence, I have included some of the important theories and theorists in this review.

#### *Benedict Anderson and National Identity*

In his influential book *Imagined Communities*, Benedict Anderson interrogates the role of industrialization, history, and memory in nationalist movements in the late-

nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Anderson defines national identity as “an imagined political community—imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members...yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion” (6). Clearly, this definition has influenced rhetoric scholars like Gregory Clark. The imagination of a nation is not only the imagination of a place but using place as a way to imagine relationships among individuals. The nation is not the place but rather the people. The place associated with the nation is a means of consubstantiation: it is the rhetorical product that provides a sense of sameness.

For Anderson, the roles of history and memory are ways to situate a space into a place so that it becomes the site of the imagined community. However, because the nation is a product of the present, he views the rhetorical uses of history and memory as paradoxes. He observes that one paradox is “The objective modernity of nations to the historian’s eye versus their subjective antiquity in the eyes of nationalists” (5). History seems to be a subject of objective study, bias, or alliances, but it is actually a politicized narrative that can be used to help create an origin story or a mythology that identifies individuals together as the nation.

The origin story is an important rhetorical product in rhetorics of identity, even those identifications that are not nationalism but that are regional or even smaller discourse identities. Anderson asserts that forgetting the previous nation—the community from which the new identity emerged—and creating a new tradition in the form of new origin story is a trope of nationalism (195). I find his conclusion about the origin story problematic, because so many origin stories do not forget the country of origin but often

discuss it in terms of conflict. Additionally, there are other ways that imagined communities remember the mother country and use it as rhetorically in their origin tales. There, I find Anderson's conclusion limited. As a result, I spend a great deal of this project examining the origin story. Of course, I am not discussing a national identity, but rather an identity that emerges from and is associated with the regional identity of the South. While Anderson's theory about the power of imagination and the origin story as an imaginative device informs my reading, I feel that he has over-simplified the rhetorical work of the origin story. In my dissertation, I pinpoint multiple origin stories—the story of the British coming to America, of the colonies becoming a nation, of the South trying to become its own nation. These multiple origin stories do not suggest a need to forget but indicate, rather, a need to legitimate the sovereignty of an identity by creating and breaking alliances. This dissertation seeks to complicate the rhetoric of the origin story by looking at it as a recuperative effort rather than as a means of forgetting.

### *Memory and Identity*

Many scholars of identity work closely with memory, remembering, and forgetting. This work with memory emerges from Anderson's own conclusions about the origin story and institutionalization of history. Recently, both rhetoric and memory scholars (and those whose scholarship functions at the intersection of these fields) have worked with trying to understand how history and memory are different, similar, and rhetorical. One of the most influential memory scholars for many rhetoricians of memory construction and identity is Pierre Nora and his essay "Between History and Memory: Les Lieux de Mémoire." Nora defines "les lieux de mémoire" as sites and points in time

in which there is a break between the past and memory, in which the present slips into the past (26). Ritual and tradition are ways to keep the former present in the present, so that the past and present do not seem separated. He explains that once the past is no longer ritualized, it is no longer remembered and seems lost. He states,

An increasingly rapid slippage of the present into the historical past that is gone for good, a general perception that anything and everything may disappear—these indicate a rupture of equilibrium. The remnants of experience still lived in the warmth of tradition, in the silence of custom, in the repetition of the ancestral, have been displaced under the pressure of a fundamentally historical sensibility. Self-consciousness emerges under the sign of that which has already happened, as the fulfillment of something always already begun. We speak so much of memory because there is so little of it left. (26)

Les lieux de memoire is the site at which the past and present break, and the past is historicized and is lost to the influence of the present.

I argue that memory is important to the study of identity because so much of rhetorics of identity are concerned with trying to historicize the past—to legitimize an official version of the past—in an effort to legitimate the present. It seeks to create a memory out of mythology. In some ways, rhetorics of identity confuse memory and history, past and present. However, as Dickinson, Blair, and Ott point out, memory and history are not binaries, but rather, they have a complex relationship with each other as they become means of identification. They muse, “To be sure, most of what passes for public memory bears at least some arguable resemblance to or some trace of a ‘real’ past

event” (13). In other words, there is a sense that what has been institutionalized must have an element of evidence to support that memory that is preserved and converted into a narrative. So history is not simply preserving memory but legitimating it by finding the grain of truth so that any fiction seems less fictitious. Furthermore, they assert,

If the substance of public remembrance is to be truly public (or collective in any sense)—that is, shared *and* embraced as a marker of identity for that group—then two conditions seem to be in play. First, there must be a mode of sharing....Second, though, a memory that is shared must somehow attract a certain degree of adherence on the part of members of the group. (13-14)

Memory, then, is important to rhetorics of identity because memory must be believed, enacted, and manifested somehow, in rituals and/or materials. Furthermore, memory, as Dickinson, Blair, and Ott point out, can attract members to a group. It is a means of identification, and as such, it has rhetorical effects that require critical attention when we discuss how history and memory create or are aspects of collective identities.

### *Strategies of Identity Construction*

In *Identity's Strategy: Rhetorical Selves in Conversion*, Dana Anderson suggests that identity negotiation seeks to reconcile the past with the present (3). In this book, Anderson interrogates the rhetoric of conversion through Kenneth Burke's theory of identification. In other words, he is interested in how to talk about identity when forces actively advocate a change of self. Anderson defines rhetoric of identity as a rhetorical strategy, asserting that identity is “the influencing of others through an articulation of our

sense of *who we are*” (4, emphasis his). He further claims, “identity matters less as something that one ‘is’ and more as something one *does* in language; or, more exactly, identity matters as something that one does to an audience through the expression of who or what one is” (4, emphasis his).

Anderson seeks to respond to criticism of identity scholarship. He directly engages Edward Said and others. Anderson explains that for many critics, “identity is a malevolent ideological minion, the mystifying calling card of a transcendental subject that never existed” and “an outright bore” (6). But by redirecting consideration from the ontological to the experiential, Anderson seeks to redefine identity (6). He concedes that the problem with identity studies has been the attempt to describe “what a person ‘really’ is” (6). He aims to use the word “identity” to describe “a person’s ability to articulate a sense of self or self-understanding” (6).

Like I seek to do, Anderson draws connections to Aristotle to provide better ways of talking about identity and identification. He asserts that understanding this articulation is rooted in ancient rhetoric because it is concerned with *endoxa* (19). He states, “Doxa often assume this peculiar status of being, as the expression goes those ideas we think *with* rather than think *about*” (8, emphasis his). Because *doxa* structure how people think, then identity studies in rhetoric is concerned with interrogating *doxa*: “within the general *doxa* that define the person, *identity* names the commonly held belief that human selves are capable of—and arguably incapable of functioning without—some sense of self-definition, some answer to the question of ‘who I am’ in the culture, society, and world they inhabit” (9, emphasis his). He calls this “the doxatic perspective” (9).

Anderson seems to try to fill the gap in studies of rhetorical identity by describing identity as a process. However, Burke's term "identification" implies a process, as does the need for consubstantiation. Thus, Anderson is amplifying Burke's argument. His addition, however, is his attempt to articulate the process. He does this by analyzing conversion narratives of individuals. Anderson's work is useful because it draws connections back to classical rhetorical theory, but his focus on the individual deserves more attention. Although he explains that identity is concerned with *doxa*—and I agree—he does not explain why analyzing an individual's identity is a rhetorical concern. Like Anderson, I seek to articulate the process of identification. However, unlike his study, I look at communities rather than individuals.

### *Southern Identity*

Many memory scholars are concerned with the identity of the southern states of the United States because of this region's contentious history with the larger nation. I reviewed and utilized scholarship about the South because the park I study here is located in the South. The state legislature activated the Tricentennial Commission to commemorate and celebrate three-hundred years of history, history that includes the Civil War and battles over identity and sovereignty. Furthermore, plans for the park were initially conceived in the 1950s during the Civil Rights Movement, and the most robust planning and building began shortly after the ratification of the Civil Rights Act. Because of this context—a park meant to celebrate a complicated past during an equally complicated and relevant present—it seemed important to consult scholars of Southern identity and memory.

The search for the South is a kind of American grail quest. Scholars have sought to define and locate the South and classify its rhetorical symbols. In *Contemporary Southern Identity: Community through Controversy*, Rebecca Bridges Watts identifies a sense of grievance as a hallmark of Southern sensibilities (4). I would argue, additionally, that a sense of grievance can exist with an (albeit biased) unique perception of the present that focuses on history. A grievance, in other words, is a memory of the past. Thus, if a sense of grievance is, indeed, a distinction of Southern identity, and grievance emerges from memories of the past, then history and representations of the past are important features to investigate when trying to understand how the South handles the past as it constructs its present.

While literature about the South and/or written by Southern authors has provided identity scholars one way to analyze identity, material rhetoric is another and perhaps more relevant text for identity interrogation. The discourse investigating material rhetoric in the South is both popular (discussed in newspapers, popular books, et cetera) and intensely academic. Scott Romine, James C. Cobb, Rebecca Watts, W. Fitzhugh Brundage, among others, have all explored the compelling relationship between materiality and identity in the American South. These scholars have located their interests in the ways in which Southern states memorialize the Confederate past, such as through conspicuous displays of the Confederate or “Rebel” flag, statues commemorating Confederate leaders, and local structures (bridges, buildings, highways, etc.) named after other Confederate leaders or Southerners with a past closely linked with the enslavement of persons of African descent. They emphasize the emergence of these materials—what I call “Confederate iconography”—with the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s and the



growing pressure from the Southern African-American community to alter the names of these sites to the names of well-known African American leaders, and to remove Confederate imagery from publically-held buildings and property.

Perhaps the most important work these scholars have done is to problematize the term “South.” Generally, most Southern studies and Southern rhetoric scholars agree that the South, as used in much of popular culture, is an imagined region. Some boundaries may feel quite real, for instance, the northern-most border of the South at the Mason-Dixon Line. However, what the South is—both geographically and culturally—is contested. Scott Romine asserts that any culture, including the South, is slippery: it cannot be located and it cannot be achieved (3). When people—scholars and plain Southern enthusiasts alike—attempt to create boundaries, the distinctions become unclear. If the South includes all the states south of the Mason-Dixon Line, then is Florida a Southern state? Who can claim the identity “Southern”? Are Southerners, by definition, culturally backward, historically-minded, and against industrial and technological progress? These are just a few of the questions asked and sometimes answered, often vaguely, in Southern studies. But what Romine and others have answered is the question of whether or not the South is restricted by Southern states, by definition, or by the history of the idea and culture of the South. Like national identity, the South is imagined and therefore not really an entity that exists. And if it does exist, at least as a social construct, it exists only in direct relationship with other communities, like “America” or “the world.” It exists only in contrast with, or as a smaller counterpart to, other political and cultural communities.

In *The Real South: Southern Narrative in the Age of Cultural Reproduction*, Scott Romine argues that the South is not actual but performed, emphasizing that in this performance, “the South is full of fakes—Civil War reenactments and plantation tourism, to name two—infinately preferable to their originals and arguably descended from them” (2). Here, I would extend his argument and underscore it by pointing out that in preferring “fakes” that reproduce the past, the Southern “fakers” deflect attention from (Southern) issues of the present. Romine alludes to this deflection of the present when he remarks, “Culture has a habit of not being where and when we are presently” (3). Whatever we call culture is elusive and is often informed by the past. This is particularly true in the South, which keeps returning to the past, either to cleanse the South through revisionist history or to ignore it by choosing other pasts to legitimate.

In analyses of Southern materiality, scholars limit their critical readings of the South to images of the Confederacy and the conflict this causes. In other words, scholars look at how only one past—or one narrative of the past—is venerated. This is, in part, because of the baggage attached with commemorating and valuing people who fought for the continuation of black slavery under the guise of states’ rights. These scholars rarely, if ever, turn their attention to other ways that the South had attempted to avoid the problematic symbolism of the Confederacy. In other words, when they discuss the materiality of the South, they look only at materials built to celebrate the Confederacy and equally to disparage the fight for civil rights. Many states in the South—Florida, the Carolinas, and Virginia, for example—have long histories of residents and conflicts before the Civil War. These histories are just as important to Southern identity as the Confederacy. However, despite the suppression of these stories, these histories also began

to materialize in reproduction and commemoration at the same time as the Civil Rights Movement. These reproductions of colonial and early American history offer important rhetoric about Southern identity. Namely, attention to colonial or early American history illustrates the ways in which the different localities in the South struggle with the burden of the identity of the South imposed upon them. This burden expresses itself in at least two ways: attempting to react against the imposition of the monolithic identity to assert a local identity as well as attempting to establish itself as a paradigm of the monolithic Southern identity.

In this dissertation, I draw upon the work of Scott Romine, Rebecca Watts, and other Southern studies scholars through two primary theoretical frames: the rhetoric of identity and material rhetoric. My dissertation explores the rhetorical sites—both actual and textual—that emerge from the creation of a state park intended to commemorate the American colonial era and not the Civil War era. This is a unique departure from the way rhetoricians and Southern scholars have studied Southern material rhetoric, because these scholars most often analyze the way white Southerners utilize symbols of the Confederacy during the Civil Rights Movement. Like Watts and others, I will look at controversies that arise concurrent with the Civil Rights Movement; however, I am deliberately choosing non-Confederate imagery and representations. I have decided to look at reconstructions and memorials of the colonial and revolutionary-era American South because these symbols have been historically neglected and because they show ways that Southerners of all races and backgrounds attempted to negotiate the issue of race without talking about it. This choice to represent identity by not using symbols that

elevate the American Civil War indicates an intention to avoid the discussion of race in the broader contentious issue of who can legitimately claim to be Southern.

### **Performance Studies**

I consulted some scholarship from performance studies because of the primary source documents in the archive revealed the Tricentennial Commission's urgent desire to recreate the past by simulating colonial villages and daily life. In his book *Simulations*, Jean Baudrillard explained that simulations have become so prevalent, so present, that "It is rather a questing of substituting signs of the real for real itself" (4). Additionally, he suggests that simulation simultaneously incites and seeks to fulfill desire because it "feign[s] to have what one hasn't" but actually "produces" some of what one does not have (5). I see historical recreation as simulating something that is lost, or that feels lost, because it has slipped from the present into the historicized past. The act of archiving removes the past from the present, but simulating what now exists in the archives is a way to restore it. Therefore, reenactments and recreations are simulations of what may have once been real, what was once a memory, and what is not mythology.

Diana Taylor, a performance scholar, analyzes performance as embodied archives in her book *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. She assumes that all aspects of daily life are performances, rather than simply scripted and staged event, and that every "performance also functions as an epistemology....Performance and aesthetics of everyday life vary from community to community, reflecting cultural and historical specificity as much in the enactment as in the viewing/reception" (3). Building and expanding upon Judith Butler's concept of

performativity, Taylor concludes, “By taking performance seriously as a system of learning, storing, and transmitting knowledge, performance studies allows us to expand what we understand by ‘knowledge’” (36). She specifically argues that it will challenge the privileging of written knowledge as a primary means of rhetorical education and archiving. Taylor’s work specifically allows me to consider multiple archiving performances: building actual archives, constructing sites of reenacted and historical living, and utilizing archives. All of these are performances that are informed by previous knowledge and also create new knowledge.

Finally, I also considered scholarship on the practice of reenacting historical events. In his introduction to *Enacting History*, Scott Magelssen seeks to understand the performances of historical events and assert, “when we expand the umbrella [of performance] to cover the realm of historical performance that takes place, for the most *outside* the traditional theater venues, it becomes even clearer that spectators and participants have found the past to be a seemingly inexhaustible repository of material for public consideration and reworking” (2). Scholarship about the reenacted past—or historical performances—offers insight into how people extract meaning from the past for use in the present and how they use these reenactments to encounter values that seem to have passed into the history books, but that they deem relevant and important.

## **Conclusion**

This dissertation reflects my effort to study identification and the rhetoric of identity in ways that previous scholarship either have not yet done or have not yet fully developed. I am participating in the broader conversations about how historical parks are

sites of rhetorical education, but I argue that this education is not simply civic but includes questions of identity and how these two inform each other. However, much of the scholarship on parks seeks to discuss identity in terms of nationalism. This focus on national identities has, I argue, limited the way we think about and discuss identity and identification through performance. Furthermore, some of the rhetorical treatment of identity suggests that identities can be monolithic and static. This dissertation argues that identity construction that happens at and through park sites reveals not a static theory of identity but rather identity that emerges from an ongoing tension and continuous negotiation of multiple identities. In fact, I seek not to label one identity in the park but rather seek to discuss the rhetoric of identity and the process of identification in terms of crisis and negotiation rather than in terms of identification and division.

The focus on the end-product of the park, its final form, is one reason why rhetoricians of parks as sites of identification analyze identity as static. There are several problems with this approach that has been so popular. First and foremost, if scholars concur that parks are cultural artifacts and are products of culture, then we need to look at the processes of production. In other words, I mean we need to look at the history of the park, not only the history that it reconstructs or teaches. The park's own history is helpful in understanding how it was intended as a site of identification. Furthermore, the process also reveals how that identification is decided upon as a goal. I believe that in order to discuss the rhetoricity of parks, scholars need to discuss its form in the present and the past that determined its form. The archives often reveal the process of moving from space to place. Looking at parks as emerging from historical research and archives to become

new sites of historical research and looking at archives will provide more nuanced ways to talk about how parks are sites of identification.

Because so much research on parks neglect the park's own origin story, rhetoricians often miss analyzing the careful ways park planners use research to negotiate and legitimate identifications. During my first work with the park's archives, I encountered newspaper articles that reported on the archeological discovery of a Kiawah Great House at the future site of Charles Towne Landing. This discovery was problematic for various reasons, not the least of which was the conflict of identities between the archeologists and the commission. Furthermore, the discovery seemed to provide evidence that would undermine the final narrative the commission wished to construct, project, and simulate. I was also interested in the way that the commission and its advocates first craved the legitimization of historical scholarship only to attack it later when it seemed to threaten the narrative that the commission approved. Additionally, I was interested in the many ways in which the commission used origin stories, history, and the park site as rhetorical products and as ways to communicate an argument about identity. This study provides a way to talk about how a space can be turned into a place by writing history onto the land.

Additionally, this dissertation provides new ways to discuss how rhetorics of identity and identification in the South use symbols. So much of the scholarship about historical sites in the South arrests on the use of Confederate images and symbols, but this park is mostly absent of those symbols, and it seemed to avoid employing them by looking to a pre-American origin. This origin, however, is not one that seeks to distance South Carolina from its ancestral roots in Britain or with its American history. It seeks,

instead, to court and market both. This courting of various identities complicates the way rhetoricians have interpreted Burke's theory of identification. Most scholars who use Burke interpret his theory as a function of binaries: to identify is to court division. But rhetorics of identity do not always actively seek division. I argue that they seek, instead, to defend themselves, and the origin story can be employed as text that needs to be defended and preserved against time.

Finally, this study investigates the rhetoric of identity at historical sites through archival research and rhetorical analysis. Many analyses of parks focus specifically on the park itself. But historical sites like parks do not suddenly appear. They come out of years of planning, arguing, and fund-raising. They are accompanied by celebrations and grand openings. This planning is the planning of an archive, and so my dissertation seeks to analyze the park as an effort to archive. This, in turn, suggests that archiving is a rhetoric of identity. This is not a new discussion, but it is new to the discussion of parks as rhetorical sites and sites of rhetorical education.

This dissertation seeks, then, to create scholarly intersections among theories from materiality, space/place, and identity to better articulate how identification is processed, enacted, embodied, and negotiated. In intersecting these theories as complements, I intend to provide new and better ways to discuss identification. Most importantly, I intend to challenge two prevalent ways of approaching rhetorics of identity. First, I seek to challenge the emphasis of a static identity that negotiates the binary of consubstantiation and division. This emphasis severely limits what we can say about these rhetorics. Secondly, I intend to challenge the way we discuss identity as stagnant and monolithic rather than as a negotiation that changes with time, history, and memory.



These are the gaps that have informed my own approach to rhetorical analysis. In doing so, I hope to contribute to rhetoric, specifically the studies of identity, place/space, and materiality, more robust ways of analyzing the rhetoricity of sites of public memory and identity.

### **Chapter Three: The Rhetoric of Identity Using British Heritage, Pedigree, and Prestige in Charles Towne Landing**

The Tricentennial Commissioners suffered from a lack of direction for the celebration, which impacted the development of the three exhibit centers in Charleston, Columbia, and Greenville. Early in the planning, the commission envisioned Charleston's exhibit center at Old Town focusing on seventeenth-century history. Along with its emphasis on the seventeenth-century colonists, the Commission also spent a great deal of time considering marketing endeavors, including petitioning the United States Postmaster General to create a commemorative stamp. More than any concrete ideas, however, the Commission emphasized the importance of legitimizing their project.

In the early years of planning (1966 through 1968), commissioners often faced questions from the public and from federal officials. Some federal officials questioned the validity and relevance of celebrating South Carolina's tricentennial in 1970 when the nation would celebrate its bicentennial six years later in 1976. Some officials even suggested that the commission halt its work entirely and redesign the celebration to coincide and complement the bicentennial in 1976. Meanwhile, some citizens were questioning the financial expenditures. In these ways, both state residents and federal officials challenged the exigence for this kind of effort. One way the commission fought to legitimate the celebration was by seeking to associate South Carolina's history with other older nations. They used this focus on South Carolina as a colony to draw attention to the state's British roots. In doing so, South Carolina's leaders effectively divided the state's past from the nation's.

This move was problematic for a variety of reasons. First, and most perhaps most importantly, South Carolina and the nation shared this British history. This means that the two histories were (and still are) inseparable. Additionally, South Carolina inconsistently situated and used its ties to Britain. In some cases, the Tricentennial Commission alluded to the shared history in a way that more closely associated South Carolina with Britain than with the United States. When the commission did this, it seemed to divide its present associations from the U.S. by suggesting that the state better appreciated its British past over its American present. However, the commission just as frequently sought to legitimize its celebration by boasting about the state's contributions to American history. In this chapter, I analyze the ways in which the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission used its British ancestry to appeal to national and international audiences, as well as to validate a celebration focused on the past rather than the present.

I argue in this chapter that creating nationalisms or national associations is an appeal to ethos in rhetorics of identity, like the Tricentennial Celebration, that use historical narratives to create arguments about the present. I should clarify, additionally, that an appeal to ethos using relationships with nations is exclusive to rhetorics of identity that seek to identification associated with a region or national, or more broadly speaking, with a place. However, I would concede that other forms of rhetorics of identity less interested in place often engage in creating connections with other entities to benefit from added prestige and credibility. For the purposes of this dissertation, and this chapter, more specifically, I focus on the way politicized places, like regions, exploit relationships with larger and sometimes older entities, such as nations, to defend their effort to carve

out their individual identities and make them relevant (often economically, but sometimes simply socially).

### **Chapter Outline**

Additionally, in this chapter, I outline a particular appeal to pathos, which I briefly described above. Here, I summarize, explore, and analyze how in 1967, the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission exploited its connections with Britain. They did this for a variety of explicit and implicit reasons. They sought to authenticate South Carolina's early history, which formed the foundation of the Tricentennial Celebration, particularly in Charleston. Additionally, the commission documented and appealed to British history and Britain's reputation of gentility and aristocracy. By doing so, I argue that the commission sought to promote relationships with Britain in the present that would associate South Carolina more directly with the aristocracy it sought to cultivate. They did this by courting and inviting members of the British aristocracy and royal family to participate in the Tricentennial Celebrations in Charleston in 1970. However, concurrent with declaring the South Carolina tricentennial a "British celebration" (McNair to Broome 1) and seeking to create national connections with the United Kingdom, the Tricentennial Commission equally invoked American commonplaces to entice tourists and national media coverage. However, these two appeals—one to garner more prestige and one to persuade tourists to visit—were at odds because the Tricentennial Commission courts two different nationalisms. The commission's efforts to promote multiple histories and associations resulted in unpersuasive rhetoric because of the lack of focus and competing ideas of identity.

Furthermore, I claim that the appeal to nationalism via history and prestige is a rhetorical approach unique to rhetorics of identity that involve some kind of historical, archival effort. It is also particular to the defensive nature of rhetorics of identity. Southern rhetorics of identity are unique texts to study for this phenomenon because so much of Southern rhetoric exists in tension with the American national identity. The tension makes them ideal texts to observe and analyze to understand the inherent defensive quality of the rhetorics of identity. This appeal to nationalism, I argue, is a defensive strategy in this genre of rhetoric because it is, quite literally, a defense of an identity's ethos. When the Tricentennial Commission argues that its history is British history (or simultaneously British and American history), it argues that South Carolina is part of larger, important social developments. It defends against claims it perceives that challenge South Carolina's influence and contribution to history. By claiming to be part of past historical accomplishments, the Tricentennial Commission invokes the past as evidence of credibility because it perceives its credibility attacked. In this chapter, I argue that the Tricentennial Commission uses British history and aristocratic pedigree to gentrify its identity, while also appealing to American patriotism and history to make itself a relevant site of tourism. Neither of these appeals is successful, as they create confusion about the purpose of the celebration and who the people of South Carolina are.

### **The Shaftesbury Papers, Proprietary History, and British Identification and the Conflict with American Nationalism**

#### *The Shaftesbury Papers*

The seventeenth century was a benchmark era for the Tricentennial Commission. All the historical records the commission had and could, at the time, access asserted that

the colonists came to what would be called South Carolina from England via Barbados. Several historians—including the academics researching at Clemson and the University of South Carolina, members of the female historian clubs like the South Carolina Historical Society and the local chapters of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and historians by trade—identified primary documents supporting the establishment of the first British colony at Albemarle Pointe in the seventeenth century. These repeated references to eighteenth and nineteenth-century primary sources reveal how the myth of the seventeenth-century British colony formed the foundation of the Tricentennial Celebration for the commission.

*The Shaftesbury Papers* were the most important primary sources that the Tricentennial Commission used to support their focus on the seventeenth century. This collection of seventeenth-century documents details the English colonizing and establishing of South Carolina under the direction of the lords proprietors. The collection is named after one of the proprietors, the Earl of Shaftesbury. Using the *Shaftesbury Papers*, the Tricentennial Commission identified British aristocrats and royalty who descended from the Eight Lords Proprietors to contact to attend the 1970 celebration. According to Charles H. Lesser, a well-known scholar of South Carolina's proprietary history and currently the head archivist at the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, "The core of the materials...is a spectacular cache of manuscripts that Anthony Ashley Cooper (first Earl of Shaftesbury) and John Locke accumulated while Shaftesbury was managing the Carolina Proprietors' affairs and John Locke was secretary to that joint enterprise" (viii). The collection included letters between Shaftesbury, Locke, and other lord proprietors, drafts of constitutions, maps, and other primary sources (viii).

The Earl of Shaftesbury alive for the Tricentennial Celebrations was perhaps the Commission's most important contact. Lord Shaftesbury directly descended from the first Earl of Shaftesbury who was one of the Eight Lord Proprietors who hired British merchants, gentry, and servants to come to the colonies and establish plantations with cash crops. The South Carolina Tricentennial Commission worked tirelessly to woo Lord Shaftesbury to visit South Carolina. Additionally, they pursued relationships with the earl and with the British ambassador to extend invitations to the English monarchy and other descendants of the lords' proprietors to attend the 1970 celebrations.

The commission used *The Shaftesbury Papers* in a variety of ways throughout the celebration's planning phase and more specifically developing Charles Towne Landing. Early in the planning stages for the statewide celebration, the commission used the papers as a thematic start, suggesting that because this was the chronological origin point for the state, then seventeenth-century British history was important data for historical recreation. In his speech to the Tricentennial Commission at their first meeting in 1966, South Carolina Governor Robert E. McNair speaks of the importance of 1670 as South Carolina's year of birth. In the minutes of this first meeting on August 11, 1966, the acting secretary records that "Governor McNair explained that the Commission was established to celebrate the first permanent settlement of South Carolina in 1670 with the idea of continuing other historic events through the present day" (1).

Because the commission intended to celebrate South Carolina history only from the establishment of what they believed to be the first permanent English settlement, then of course, the commission's decision to begin their celebration with a retrospective of seventeenth-century colonist life makes sense. In other words, the commission used *The*

*Shaftesbury Papers* to support their assumption that South Carolina's history began with the English settlers, and then used it as evidence to support their historical preference. However, the commission had some incorrect information. The first British colonists did, indeed, make their temporary settlement on Albemarle Point in 1670, but only before moving to the Oyster Peninsula (current Down Town Charleston) a decade later. Thus, the Old Town/Charles Towne Landing site was never a permanent settlement. Furthermore, archeological evidence would prove that Kiawah had settled at the site long before the English did. Finally, conceding that Old Town was not a permanent settlement but rather a temporary one would call into question the claim that South Carolina's tricentennial year would be 1970. People could argue that it would be in 1980, when the English established Charles Towne. To concede this would allow the tricentennial to follow the nation's bicentennial, which would overshadow this festival.

The decision to elevate Charleston as the focal point of the celebration aided in shifting the scope of the celebration from highlighting three-hundred years of historical achievements and contributions to emphasizing British achievements and contributions. According to the minutes from the September 21, 1966, meeting, "The Chairman expressed the fact that the acquisition of the original site at Old Town [was the] most important and urgent [action]." The commission and chairman, in particular, felt this urgency because the focus on 1670 was the only cogent theme of the celebration's early stage in development, and it would push celebrating South Carolina's tricentennial ahead of the nation's bicentennial.



### *Proprietary History as Racism*

The focus on an Anglo-centric ancestry and heritage resulted in a method to neglect under-represented populations in the celebration. The commission could easily avoid acknowledging African Americans' contributions to South Carolina history as well as more easily (but equally less honestly) sidestep recognizing slavery, the Civil War, and the even the Civil Rights Movement. While slavery existed in the seventeenth century, and the documents from the 1670 voyage from Britain to South Carolina indicate that the colonists brought slaves and indentured servants with them to the new colony, slavery had yet to become a prominent human rights topic for the colonists. Therefore, the commission had little reason to acknowledge it as a problematic historical process. Thus, aligning itself as a British colony with a British heritage seemingly allowed the commission to construct a historical narrative that could ignore racial issues that were causing political and social tension in the United States in 1966.

### *British, Not American, History*

Beyond disconnecting itself neatly from issues of race by emphasizing a pre-American and therefore pre-Civil War history, South Carolina effectively divided itself from America and its national identity as well. I concede that many sites in the United States celebrate America's colonial, pre-nation history. I would argue, however, that the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission asserted to multiple audiences that South Carolina was not celebrating the history of a future U.S. state but rather a British colony. Additionally, I would point out that the commission intended the celebration to restore values from the past in the present; these values, then, could be considered British values, not the values of a state in the U.S. However, South Carolina was inconsistent with its

messages of value and historical perspective. Finally, I would argue that South Carolina's decision to move forward with the Tricentennial Celebration despite strongly worded suggestions to cancel it for the nation's bicentennial demonstrates a desire to promote its own rhetorical identity as sovereign and unique from the nation's (dynamic) identity.

This focus on pre-American history was problematic, in particular, because of the state's ongoing insistence that South Carolina contributed meaningfully to the United States' history and national development. A document titled "South Carolina: America's Oldest New Frontier" in the archives is a proposal written to the 1960s-era popular television show *American Profile*. The proposal requested the program to air an episode about South Carolina concurrent with its tricentennial. The proposal's author, Tricentennial Commission Chairman Thomas O. Lawton, repeatedly uses the words "nation" and "national awareness" as commonplaces in this proposal. He argues, "As one of the original thirteen states, South Carolina contributed greatly to the early years of our nation's history and its vital nationalism" and labels South Carolina "America's oldest frontier" (1). However, in the same paragraph, Lawton notes, "as the mother of the deep South, [South Carolina] led the fight which almost split the nation asunder" and finally "as an emerging leader in the 1960's, South Carolina is leading the way back to an even stronger union with closer federal-state relationship and cooperation" (1). Perhaps in an effort to embrace the theme of three-hundred years of history, Lawton includes an oblique reference to the Civil War. However, the reference to South Carolina's growing and "closer federal-state relationship and cooperation" appeals to a desire for national unity.

The problem with this appeal to the commonplaces of United States' nationalism is simply that the commission also attempted to utilize Britain's ethos to add credibility to the tricentennial project as well. Barely a century after South Carolina fired the first shots of the Civil War and sought—as the Lawton noted in his proposal to *American Profile*—to divide the United States into two nations, the commission is courting two nations and not committing to either. In 1967, however, South Carolina governor Robert McNair writes a response to a letter from William Broome, the executive vice president of Charleston Trident and the Chamber of Commerce. In his letter to Broome on March 21, 1967, McNair says, “It had previously occurred to me that since this is a British celebration we might persuade the Queen or Princess Margaret to come to South Carolina” (1).

It is not unusual for the United States to look to Britain as a cultural forefather. Moreover, Britain's role in American history is undeniable. I am concerned here, however, about two issues. First, when South Carolina governor Robert McNair authorized the commission, he charged it to celebrate *South Carolina's* history, not Britain's. This should and would include some shared history with Britain, but it would not categorize all the history as British. However, in this case, Governor McNair tells Mr. Broome that this is a British celebration. Until this letter, the commissioners only referred to the tricentennial as a state celebration and, sometimes broadly, a national celebration. Granted, Governor McNair seems to hope that calling the Tricentennial Celebration a British celebration might attract Queen Elizabeth II and, I would assume, more tourists; however, this is a major attitudinal and marketing shift with rhetorical implications. Here,

Governor McNair redefines the political associations of the event, disconnecting it from South Carolina and the United States.

Secondly, McNair's authority to label the nature of this celebration cannot go unnoticed here. Governor McNair activated the Tricentennial Commission and their project in 1966 when the state legislator approved funds for a state-wide celebration. McNair additionally spoke at the opening meeting and set the tone for the nature of the commission's work. Additionally, the commission executive committee and state residents, such as Mr. Broome, often consulted and advised McNair about the tricentennial project. He frequently received letters of praise or complaint, both from commission members and his voting public. Although he was not a member of the Tricentennial Commission, Governor McNair was clearly an important political and social figure for them. Therefore, his assertion a year and half into the project that it was "a British celebration" rather than an American or a state festival opposes the competing rhetoric that this is an American festival—or even a state event. In other words, he denies any American nationalism connected with this endeavor, which also undermines any state efforts, as states are political entities incorporated into the national identity. McNair's focus on the British—like many of the parties interested in the Tricentennial Celebration—seems to believe that the British connection would bolster the commission and the state's ethos.

The commission's simultaneous appeals to British and American identities suggest a need to gain credibility from external sources because the internal, localized ethos is potentially unappealing. More importantly, however, it reveals that the state had little, if any, confidence in its own authority and prestige. Of course, there are very real

reasons for this. In *The Real South*, Scott Romine asserts, “efforts to locate culture turn out to *dislocate* it from the here and now—that is, to defer its imagined ‘true’ or ‘authentic’ existence to some nostalgic past or utopian future” (3). In other words, Romine, like many other cultural theorists, notes that culture often operates much like the scientific Uncertainty Principle: once we try to identify culture, we lose it. Often, this loss of culture occurs when social theorists seek to label a culture, for instance, identifying “the South” or “America.” But we see this happen in a more practical way here as South Carolina sought to identify itself with a culture it saw more prestigious. As it did this, seeking the history of Britain on one hand and on the other the adventurous spirit of America, it lost itself.

In the case of the Tricentennial Celebration, the commission perceived Britain’s past as utopian and worthy of nostalgia. This emphasis of nostalgia for a British past suggests that the Tricentennial Commission had a different idea of Southern identity than ones previously examined by other scholars and posited by other Southern states. Its silence about the Confederacy seems an implicit acknowledgment that previous ways of mythologizing the past were not accessible because they could not be perceived with nostalgia, or desire for the past. Furthermore, I argue that this focus on a pre-South Carolina, pre-American history and nostalgia is more than a marketing ploy. It focuses the public’s attention on positive elements of the state’s past. I read this as a defensive strategy, one that foregrounds a positive history and allows room for the British to be positioned as those responsible for South Carolina’s trajectory toward the present.

However, I would also point out that this is a different perspective of Southern identity than many Southern states construct<sup>5</sup>. Rather than construct a history isolated from the United States or global narratives, the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission actively seeks to foster relationships that suggest a more metropolitan identity. The commission seems to project an image of a state interested in joining national and international communities. In this case, British history and British relationships in 1966 symbolize South Carolina's international connections. The need to point this out and to manifest these connections by bringing in high-profile members of the royal family suggests that the relationships needed evidence of their existence, in part because they did not exist.

### *Hybrid Nationalisms*

Several archived documents reveal the ineffectiveness of the Tricentennial Commission's marketing of both British history and its contribution to American history. In a letter written May 8, 1969, to James Barnett<sup>6</sup>, I. Noel Hume, the director of the Department of Archeology at Colonial Williamsburg in Virginia, reveals that the marketing of the tricentennial is simply ineffective because it seems to compete with the imminent celebration of the nation's bicentennial. In a letter full of recommendations for how to develop Charles Towne Landing and how to handle archeological findings, or the lack thereof, Hume tells Barnett, "I think that it is much more realistic at this stage [May 1969] to be thinking of the Bicentenary of the United States rather than the Tercentenary

---

<sup>5</sup> New Orleans comes to mind as a notable exception.

<sup>6</sup> A member of the executive committee of the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission.

of South Carolina” (4). With the bicentennial anniversary looming a mere seven years in the future, Hume suggests that the focus shift from a very local celebration to a national celebration. In some ways, this advice would help support Lawton’s claim in his proposal to *American Profile* that South Carolina was seeking a stronger relationship with the nation. Furthermore, in terms of practical concerns, Hume’s advice takes into consideration that the opening for South Carolina’s tricentennial celebration is less than a year away, yet the Commission is still determining how best to construct its historical sites, namely its cornerstone park Charles Towne Landing. Time is running out for a successful, cohesive tricentennial, but if the commission would yoke the exhibition site in Charleston with the national bicentenary, then they would have seven more years to work through the issues and controversies looming over the current construction.

Not only does Hume suggest that the commission forego their plans for the tricentennial for the bicentenary, but he also seems confused by the excessive focus on the seventeenth century. After suggesting that the commission work cooperatively with the federal planning for the bicentennial, Hume asserts, “for that reason I would urge the inclusion of work on eighteenth century house sites during the next two or three years so that sufficient evidence can be gathered for a typical and well documented eighteenth-century house to be erected in time for the bicentenary” (4). Hume completely dismisses the British connection to the seventeenth century. He suggests here that if the park is supposed to gesture toward South Carolina’s contributions to American history, then it should foreground American history and the significance of the eighteenth century. Hume’s attention to the eighteenth century underscores his embrace of a nationalist approach to identity and to public memory, since the United States became a sovereign

nation during this century. It seems as though the commission's reasons for privileging seventeenth-century history and reenactment are not persuasive to Hume, because they do not recall American history to him but rather pre-American, proprietary history.

According to Hume, the commission's emphasis on seventeenth-century colonial history is irrelevant when taken in consideration with the nation's bicentennial. Later in the same letter, he explains that he abandoned a particular seventeenth-century project associated with South Carolina's tricentennial because he sees it as a less important pursuit because the research is of a pre-American past and does not complement the research efforts to help the bicentennial. He explains, "the time left between now and the bicentenary is already limited and therefore a study of the eighteenth and nineteenth-century sites would have greater relevance—providing that the seventeenth century can be represented by the fort and part of the township" (5). Hume clearly states that his own archeological and historical projects are motivated by their relevance to the bicentennial. His repetition of the bicentenary's importance indicates his strong feelings that not only should the commission and its researchers do the same but also that their current course of action is trivial. The only way the exhibition site can be relevant to Hume is for it to be incorporated with the bicentennial and cease its relevance as a state celebration. In this way, the rhetoric of identity that the commission forwards not only is unsuccessful but comes under direct attack from a federal position.

Additionally, Hume's focus on the bicentennial reflects the confusion many whom the commission approached to market the tricentennial expressed. In a letter dated April 5, 1969 to Thomas Lawton, Alderman Duncan, the president of Southern Publishers, Incorporated, reports to the chairman about his trip to New York City.



Duncan met with Al McNeely of Withers, Carsen & McNeely, “where we had pre-arranged interviews and conferences with a number of top magazine editors and writers” concerning the South Carolina tricentennial. Duncan notes, “Practically all of them expressed much interest in our plans and I believe we will get good help from them” (1). However, he and the publicist seem to fumble with using appropriately persuasive terminology to promote the celebration. He tells Lawton:

The matter of the name “South Carolina 300<sup>th</sup>” came up considerably in New York. The Moynahan people<sup>7</sup> have been trying it out cautiously on editors and they report that the reaction has been rather cold. The consensus seems to be that while the name “South Carolina Tricentennial” admittedly may not carry all the desired punch this most probably is the best and most descriptive name that can be had. It is self-explanatory and readily understandable whereas the question “300<sup>th</sup> what?” inevitably arises when “South Carolina 300<sup>th</sup>” is used....Most everyone we talked with seemed to think it should be “South Carolina Tricentennial” with a sub-title such as “300 Years of History” or “Festival of History”....I am convinced “South Carolina 300<sup>th</sup>” will be a bust public relations and publicity wise. (Duncan 2)

This exchange from Duncan reveals the extent to which the marketing approaches for the tricentennial had failed to generate attention. Most interesting here is Duncan’s discussion about the slogan for the celebration and the confusion it caused. At the

---

<sup>7</sup> This is another public relations firm the commission had retained.

beginning of the project's planning, the commission feared that South Carolina went unnoticed by much of the nation, and they worked to change that by hiring public relations firms on the East Coast, by courting British aristocracy, and by seeking media attention. The confusion Duncan notes—that the slogan “South Carolina 300<sup>th</sup>” causes the audience to think, ““300<sup>th</sup> what?””—indicates how their attempt to court national attention by invoking history and patriotism failed to create notice. Discussions about marketing are fruitful texts for rhetorical analysis because they are concerned with persuasion. In this case, the Tricentennial Commission's poor marketing draws attention to its misunderstanding of its audience. The “cold” reception to various slogans suggests that the commission's lack of focus and poorly constructed appeals to a national focus resulted in nominal public attention. Ultimately, they proved their own worse fear true by making themselves irrelevant through historical evidence rather than present concerns.

I argue that the failure here to construct a unique state identity (or to tap into the common topic of “The South” as an identifying feature) results from and is also a feature of the defensive nature of rhetorics of identity. This detachment from or ambivalence towards America nationalism is probably a unique feature of Southern rhetoric and identity, but it highlights ways in which rhetorics of identity often defend themselves against what they see as competing rhetorics (nationalism, here) or oppressive rhetorics. The problem, here, is that when rhetor (in this case, the commission) perceives himself as a defendant, he needs allies. He needs defenders, character references, and evidence to support his counter-arguments against his opponents. In rhetorics of identity, this can exhibit itself in seeking to create patriotic alliances. Thus, in seeking to create historical connections with Britain, the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission attempted to

distract its audience from controversies that they felt they were fighting against—racism, sexism, et cetera—and focus it instead on a distinguished local past and satisfy itself by courting state residents rather than national and international tourists.

### **Courting the Earl of Shaftesbury the Queen of England: Making South Carolina a British Colony in the Twentieth Century**

Despite the lack of thematic and cohesive direction for the tricentennial celebration, commissioners make clear in their correspondence a desire to create a positive image of South Carolina. One way they attempted to do this was by aligning South Carolina's early history with Britain's history as an expanding empire. They did this specifically by emphasizing South Carolina's history as a colony in the seventeenth century by contacting the descendants of the British aristocracy that helped establish the colony. In fact, they contacted these descendants before they even purchased the Old Town property from Doctor Waring.

As early as 1967, in its second year of planning for the opening in 1970, the Tricentennial Commission contacted the Earl of Shaftesbury to cultivate a relationship for the celebration three years later. They focused less on a friendly relationship and more on creating a direct connection between the prestige of his ancestry and South Carolina's value. Creating this connection included passing a resolution through the state legislature to recognize the earl as an honorary citizen of South Carolina. In a letter to the earl dated February 6, 1967, Tricentennial Commission chairman Thomas Lawton writes,

I am pleased to enclose the corrected Concurrent Resolution of the  
General Assembly of the State of South Carolina declaring that you and  
Lady Shaftesbury are Honorary Citizens of the State of South Carolina

and Honorary Members of the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission.  
This Resolution is signed by His Excellency, Governor Robert E. McNair;  
Lieutenant Governor John C. West; and Solomon Blatt, Speaker of the  
House of Representatives, and is affixed with the great seal of the state.  
The Tricentennial Commission is very grateful to our Vice Chairman,  
Joseph H. McGee, Jr., who sponsored the introduction of the resolution.  
(n. pag.)

The Tricentennial Commission bestowed Lord Shaftesbury with an honorary citizenship before they purchased any land for the exhibit sites. The Tricentennial Commission's prioritizing of making British connections and yoking South Carolina more with British than with American history—at least in the early planning phases—indicates an attempt to diminish the state's heritage from the United States history and present. Furthermore, this identification with Britain could distract critics from the negative press surrounding the South because it could draw positive attention.

The carnival of public attention given to the earl and his wife was only form of distraction; a lineage of gentility for white South Carolinians to claim as their own was another. The bill drafted by the South Carolina state legislature that grants the earl and his wife their honorary citizenship makes this heritage of aristocracy explicit<sup>8</sup>. The resolution asserts "it is appropriate and fitting that a descendent of one of the founding Lords Proprietors of the Carolinas inaugurate the planning and preparation for so momentous and historic occasion" ("Concurrent Resolution" 1). It is striking here that the writers of

---

<sup>8</sup> The "Concurrent Resolution" notes that "Messrs. McGee, Medlock, Craven, Dangerfield, Grice, Guerard, Harnett, Krawcheck, LeaMond, Scarborough, Abney A. Smith and Turner" introduced the resolution (1).

the resolution—several commission members—credit the earl with inaugurating the “planning and preparation” for the celebration. While the resolution honors the earl’s ancestor whose actions help to found Charleston and the Carolinas, it also grants the British more honor than the United States and, even more importantly, the state. This statement also minimizes the work of so many South Carolinians who brought the celebration into fruition.

While redirecting credit from South Carolina residents to the Earl of Shaftesbury and his ancestor may seem an extreme and unexpected action, more surprising is connecting South Carolina’s state pride not in its own history but in the earl’s history. Later in the resolution, the commissioners write,

all South Carolinians take profound pride in this State’s long tale of glorious achievement commencing with the year 1669 when [the lords proprietors sent British ships to South Carolina to establish a colony and British government there] but in nothing do Carolinians feel more justifiable pride than in the broad and liberal principles on which the first Earl of Shaftesbury insisted that the province should be established.

(“Concurrent Resolution” 1)

That the lords’ proprietors sent colonists to the Carolinas to manage and cultivate property is undeniable. However, the epideictic rhetoric here that admires the Earl not so much for commissioning merchants and agrarians to come to South Carolina but rather for bestowing upon the land and its future residents British values of “broad and liberal principles.” So much of the ceremonial language here privileges cultural values over the

concrete facts that a colony was established to bring the lords proprietors more money and to benefit the already wealthy British aristocracy.

The focus here on British values that continue to influence South Carolina permeates the resolution, most importantly in mentioning the constitution that the first Earl of Shaftesbury sent with his hired settlers. The writers continue to praise the first earl, declaring, “South Carolina is forever in the debt of the first Earl of Shaftesbury who entrusted the philosopher John Locke, with the task of drawing up a constitution for the province based on liberty and tolerance and which unto this time remains the guiding principle and established rule of the people of South Carolina” (Concurrent Resolution 1). The reference to the principles in Locke’s constitution that “[remain] the guiding principle and established rule of the people of South Carolina” links the state’s current social and ethical values to those that the British brought three centuries earlier. More importantly, it associates the present state of South Carolina with the current moral state of the tenth Earl of Shaftesbury. In other words, South Carolina in 1967 is still as much influenced by the British aristocracy as it was in 1670 when the settlers landed and established the colony.

It is important to note here the Anglo-centrism of the language. Superficially, it is obvious that a legislative resolution honoring a British earl would celebrate England and its history. However, what is remarkable here is the general language that declares all South Carolinians proud of the first earl’s work and therefore indebted to both earls’ legacies. This language neglects minority populations in South Carolina whose ancestors the British historically oppressed, particularly the Kiawah and other Native American tribes living in South Carolina in the seventeenth century as well as the African slaves

transported from England and later Barbados to the American colony. This language about South Carolina pride excludes minority voices that may oppose the insistence of such a sentiment.

Furthermore, the language excludes the working-class colonists who executed the work the proprietors sent them to do. According to records compiled and published by commission researcher Agnes Baldwin, the majority of the colonists were planters, servants, and tradesmen, along with lesser-titled gentlemen and esquires (“First Settlers of South Carolina 1670-1680” 1-2). The majority of the original colonists were not aristocrats. Instead, some had either purchased or been given nominal titles in exchange for coming to the colony (Baldwin 2). Others came to the colony for employment. These are the men and women, along with the slaves and Native Americans, who built and founded South Carolina. However, the classist language elevates the aristocracy as the founder, an aristocrat who never set foot on the land that would be called South Carolina nor traversed the rivers named after him, the Ashley and the Cooper Rivers. The privileging of the elite British class, however, is consistent with the commission’s efforts to associate Britain’s reputation and prestige with South Carolina’s.

Perhaps most interesting is the press release published on January 2, 1967, by W. Russell Campbell, the manager of the Public Relations Department of Charleston Trident Chamber of Commerce about the earl’s visit to South Carolina and his honorary citizenship. The press release explains briefly that the first Earl of Shaftesbury became an earl only after his employees settled in Charles Towne: “Lord Shaftesbury is the tenth Earl of Shaftesbury, a title created in 1672—two years after the English established the first permanent settlement in South Carolina at Charleston” (Campbell 30). The Earl of

Shaftesbury, whom the commission praises in the resolution, became an earl only after he essentially purchased the title from King Charles II of England upon the successful establishment of a colony. In other words, the earl did not inherit his title but earned it. Thus, the gentility that the commission craved to bestow upon its state was one earned and bought rather than inherited from centuries of aristocratic birth. This legacy, then, is not quite what they represent it to be. The title is one that that was purchased, and it was bought relatively late in British history. This earl is not one whose rank would be highly esteemed in Britain, because his status was new. The prestige, then, is not one that was genuinely aristocratic.

This courtship of Lord Ashley Cooper, the Earl of Shaftesbury, served an additional purpose. Bringing the tenth Earl of Shaftesbury to South Carolina to celebrate its tricentennial was not the only plan. The commission intended to use the earl to open the lines of communication with the British monarchy. F. William Broome suggests to Governor McNair that South Carolina needs the monarchy to properly celebrate its three-hundredth anniversary, and explains,

When you are in the company of the Ambassador, it may be possible for you to request his cooperation in a venture which would assist South Carolina in observing properly its Tricentennial in 1970. During the past two years, several contacts have been made through the British Consulate General, Mr. T. C. Sharman, and in turn to the Ambassador's office in an attempt to have Prince Charles visit South Carolina during the Centennial year. We have been informed recently that the Prince will be in college or in the military at that time. This being the case, it may be



possible for us to then proceed to extend an official invitation to Her Majesty, the Queen, and other members of the Royal Family to visit Charleston in 1970. (1)

According to Broome, South Carolina's connections with its British past are so strong that they should be honored with the presence of the royal family. This is particularly interesting because, by this point in the planning of the celebration, they had not invited the President of the United States, past or present, to participate in the celebration. The exclusion of the president from the ceremonies and the invitation to the prince or queen of England reveal how much South Carolina sought to divide itself from the United States, no matter the commission's claims to want to improve state relationships with the federal government.

The commission and public relations representatives hoped that the positive connection between the state and the current Lord Ashley Cooper, the Earl of Shaftesbury, would provide them access to the monarchy. Broome makes this clear in his letter to McNair:

Although the Earl of Shaftesbury has told us that he would encourage the Queen to visit South Carolina during the Tricentennial, and we understand that she was his house guest recently, the Ambassador's office in Washington has not been too enthusiastic about our proposal to bring Prince Charles here. Since you and the Ambassador will be spending some time together, we are suggesting that you may wish to make a bid for his cooperation when we extend an official invitation to Her Majesty

sometime this year. I trust that this is not asking too much of you for the proper observance of the great Tricentennial year. (1)

The way Broome discuss two political figures—the earl and the British ambassador—reveals how much he esteems not so much the earl as his position as an aristocrat. His hope that the earl will convince a member of the British royal family to attend South Carolina’s opening celebrations for the tricentennial suggests his value for aristocrats exceeds that for American politicians and public figures. In some ways, this esteem gestures towards how many of the commissioners and their associates did not understand the nuanced interactions between British politicians and the monarchy. The devaluing of politicians coupled with the privileging of an aristocratic signal an old world hierarchy that did not exist any longer in 1967 in America.

A great deal of correspondence among the commissioners, the governor, and other elected leaders with the earl focus on his efforts to persuade the royal family to attend the impending celebrations. The earl responds to a letter from Charleston city mayor J. Palmer Gaillard, Jr. The earl’s response makes it clear that the “[p]lans for the Tricentennial Opening, April 1970” that Gaillard sent were a small part of the communication. After expressing excitement for the plans in the first sentence, the earl immediately turns his attention to addressing questions regarding the monarchy. He writes, “I had already been in contact with Buckingham Palace over the question we discussed when I was in Charleston during 1967” (Cooper 1). This letter, written nearly two full years after the earl’s visit to South Carolina to inaugurate the tricentennial plans and to receive his honorary citizenship, acknowledges his recognition that once connected with the project, he bore the responsibility to extend his influence. He

continues, “Having received your letter I pressed the point further, and have had an unfavourable reply from Squadron-Leader David Checketts, who was appointed Equerry to Prince Charles” (Cooper 1). His “[pressing] the point further” discloses that he had been initially met with rejection. However, more interestingly, his references to contacting Buckingham Palace and interacting with Squadron-Leader David Checketts rather than the queen or the prince reveals that the earl does not have as much contact or influence with the monarchy as the commission seemed to expect. As with their dismissal of the British ambassador, it is clear that the commission does not understand how British politics work or how unimportant many aristocratic titles are.

The earl seems to try to educate the commission about his limitations. While he admits that he is “extremely sorry that I have been unable to assist the Tricentennial Committee better,” he “strongly advise[s] against making further approaches to the Royal Family owing to the impossibility of either Her Majesty the Queen, or the Prince of Wales, being available” (Cooper 1). Lord Shaftesbury seems aware that the commission is using him to appeal to the royal family. His caution in this case, particularly his assertion that no member of the family will be available and that, in fact, such availability is impossible, not only urges the commission to cease their attempts to address the queen but also suggests that the commission’s belief of the importance of their celebration and South Carolina’s connection with the British is imagined.

Despite the earl’s advice, Lawton writes to Charleston mayor J. Palmer Gaillard on January 17, 1969, that the earl’s report that “the outlook of our having a royal visitor from England seems so unfavorable at this point” disappoints him (1). Despite the earl’s communication to Mayor Gaillard that communicates certainty that the monarchs will not

accept the invitation to South Carolina, Lawton persists: “Do you think that Shaftesbury should be contacted when he is in New York...? It might not be a bad idea to keep in touch with him at this point” (1). This discussion between Lawton and Gaillard describes a rather utilitarian relationship with the earl. In the letter, Lawton suggests that they continue to employ the earl as a means of approaching the queen. He persists in his argument that the earl’s status with the queen will compel her to accept the South Carolina event as important to British state affairs and, therefore, honor it with her presence.

The commission perceived a strong British presence crucial and even compulsory to the atmosphere of their celebration. Their refusal to accept Buckingham Palace’s rejection of their invitation indicates two important qualities: first, a confidence in the strength of the state’s relationship with the British, and secondly, a successful effort at identification. However, the queen’s repeated rejection reveals that identification was not achieved, perhaps because of the reality of the situation. South Carolina, despite its claims, is part of the United States and not Britain. South Carolina and the United Kingdom identify only in terms of their briefly shared history, which only the Earl of Shaftesbury seems to recognize. Unlike the royal family, which has no reason to identify with South Carolinians as a community, the Earl of Shaftesbury seems to perceive a relationship there, perhaps because he was granted his title because of his ancestor’s work to establish the state when it was a British colony.

Furthermore, his relationship—at least at the point when the state bestowed him honorary citizenship—was mutually beneficial. Just as the commission perceived its relationship with the earl and his presence at the celebration as means of elevating the

state and the tricentennial's status, their honoring of him is equally flattering. Thus, they identify only in so far as they flatter and benefit each other. Once these benefits wane, the relationship is strained. When the earl explains that he cannot help them any more with the royal family, identification is threatened because he seems not to provide additional benefits. Additionally, it creates an imbalance, which threatens identification: while the state continues to seek further benefits from their relationship with him, it has little to give him in return. His refusal to help is both practical but also an attempt to restore the balance in the relationship by restoring the relationship to one between individuals rather than between political entities. However, the commission's insistence to continue to use him to pursue the royal family reveals that identification has, indeed, been broken because they no longer share goals.

The South Carolina Tricentennial Commission's insistence of attracting the royal family's presence seems more than a desire to amplify the event's publicity. Lawton and Mayor Gaillard's correspondence on the matter reveals a desire to save face. Winning the royal family's attention would have created better ways to publicize the celebration; it would also silence the marketing critics in New York. The royal family's presence would also silence the South Carolina residents who were already writing letters to various commissioners to complain about the celebration's expense. Finally, it would have proven to the nation and to the commission South Carolina's worthiness. The appeals to the earl and via the earl to the royal family are strategies to promote and defend an image in which the commission believed: South Carolina was a state with laudable ties to prestigious public figures, and that these ties were indicative of its character. But that character as a positive contributor to history had come under attack, so it was not

necessarily a widely believed truth. The commission needed proof to defend this character. In this way the use of a British lineage transcended the rhetoric of marketing.

### **Negotiating Nationalisms: Integrating the South into the National Identity**

The relationship between British aristocrats and South Carolina reveals the tenuous negotiations between political bodies seeking to identify with each other and the importance of shared goals in identification. Rhetorics of identity often seek identification with other political bodies to elevate their status. However, for identification to be successful, both parties must share goals and benefit from the relationship. The imbalance in the relationship—that South Carolina will benefit more in publicity, economically, and socially from the relationship—only serves to reveal how rhetors using arguments about identity exploit other parties as a way to defend their claims of prestige and against claims that seem to diminish that prestige. The negotiation of power between these political entities threatens the attempt to bolster South Carolina's claims of importance.

In her book *Contemporary Southern Identity*, Rebecca Watts points out that, perhaps unjustly, Southern states often perceived themselves as victims of both the post-Civil War reconstruction and later the Civil Rights Movement in the 1960s. According to Watts, this identity of victimization and segregation created a system of order that identified the South against the rest of the nation (9). Watts points out that the South was mired in a history of segregation and division that would continue even after it had been re-assimilated into the union (9). She argues that the southern states ordered their way of life in terms of division, noting that “[f]irst through slavery and then through segregation,

Southern leaders sought order by creating and maintaining divisions among the South's people—principally according to race but also according to gender and socioeconomic status and often through some combination of these factors” (9-10). However, it is clear by the mid-twentieth century that although the South would never again be its own nation, it still sought ways to identify itself as its own political and social entity by seeking order through division from the United States, and I argue that much of the efforts of memorializing and commemoration of the South's history were not so much to celebrate history as to create identification through the defensive rhetoric of identity through division.

However, memorializing based on history is predicated on a common belief in truth or facts. In *Identity's Strategies: Rhetorical Selves in Conversion*, Dana Anderson posits that “identity...also names that which we regard as true about ourselves” (10). For Anderson, “truth function” (10) is an important feature of rhetorical identity, because “when people have something they thus regard as true *about* themselves, they also have something they can be—and are often expected to be—more or less true to” (11, emphasis his). Anderson asserts that the extent to which a truth of self-description is internalized affects a person's performance. A highly internalized truth is enacted because not enacting it would run counter to who a person is and who she expects to be.

Although I find some parts of Anderson's use of truth and performance problematic, I still find it a compelling description of identification as a process and strategy. In this chapter and dissertation, I am concerned with various experiences that construct and disseminate rhetorical identities. The Tricentennial Commission's activities to associate the state with Britain are a performance of that identification. First, they have

believed in the truth of that association. Their work with the Earl, including the resolution to grant him and his wife honorary citizenship, are performances influenced by this belief. However, they are also performances inviting consubstantiation. They persist in seeking a public relationship because they believe so strongly in its existence.

Truth, in this case, is relative, which Anderson does not address. David Goldfield notes that the processes leading up to memorials in the South are interpretations of culture internalized as truth. He argues that during the 1960s, Southern whites “interpreted the changes in landscape, museums, textbooks, and public discourse as a threat to their identity as Southerners” (31). The commission worked during this time of perceived threats to defend and legitimize their ways of life. I would argue that the manipulation of discourse and relationship with the British is an enactment of this internalized belief in their threatened existence and attempt to reify it.

When discussing rhetorical collective identity, I argue that rhetoricians must pay attention to the truth, or *doxa*, that the agents seek to embed in the cultural ideology that shapes commemoration and public memory. If *doxa* were generally accepted, it would not need to be manifested and defended by something like the Tricentennial Celebration, because it could be remembered without public performances and materials. I argue that these acts of historicizing ideology and memory, then, are defensive, because they seek to preserve something an agent perceives as threatened.

## **Conclusion**

The Tricentennial Commission’s creation of associations with the British suggests that the commission perceived a variety of attacks on its state’s image. By seeking to



focus on a history of heroic discovery (the colonization of South Carolina), the commission sought to counter claims to the contrary. I would argue that by yoking itself to Britain as a colony, the commission implied—albeit most likely unconsciously—a lack of agency; this kind of association suggested that South Carolina was simply a passive recipient of Britain’s decisions. On the other hand, this use of a British legacy also redirects attention to pomp and circumstance instead of less attractive legacies that were already well known. This, I argue, is a defensive strategy that anticipates criticism and seeks to nullify it.

I argue that the commission’s courtship of the British descendants of the lord proprietors and the monarchy was a way to identify a division between the state and the nation. This is particularly poignant as South Carolina, like most of the southern states, had come under attack by Civil Rights activists because of its unfair and discriminatory practices against African-Americans. The Tricentennial Commission used their connection to other histories—British history, United States history—to make themselves more relevant. The problem here is that they built the character of South Carolina on the reputations and accomplishments of other political entities. In his book *Rhetorical Landscapes in America: Variations on a Theme from Kenneth Burke*, Gregory Clark argues “that the experience of touring the American homeland has much to do with the public rhetorical project of constituting in diverse and divergent individuals a shared sense of national identity” (147). If this assertion is true, if tourism of public landscapes helps individuals constitute their national identity, then the Charles Towne Landing project reveals the flaw when the rhetorician attempts to constitute more than one national identity. Tourists cannot shape a cohesive national identity if they are asked to

form relationships with multiple nations, which the commission compelled them to do by claiming to reenact and memorialize both British and American histories.

## **Chapter Four: Scapegoating Academia, The “Problem” of the Kiawah in Charles Towne Landing, and the Threat of a Pre-European History through Archeological and Historical Research**

The South Carolina Tricentennial Commission relied on archeology to validate the claims that South Carolina was a state of national importance. This validation was intended to be a persuasive force in the rhetoric of identification, to make the past a uniting event of consubstantiation; this recognition of consubstantiation would then lead to support (financially or through services) for the Tricentennial project. Therefore, the commissioners perceived research as a supportive tool rather than an independent device. However, the relationship between the commission and its contracted archeologists, Doctor Robert Stephenson and Stanley South, was often tenuous. The commission’s manipulated and redirected the archeologists’ research priorities; when the commission believed that they research team was not supporting the commission’s goal, it would attack the two men and their student workers. This relationship indicates that the commission viewed academic research as a tool to support the efforts toward identification.

The commissioners, particularly James Barnett, and the advisory committee for the Charles Towne Landing site employed research as an appeal to logos: evidence to validate their claims. It additionally served as an appeal to ethos, to build the credibility of their claims, seemingly to outsiders, as one might assume that self-identified “South Carolinians” would not question the state’s historical importance nationally. The commissioners and designers actively sought corroborating evidence for claims that Old

Town had been a permanent and flourishing settlement; however, they ignored evidence and attacked the archeologists and employees who found historical evidence that contradicted the commission's claims about Old Town.

Using research as a persuasive strategy in the rhetoric of identity further illuminates the defensive nature of identity discourses that remember history and that can be both read or performed and experienced. In rhetorics of identity drawing on history, archeological, anthropological, and archival research are often crucial activities in reconstructing the historical past. Based on my study of Charles Towne Landing, this is, in part, because research becomes an investigation for threads that support a pre-constructed narrative. Rather than using research to discover better authenticated narratives, rhetors who use historical research rhetorically often seek to create a pre-determined historical memory, even when the veracity and validity of that narrative are tenable at best, untrue at worst. When research unveils a more complicated historical narrative, one that may even contradict the current public memory of identity, then research and researchers become threats to the cause.

Additionally, the effort to use research to support claims of public memory is more than engaging in responsible methods of historical construction. In these cases, research is intended to uncover evidence to defend the memory and historical perspective in which the community already believes. It is a defense of a memory and an ideology. When identity discourses rely on research to corroborate their claims, they acknowledge implicitly the opposition's position. However, researchers often face becoming the opposition when they prioritize scholarly integrity before the identity construction. Historical researchers and their activities, therefore, have important and tenuous roles in

the ongoing rhetoric of identity that shed light on how important historical evidence is to authenticating an identity through historical artifacts.

## **Chapter Outline**

In this chapter, I further develop my theory about the implicit defensiveness of rhetoric of identity by showing the important role of scapegoating. Using Kenneth Burke's theory about the dialect of scapegoating from *A Rhetoric of Motives*, I argue that scapegoating is not simply a possible strategy in identification but rather is essential to identification. Thus, the rhetors constructing identity and seeking a rhetoric toward identification must also identify a viable scapegoat. The scapegoat does not have to be an obvious outsider, but can be someone whose goals seem to conflict or not align with the work to act together that marks consubstantiation and identification. In other words, the scapegoat can be an insider who comes into conflict with the others of the in-group. The scapegoat not only receives blame for any perceived threats against the identification (anti-identity, or division, as Burke would call them), but also create identification by providing the rhetor *and* the audience a target against which to construct the identity. I will argue that without a scapegoat, the efforts toward identification are fruitless.

To argue my point, I return to the case of Tricentennial Commission and Charles Towne Landing. I look specifically at the years 1968 through 1969. During these two years, the Tricentennial Commission contracted Dr. Robert Stephenson from the University of South Carolina's Department of Archeology and Anthropology to excavate the Old Town site. According to correspondence among Stephenson, James Barnett, and Thomas Lawton, all parties agreed that Stephenson's work was intended to uncover the

original settlement site at Old Town, including the palisades. After this, the commission would instruct architects and dramatists to reconstruct the settlement site. The problem, however, is that Stephenson and his colleague, Stanley South, found little evidence of the British settlement by 1968. The Tricentennial Commission seemed to rely on evidence of the palisades and some historical documentation that the original colonists of South Carolina landed at Old Town. The Commission and even Stephenson, early on, believed that this site was a permanent settlement and therefore indicative of South Carolina's progressive work toward establishing the New World as the United States. Stephenson's archeological excavation from November 1968 through the middle of 1969 uncovered contradictory evidence.

When Stephenson and South asked for more time to research their discovery of the Great House from an extinct Kiawah tribe, the Commission and its public supporters in the media immediately pulled their support from them. Stephenson and South had also suggested that the Commission move their space-age pavilion away from the its proposed site—where Stephenson and South discovered the Great House remains—to another location so that the Kiawah artifacts could be recovered, preserved, and displayed as part of the Charles Towne Landing exhibition. After these requests, the Commission privately and the media publically attacked the researchers, claiming that Stephenson and South valued their own research priorities over the State's. While the Commission could not leverage “anti-South” claims toward Stephenson and South, they could, however, claim that the prioritization of scholarship over the Commission threatened the Tricentennial Celebration's time schedule, evidence, they would argue, that the archeologists did not care about the celebration and worked for the Commission for their own gains.

I argue that this support and then attack on the historical researchers suggests an important role for scapegoats in the rhetoric of identity. Without scapegoats, the audience can and will notice the fallacies and flaws in the rhetoric of identity. Because of this notice, the rhetor has more difficulty achieving identification, or persuasion, in other words, of shared substance and goals. The scapegoat detracts from any failures in the process of identity construction, making identification more easily achieved.

### **Researchers' Roles in the Rhetoric of Identity: Archeologists and Dramatists as the Supporting Cast in the Drama of the South Carolina Tricentennial**

The plans for Charles Towne Landing provided exciting research opportunities for historians and archeologists in South Carolina. In a letter dated September 25, 1968, to James Barnett, Doctor Robert L. Stephenson, the Director of the University of South Carolina's Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, praised the Tricentennial Commission for allowing him to work on the project: "It has been a most rewarding experience to me to have become involved with the activities of the Tricentennial Commission and its activities at Old Town Plantation. I look forward to working closely with you on this project through its development, particularly as this relates to the archaeological aspects of Old Town Plantation" (1). Stephenson expresses his excitement for taking on this project, particularly because of the opportunity to conduct archeological research at Old Town. For Stephenson at this point in the project, it seems clear that he sees this as a scholarly endeavor and does not note in this letter concerns about his academic integrity. He seems to speak of himself as a partner in the project, using phrases like "working closely with you" to suggest a mutually beneficial collaboration.

Stephenson seems to expect a partnership in which he gains “exciting” research experience and the commission gains archeological evidence for “its development.” His expectation indicates that he acknowledges that his research is a tool for the commission. It also suggests that the research will help to develop *an aspect of* the identity under discussion. In fact, the publicity of the research suggests that this was an aspect of the identity that the commission intended to promote in its ongoing efforts toward identification. Barbara Williams, a staff reporter for *The News & Courier*, contributed to this publicity with her article “Old Town Dirt Rich with Relics” on July 26, 1969. This article covers the majority of page 1-B and includes multiple photographs of archeological dig sites at Old Town/Charles Towne Landing. Williams describes Old Town as “the cradle of South Carolina’s civilization” (“Relics” 1-B). She uses glowing language to describe the archeologists’ work. Furthermore, the number of pictures included in the article—nearly all pairing people with archeological discoveries—demonstrates the researchers’ entertainment value in Charleston.

For Stephenson, an academic and well-known archeologist in South Carolina at this time, research is fundamental to his individual identity. It is his career, his profession. By being asked to join the Tricentennial Commission’s project, he seems to presuppose that research is an important component of discovery. This would suggest that Stephenson assumes that research and the academy are essential activities of memory construction that would happen in the reconstruction of the site. Furthermore, it illustrates Stephenson’s (and vis a vis Stephenson, the academic community’s) recognition of a shared identity.



Recognition of sameness is crucial to the process of identification. In *A Rhetoric of Motives*, Burke explains that “To identify A with B is to make A ‘consubstantial’ with B” (21). According to Burke, identity hinges on the co-recognition of shared substance or essence of being. As far as sameness is shared, then multiple entities can identify with each other. Sameness, in this case, seems to be shared goals. These shared goals are consubstantiation. Burke later clarifies his theory of consubstantiality as identification, saying, “For substance, in the old philosophies, was an *act*; and a way of life is an *acting-together*; and in acting together, men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, attitudes that make them *consustantial*” (21, emphasis his). The acting together toward a common goal suggests “common” interests, and that suggestion in acting together indicates consubstantiation. The Tricentennial Commission’s inclusion of multiple private and public industries and spheres was an attempt to have the entire state system work together, to appear consubstantial and united behind the nebulous goals of the Tricentennial celebration.

Stephenson, assuming that he and the commission share the same goals, makes his expectations explicit when he focuses on his responsibility in the project, the archeological research. In the same letter to Barnett, Stephenson further emphasizes his goal of accurate interpretation by orienting historical interpretation in terms of “true” and “false.” He argues in this letter, “It is false to reconstruct a lot of buildings on the basis of what might have been their original appearance. I would, of course, strongly advise against use of any false fronts, facades, or partially reconstructed buildings” (2, emphasis his). Stephenson’s recommendations—and the assumption that Barnett and the commission desire the same commitment to academic integrity—indicate his perception

of the Tricentennial project: one that would involve academic investigation and reporting. While Stephenson is clearly excited about the opportunity to excavate the Old Town site, he is clearly more focused on excavation than the Tricentennial Celebration. However, what is clear is that he, like the Commission, assumes that “the actual English Colony that settled at this place in 1670” (1) existed.

His emphasis on the “falseness” of reconstructing out of speculation, without evidence, underscores his dedication to scholarly integrity. He is unequivocal when he declares, “It is false to reconstruct a lot of buildings on the basis of what might have been their original appearance” (2). His opinion indicates that he considers any use of speculative history to reconstruct buildings, by nature, inherently and irredeemably wrong. His bold use of “is” also indicates that he believes the commission agrees with his position. Stephenson’s candor on this matter shows that he does not perceive a division in goals, which would put the commission and the researchers at odds. His frankness about the assumed shared goal of historical integrity reveals his perception of the state’s actions through the Tricentennial Celebration: to discover, uncover, and celebrate history and historical achievement to promote a history of excellence. However, the only shared substance of the goals was the promotion of history to elevate South Carolina. Discovery and uncovering history were goals common only to the researchers.

Stephenson makes two assumptions: first, that academic research functioned as an essential and equal component of the park’s construction, and secondly, that the importance of research to parks. These assumptions signal an important rhetorical device in historically-focused rhetorics of identity and identity construction. I argue that rhetorics of identity are defensive in nature. In other words, the rhetor works always to

persuade an opponent to come into identification or to accept division without threatening the rhetor's identity. Furthermore, the rhetor seeks to discredit the opponent in order to persuade an audience to align with the rhetor's goals and intentions. Rhetoric needs a nemesis. Research, in this process, can provide evidence so that the rhetor can claim that this identity *always* existed. The assumption here is that history cannot be challenged and additionally that history authenticates the work of identity construction. This strategy is defensive rhetoric because it seems to respond either to implicit or explicit criticism of the rhetor's identity. The effort to discover evidence to demonstrate precedence responds to criticism by establishing a historical narrative. Because so many people often fail to question the editorial process behind the construction of historical narratives and instead perceive history as a single, fixed event, the use of history in identity construction often aids in arguing for the ongoing existence of this identity.

As long as there was a sense of shared interests—or at least, interests that were mutually beneficial and not in conflict with each other—then the researchers and the Commission could work together harmoniously. This seems an obvious statement, but for Kenneth Burke, this is an important point in identification. According to Burke, “A is not identical with his colleague, B. but insofar as their interests are joined, A is *identified* with B. Or he may *identify himself* with B even when their interests are not joined, if he assumed that they are, or is persuaded to believe so” (*RM* 20, emphasis his). This perception of belief results from persuasion. For Burke, identification and persuasion are the same result of rhetoric. The purpose of rhetoric is to persuade others that they identify with the rhetor because of shared interests, or consubstantiation. The belief that multiple parties share interests (regardless of the truth of that matter) incites the parties to work

together because of the shared identity, to work toward a common goal. After the goal is achieved, the identification may end or change.

For Stephenson, he seems from his letter persuaded that he and the Commission share goals. At this point, the belief that the white colonists in the seventeenth century were the most influential inhabitants of Albemarle Point created the appearance of a shared interest. Because Stephenson believes he will find evidence to support the narrative that the Commission has constructed and disseminated—and intends to disseminate further—then his interests in part align with the Commission’s. However, Stephenson’s letter to Barnett reveals some underlying conflict. He explains to Barnett in his suggestions that

The reconstruction of any part of [Old Town] must depend upon several things. First and foremost nothing of this sort should be done at all until the archeological work is sufficiently well along to indicate (a) that this is, in truth, the actual site, and (b) what at least some of the building dimensions were, where they were, some aspects of their appearance. This latter, of course, would be in intimate conjunction with the information derived from contemporary documents. The documentation and the archeology must be intimately coordinated throughout the work. (2)

This letter reveals a conflict in the *doxa*, which can lead to dis-identification. In the academy, scholarly integrity is the paramount value. Stephenson clearly prioritizes scholastic integrity when he informs Barnett that “contemporary documentation” must be corroborated with archeological evidence. Stephenson seeks to test the hypothesis of the existence of the original landing site as a permanent village, gleaned from “contemporary

documentation,” against archeological evidence. In other words, Stephenson trusts the scientific method of testing and locating evidence.

For the Commission, reifying their ideology through historical evidence was the foremost priority. These are conflicts in the structuring belief systems of two different communities, the academic and pro-South, pro-white imperative. In the published minutes from the first Tricentennial Commission meeting on August 11, 1966, the secretary records that the current governor of South Carolina, Robert McNair, “explained that the Commission was established to celebrate the first permanent settlement of South Carolina in 1670 with the idea of continuing other historic events through the present day” (1). Governor McNair’s impulse to explain directly the commission’s purpose indicates two things: first of all, the need to clarify goals, and secondly, the necessity to emphasize the importance of white history (or one particular version of history) through the commemoration of what he purports to be “the first permanent settlement of South Carolina” (“Minutes 8/11/1966” 1). Finally, it is important to note that at this point in the commission’s work, its goal seemed to emphasize the 1670 colony as the precedent from which all South Carolina success emerged and to prioritize this site over the other two exhibition centers. The decision to construct 1670 as a pinnacle of achievement indicates that even before the Commission began its work, the state government had determined the course of the narrative. This was the structuring belief system of the Commission.

The commission intended historical research to add credibility to the project by providing evidence of a glorious yet seemingly forgotten past. The appearance of researchers and research activity would add authenticity to their claims of Anglo-Euro achievement that they were hoping to promote. In the minutes of the August 14, 1968,

Tricentennial Commission meeting at Boylston House, the secretary of the commission records that the commission chairman, Thomas Lawton, reports that the Dean of the University of South Carolina's Department of Archeology and Anthropology "has given permission for Doctor Stephenson to come to Old Town to give advice" after Stephenson completed his move to Columbia, South Carolina (3). In the minutes of the September 11, 1968, commission meeting, again held at Boylston House, Barnett makes clear his intention "to tie South Carolina in with the early history of the nation" (3). The reason for this focus on the past seems obvious at first: the commission intends to celebrate three-hundred years of history. Rather than celebrate three-hundred years leading to present successes, the commission keeps looking to *past successes* to erase present contentions. Historical evidence is an important strategy to redeem and defend the present.

This is made evident in the draft of a proposal for funds that the Tricentennial Commission composed. In the draft, the commission focuses not on the contested eras of South Carolina's past, such as the Civil War and Reconstruction, but rather a pre- and early-American past that excluded the controversy of slavery. In a draft of a proposal, they write:

During the first 200 years of South Carolina's history we took our place among the most important colonies and then among the top five states in the young American nation. South Carolina made a most meaningful and considerable contribution in both statesmen and governmental concepts to the United States. But these contributions are virtually unknown today to the American public as a whole. The

Tricentennial celebration would be one of the most practical, reasonable and effective ways in which we could correct this oversight. (1)

Furthermore, the Commission also considered Stephenson, South, and the archeological team both researchers and performers intended to entertain the tourists. In the minutes of a commission meeting on September 21, 1968—a mere four days before Stephenson writes enthusiastically to James Barnett with advice—the commission secretary reports that the commission’s former researcher, Lee, suggested “having archeologists working on the site would provide a good live exhibit of interest to visitors. Dr. Stevenson [sic] cited the archaeological work being done at Dinosaur Quarry as an example of such an exhibit which has been immediately popular with visitors for a number of years” (4). Even Stephenson seems, according to the minutes, to concur that that the *activity* of excavation was something that could attract visitors. This is important, in part, because the Tricentennial Celebration was supposed to draw more tourism to the state, as well as specifically to Charleston. Racism and support of the Confederate flag had led to Civil Rights groups boycotting the tourism of Southern states. Although no one in mentions these boycotts or their effect on South Carolina, it seems not unlikely that the focus on wooing tourists was in part a reaction to the concern about losing them during the Civil Rights Movement. Furthermore, tourism has been an important part of South Carolina’s economy for the better part of the past century. New reasons to bring returning tourists and to entice new visitors seem crucial to the state’s financial security.

In spite of worries about drawing tourists, Stephenson considered the project a serious endeavor toward historical discovery, however biased; it is clear that the commission was equally excited about the prospect of a living exhibition as well as

discovering evidence for their historical narrative. Research, in other words, was both a scholarly activity and a display to promote the historical memory about the 1670 South Carolina. Stephenson, according to the minutes, notes that such strategies have been successful in at other parks and does not seem to find fault with the idea. Despite his receptivity to this idea, the suggestion to exhibit the researchers indicates the extent to which the commission perceived Stephenson, South, and their team simply as players on the stage rather than co-contributors to the project. As actors, their activities could be scripted to develop a character that would align with the commission's goals.

For the commission, historical research was a way to create a shared past based on the myth of the white Anglo-European settler taming the wild lands of the New World. While academic research could have proven helpful in elevating South Carolina's prestige nationally if left untainted by the commission, instead, it became yet another scapegoat, this one more tangible than the "anti-South" activists noted in the newspapers. In their defensive rhetoric of identification, the Tricentennial Commission had not located a specific threat to their actions, although their ongoing discourse suggested that some kind of real threat existed.

### **History as a Serious Endeavor to Construct a Serious Identity**

In 1968, the Tricentennial Commission approved a design to transform Old Town into Charles Towne Landing to celebrate South Carolina's tricentennial (Williams "Architects" 1b). The commission, by this point, had agreed to build a village that simulated seventeenth-century life at Charles Towne Landing. However, historians and preservationists at the federal level had warned the commission against such an action. In



a letter responding to James Barnett, William J. Murtagh, the Keeper of the National Register from the United States Department of Interior's Office of Archeology and Historic Preservation, responds to a letter from Barnett in which Barnett sought Murtagh's advice on the Old Town site:

It seems to me the sustaining quality of the site can only be achieved by allowing it to stay, to the maximum degree, in its natural setting. Only in this way will one eventually recapture the wilderness quality which formed the setting for this short lived endeavor. As you know, professional preservationists are very reticent about reconstructions except in unusual circumstances. I would hope your decisions in this case would not include any reconstructions that would intrude on the wilderness quality of the site which is its greatest asset. Indeed, I would put such a high premium on this quality to even go so far as to suggest that any orientation center which would interpret the site to the visitors be carefully planned at an unobtrusive point to make certain this wilderness quality remains undisturbed.

Unlike the problem of creating a festival center to celebrate such an illustrious occasion, one should remember that he is dealing with a unique site which, if handled incorrectly, will be degraded beyond repair since only one such site exists. It follows that the responsibility for decisions concerning it are inordinately onerous. (n. pag.)

Murtagh proposes a different goal for the tricentennial project, one of preservation rather than reconstruction and simulation. He implies that reconstruction is tantamount to

destruction. He educates Barnett (and through Barnett, the commission and likely other important bodies, such as Charleston's local advisory committee, a sub-committee empowered by the Commission) about the importance of preservation. At this point, Murtagh, who represents historians and the academic community, becomes the commission's opponent: any historian, preservationist, or scholar who advises against reconstruction. He indicates that reconstruction of the original site is equivalent with a "festival center," frivolous rather than serious.

According to the architects working for Corkern-Wiggins and Associates, whom the Tricentennial Commission hired to design and build Charles Towne Landing, the associates and the commissioners were "concerned with how the historical site, the locale of the first permanent settlement in South Carolina, should best be preserved and emphasized. Lee [an associate and later partner of Corkern-Wiggins] emphasized that all those involved in the planning are determined to prevent any sort of 'carnival atmosphere'" (Williams "Architect" 1b). The emphasis on the seriousness of the park as a historical site suggests a struggle to legitimize the commission, the project, and the history. However, they intended to legitimate a history they assumed existed rather than the history that may be uncovered.

Lee's concern about the "carnival atmosphere" is defensive of the project. He seems to address criticism unvoiced in the local media<sup>9</sup> but could have been circulating in other media to which the public had little, if any, access. Most importantly, he

---

<sup>9</sup> Here, I'm thinking of state and local newspapers that covered the commission and construction: *New and Courier*, *The Evening Post*, and *The State*.

emphasizes taking the South's history seriously. Scholars of the South have identified this concern as a thread of modern Southern identity construction. In *The Southern Past*, W. Fitzhugh Brundage notes that in the early twentieth century, the South pined for its forgotten past: "These laments about the 'want of history' in the South, in fact, coincided with the flowering of the Confederate tradition, the glorification of the Old South, the onset of a southern literacy renaissance absorbed with the past, and the emergence of academic historical scholarship in the region" (1). Lee's statement and, indeed, the entire Tricentennial Commission's project operate as extensions of both this concern about history as well as the resurgence of interest in the glory of the South. Lee, in particular, seems preoccupied with defending not only the seriousness of the project, namely Charles Towne Landing, but more specifically the seriousness of history as a state endeavor. His concern about issues of a carnival environment indicates a cultural fear about the reputation of the South as a serious place.

The legitimacy of the South was a commonplace in the contemporary *doxa*. An issue of *The State*, a newspaper from Columbia, South Carolina, featured two articles that, in juxtaposition, provide insight about the popular feelings about the discovery of the Great House and "anti-South" bias. William D. McDonald's article "'Great House' Threatens Tricentennial Dreams" appeared an editorial by James J. Kilpatrick entitled "Anti-South Bias Is Still Strong: If Dixie Likes It, It's Bad." Kilpatrick opines that while federal reconstruction of the South has long since come to an end, "there are times, honest to Pete, when Southerners wonder if the South is ever to regain an equal standing in the Union" (D2). Kilpatrick's editorial focuses on the opposition of Clement F. Haynsworth to the Supreme Court, claiming that "[t]he objection, at bottom, is that

Haynsworth is a Southerner—a moderately conservative Southerner. That is enough. Lynch him!” (D2). Kilpatrick notes that Haynsworth repeatedly defended himself against any alignment with the traditional South, suggesting that Haynsworth acknowledged the prejudice against the South and Southerners and sought to distance himself from his cultural origins (South Carolina in particular) to legitimate his nomination to the Supreme Court.

The inclusion of research in the project would not necessarily counter these “anti-South” sentiments, but it would make the project seem a serious endeavor. As I have argued throughout this chapter and, indeed, throughout this dissertation, identification is a defensive rhetoric, intended to create an “us/them” situation to garner support for the acts that would come out of the identification. In order to aid in identification, an opposition must be located. “Anti-South” rhetoric, as the Kilpatrick called the criticism of Haynsworth, while clearly on the forefront of the media’s concern, did not directly target the Tricentennial project. Furthermore, adding Stephenson’s conditional support for a reconstructed village suggests that there are multiple ways to perceive historical preservation. Despite Stephenson’s reluctance to build without evidence, he does not directly oppose all reconstructions. To have an archeologist side with the commission adds strength to their argument to build the village while also adding to the seriousness of the project. Without an opponent to target, the project instead focused on bolstering support by discussing the seriousness of the project and making these claims public.

### **A Break in Identification: the Clash between the Goals of Discovery and the Goal of Commemoration in Correspondence about the Archeological Discovery**

However resonant, “anti-South” feelings had little real effect on people’s daily lives, so using it as a persuasive force to garner support for the Tricentennial Celebration would not be likely be a successful tactic. What could help persuade South Carolinians to support the project more vocally (and in the media) would be an actual threat to the project that would incite emotional responses. Despite concerns about a carnival atmosphere and how that might negatively affect this historical endeavor, the commission and the firm eagerly progressed toward building the Pavilion, “an exhibition hall with adjoining movie theater” (Williams “Architects” 1b). This structure, more than any other, incited controversy, because of its futuristic design and because of what was discovered on the land where the firm planned to construct it: remains of a Kiawah Great House. On August 6, 1969, shortly after this archeological discovery, the “Tricentennial commissioners unanimously agreed...to proceed with Charleston’s Old Town pavilion on the planned location and authorized a crash archaeological program on the Indian discovery site. The proposed pavilion site is on the exact location of the ruins of an Indian ‘Great House’” (Williams “Pavilion” 1A).

By July, correspondence between commissioners and members of the public increased. Stephenson and South’s discovery of the Great House site led to heightened public awareness of the project because of greater media attention. The media handling of the event, discussed later in this chapter, led to the perception that the archeologists wanted to change the tricentennial project to accommodate the discovery and to emphasize the Native American history over the Euro-Anglo history that had been

planned. A memorandum from James Barnett to the Commissions Executive Committee on July 18, 1969, panicked requests a special meeting of the Executive Committee:

The Chairman [Lawton] has requested a meeting of the Executive Committee members in the coming week to consider several points which require immediate decision. One of these involves the discovery on the site of the Charleston Pavilion of a 17<sup>th</sup> Century Indian compound. The archeologists and at least one member of the Executive Committee have requested that consideration be given to moving the pavilion so that the Indian compound might be restored. (n. pag.)

Already, Barnett demonstrates the slow turn against the archeologists and the as-yet-unnamed Executive Committee member (later revealed to be Senator Joseph H. McGee). In naming the archeologists and the committee members as the parties requesting the commission to reconsider their plans for the pavilion, we can see that they are already being singled out as “problem parties.”

Later in the memo, Barnett predisposes the executive committee to support his position regarding the discovery. He states, “I have investigated the consequences should we decide to follow this action and have ascertained that the completion of the pavilion and general development would be definitely jeopardized....Much as I dislike not considering an archeological find of this sort, I feel...that I must recommend proceeding with plans as they are” (n. pag.). Barnett literally creates an oppositional situation by using “I” against the other of the archeologists. Furthermore, he positions his own investigation against the knowledge of the archeologists. He situates himself as more financially aware, and argues that the commission should prioritize finances over facts.

While the archeologists may have better knowledge about the importance of their findings, Barnett argues that “A change of location in this building would necessitate cancelling the present advertisement for bids so that alterations could be made in building design. This would add approximately three weeks to an already seriously tight schedule” (n. pag.). While Barnett explicitly mentions the tight schedule, his later mention of fiscal year reports in the same memo places finances in mind. Barnett begins to sabotage any authentic debate about how to handle the findings.

Meanwhile, starting in July, various citizens began mailing letters to commissioners, particularly Chairman Lawton and Executive Director Barnett, about the Kiawah Great House. Commissioner Joseph H. McGee, Junior, who was also the vice chairman of the commission, is one of many voices dissenting from Barnett and the majority of the commission. He is also the Executive Committee member to whom Barnett referred in his memo calling for the special executive committee meeting. On July 30, 1969, McGee writes to Lawton, “Although I do not share the enthusiasm which some have for the archeologists, I am persuaded that the importance of these latest findings could be of great significance and we simply cannot take a chance. In short, my vote is to relocate the pavilion, even if it costs some more money and causes some delay” (1, emphasis his). Here, McGee tries to combine the interest of the commission with the archeologists’ discoveries. His “vote to relocate the pavilion” despite the challenges this would raise shows that this discovery did not have to threaten the historical narrative the commission sought to construct. In other words, he argues for continued work toward identification and urging caution against division. He makes a case that the interests the commission shared with the archeologists have not changed but rather may have even

been bolstered by the discovery that may add, although he is not certain how, to the Charleston exhibit.

McGee is not alone in his support for the archeologists and the continued research of the site. Senator to the state senate from Florence, Marion, and Williamsburg counties, representing district sixteen, and Tricentennial Commissioner on the Executive Committee, E.N. Zeigler writes a strongly-worded letter to chair Lawton. In this letter, Zeigler “wish[es] to make a most serious and earnest protest against the destruction of significant archeological material...I earnestly request that the opinion of the professional archeologists employed by the Commission be given to the Executive Committee when it meets...and that the expert opinions of other archeologists be secured” (n. pag.). Zeigler’s letter more harshly criticizes the commission’s looming decisions in light of Barnett’s statement in the July 18 memo that he would not support additional work on the site or relocation of the pavilion.

I have earlier accused Barnett of engaging in antagonistic and defensive rhetoric of identification by utilizing oppositional strategies. To be fair, Zeigler engages in similar rhetoric, siding himself against Barnett. In doing so, however, he proves that public memory seems like idea that needs to be defended and protected. What he does that no one has done previously is create a side for the archeologists. Little correspondence from the archeologists remains in the archives, and much of what remains is second-hand communication among commissioners that inform readers that the archeologists have requested either more time with the site to excavate before the site is bulldozed for the pavilion to the “radical” suggestion to move the pavilion site a few hundred feet to preserve the Great House site. Zeigler, as a second-hand voice, argues that opinions like



Barnett's are not only unreasonable but also ignorant because he and others like him are not authorities. He additionally asserts that to neglect or, worse, to destroy the site would be at odds with the commission's goal, to be a festival of history.

What Zeigler misses is a key point in working together from identification—the beliefs that guide the actions of the group. From its earliest inception, the Tricentennial Commission agreed to celebrate and to commemorate South Carolina history *from* 1670, not before. Furthermore, implicit in this decision to celebrate South Carolina's history starting at 1670 is the decision to celebrate white achievement and not those of any other ethnic group. No one protested Governor McNair's proclamation at the first commission meeting in 1966, when he declared the purpose to memorialize 1670 and the British settlers. Granted, at this point, while the myth about the settler's included trivial stories about the Kiawah who "helped" the settlers when they landed, no evidence had emerged or survived to suggest that Kiawah had either previously or simultaneously inhabited Albemarle Point like the British colonists. So it is clear that the new desire to include the Great House discovery as part of the Charleston exhibit departs from the original concept of the festival. It is this departure of ways that causes dis-identification.

Dis-identification elicits, however, new arguments toward identification and more defensive rhetoric. Zeigler, like the commissioners before him, engages in defensive and antagonistic strategies to *persuade* Lawton to take his side. He retorts, "I hope that the members of the Executive Committee have not already prejudged this matter" before closing the letter (n. pag.). In closing with an appeal to the committee's rational side—an appeal Zeigler exploits with his repeated calls for experts to testify to help guide their decision—he also attacks those who have, indeed, prejudged the matter. In doing so, he

suggests that they are irrational and perhaps not qualified to determine the site's future. His appeal, however, is replete with anger and frustration, which seem to do a disservice to his cause to appear rational to persuade his fellow committee members through reason. By creating a relationship based on the division between reason and unreasonable, Zeigler defends his own identity as a committee member and seeks to gain supporters.

Zeigler is not the only South Carolinian who recognizes an identity not represented in the commission's vision. Various concerned citizens argue that not only is it more ethical to preserve the site, but that the site's destruction actually destroys an important culture that is part of the South Carolina history with which these correspondents identify as influential to the present. Thomas J. Edwards, the associate editor of *South Carolina Antiquities*, a publication of the Archeological Society of South Carolina, writes on July 22, 1969, to James Barnett<sup>10</sup>:

I know I speak for many South Carolina citizens when I say I am interested in seeing our Indian heritage preserved, as well as that of the early colonists. Certainly the interplay that occurred between these two peoples has cultural significance. Destruction of this site will mean the irreplaceable loss of many valuable pages of South Carolina history. (n. pag.)

In another letter also dated July 22, 1969, Mike Hartley, a news editor for station WBTW-TV in Florence, South Carolina, also implores Barnett "not [to] place [the site]

---

<sup>10</sup> He misspells Barnett's name in the address and the salutation as "Barrett." Because the first name is the same as Barnett's, James, and because Edwards also identifies "Barrett" as the Director of the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission, I assume that Edwards intends to address James Barnett, the Executive Director of the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission.

beyond the reach of posterity” after levying attacks at the commission: “I feel that the construction of a museum purportedly to preserve artifacts of the state, which by the act of being constructed, destroys a unique example of South Carolina culture is both paradoxical and a mockery” (n. pag.). Other letters express similar sentiments, desiring the commission to include “our Indian heritage” in the state narrative.

These letters, particularly Hartley’s, like Zeigler’s, accuse the commission not only of being irresponsible but also of excluding an important culture from the official historical narrative being written on Charleston land. Writing from other cities, counties, and regions in South Carolina, these citizens employ attacks against the commission more than defenses for their position. Hartley, in this case, engages both in attacks and defense. He, more than some of the other correspondents, appeals to the ethos of the commission by claiming the Kiawah heritage as “our” heritage. When he does this, Hartley does not allow the commission to divide from him. He forces them into identification.

The discovery of the Kiawah Great House and the ensuing public and private debates about how best to handle the site created a crisis of identity that did not seem to exist at the start of the Tricentennial project. In a way, this identity crisis created more publicity for the project, which led to stronger feelings about it. However, rather than unify the citizens behind a cause, it created a rift that played out in the newspapers.

### **Not Anti-South but Anti-Tricentennial and Anti-South Carolina: The Media Handling of the Archeological Discoveries**

Barbara S. Williams, a staff reporter for Charleston’s *News and Courier* newspaper, had followed the developments on Old Town since Corkern-Wiggins took

over the construction project. Until archeologists from local universities discovered these Kiawah artifacts, much of Williams' writing concerning Old Town/Charles Towne Landing were buried in the early or middle sections of the paper, such as her article "Architects Begin Laying Plans for Old Town Site" on pages 1b and 4b. With the Kiawah Great House discovery, her article "Pavilion on Site of Ruins Approved" made front-page news. This sudden move to the front page indicates not only an increased awareness culturally in the project but also a rhetorical problem: how does this discovery affect the way South Carolinians represent themselves? Even more important, it raised the question: who are South Carolinians?

This move to the front of a major state newspaper upon this controversy and the decision surrounding how to handle these non-European artifacts suggests that until this point no one had considered that the park could or would represent any history other than those of white South Carolinians. One of Williams' previous articles, "Architects Begin Laying Plans for Old Town Site," never discusses how the commission or the architects intended to handle or incorporate non-white history and artifacts. This is, of course, because the commission did not plan for such inclusion. The concern over the park's atmosphere and fears that it may reflect a less-serious attitude or depiction of South Carolina history indicates a perceived conflict regarding the legitimacy of South Carolina history, or more specifically, white South Carolina history. The project's purpose was at stake, and the commission needed to justify its funding and actions. In other words, Lee's rhetoric of serious history avoids making a case along explicitly racial lines but along regional lines. However, his omission of other races indicates how the white,

homogenous power structures excluded all non-white discourse, history, and participation from this project.

This discovery threatened the commission's commemoration of white history and white South Carolinians because it brought into sharp relief not only the existence of other races and ethnicities in South Carolina but also their history on this land before white Europeans staked their ground on Albemarle Point. In fact, the rhetoric of victimization is evident in articles that discuss the discovery. In his article "'Great House' Threatens Tricentennial Dreams," *The State* staff writer William D. McDonald indicates in his headline the white South's position in this scenario: the passive, threatened victim in the face of the threatening Indian artifacts. McDonald writes that the placement of the Pavilion at "old Charles Towne" was "a predictable wish to build where the first English colonists settled 300 year ago" (D1). He remarks that no one could have known that the Kiawah Indian Great House was "buried in the mud and clay of the site" (D1). Furthermore, he mocks the two commission members Zeigler and Medlock who "not unexpectedly...led a strong minority fight for moving the pavilion [to a different site in the park]" (D1). McDonald quotes Zeigler, "'The public wants tangible evidence (of the structure), for this site was intimately connected with the (Charleston) settlement'" (D1).

In juxtaposition with articles that perceive the discovery of a Kiawah Great House on the site for the proposed Pavilion as a threat to Southern history and the Tricentennial Commissions dreams, it seems clear that the defense of the South and the victim identity were commonplaces in Southern rhetoric. McDonald's article "'Great House' Threatens Tricentennial Dreams" also suggests a victimized tone. McDonald opens his article with the lead, "A scant seven months before the state is to celebrate its 300<sup>th</sup> birthday, the

scheduled construction of a pavilion at old Charles Towne threatens to shatter the fondest dreams of the S.C. Tricentennial Commission” (D1). McDonald’s use of victimized language identifies the commission as a group of dreamers whose one mission has been disrupted. Although McDonald refers to the discovery of the Great House remains as an “archeological jewel,” his dismissal of the individuals who opposed the commission’s decision—commissioners Travis Medlock and Eugene Zeigler, as well as “[f]ive Charleston citizens [who] brought suit against the commission”—imply that he does not understand or respect their decisions (D2). The appearance of two articles that rely heavily on describing the South and Southern projects in terms of controversy and clashes reveals the resonance of a sense (however unjustified) of victimization in the South as plans and traditions were threatened by changes.

McDonald’s tone indicates that this discovery is unwelcomed at best, as were Zeigler and Murdock’s calls for integration of the discovery into the park and a lawsuit against the commission by five Charlestonians<sup>11</sup> (D1). His use of victimized language, particularly the house threatening the dreams of the commission, who represented the state and the public, suggests that nothing should come between the original plans for the park and its actualization. Furthermore, his imagery of the artifacts “buried in mud and clay” indicates not only that these people and their civilization were forgotten, but deservedly so, as nature and history forgot them by covering them. His use of the word “buried” invokes images of death. Like Kilpatrick’s editorial about anti-South bigotry in the North, McDonald constructs a threatened South: this time, the threat is history itself,

---

<sup>11</sup> Also see Page “Group Votes Not to Change Site of Charleston Exhibit” in *The State* August 7, 1969; Williams “Tricentennial Suit Is Dropped” *News and Courier* October 21, 1969.

daring to emerge from Southern mud and clay and impose itself on an Anglo-centric narrative.

Other editorialists also wrote with enraged passion against moving the Pavilion. Hortense Roach's editorial "Little Remains of Great House" in the *News and Courier* argues that the discovery of the Great House site is not much of a discovery at all:

Some people seem to be under the impression that there are "ruins" at the Kiawah Indian findings at Old Town Plantation in Charleston. That is not so. No Tricentennial-employed bulldozer is coming in to knock down the remains of an Indian structure. What it will be erasing are the filled-in post holes marking the outline of either an Indian great house or ceremonial compound. (n.pag.)

Technically, Roach is not incorrect. Multiple archeological records and reports show that no actual remains were found but rather that the archeologists observed discolorations in the soil<sup>12</sup>. However, an article published in August 1969 minimizes the discovery while mocking the lawsuit brought against the Commission. A month later, State Archeologist Robert L. Stephenson aligned himself with the commission, albeit with less rage, stating that "archeologist digging at the Old Town site discovered on the same spot [as the proposed Pavilion] what they believed to be the remains of a rare Indian structure. Only post holes remained" ("Archeologist" 1-B). Both he and local journalists argue against the use of the word "ruins," because that word suggests not only pieces of the existing

---

<sup>12</sup> See Stanley South's *Archeology at the Charles Towne Site (38Ch1) on Albemarle Point in South Carolina*).

structure but something that can physically be destroyed. Roach points out that there is nothing to be destroyed by bulldozers but rather dirt that will simply be moved around, again.

Both Roach and Stephenson trivialize how the site is treated. For Roach, bulldozing the site represents modern progress. She foregrounds the benefits of modernization by noting how time has already degraded the site: “The cut, small trees which once filled the holes have long since rotted away and what is left are circles made distinguishable by the darker dirt which lid in to take the posts’ place” (n.pag.). Like McDonald less than a month before her in a competing newspaper, Roach uses the natural imagery of decay to describe the effect of time. In doing so, she suggests that this civilization is unfit for modern eyes. Its incapability to be preserved through the centuries is where Roach grounds her argument in favor of bulldozing, helping recover what nature has already done.

Roach also positions the Tricentennial Commission members as victims of modernization and progressive agendas: “The Tricentennial Commission’s task has not been an easy one and it has been the target of much abuse. Its primary job is getting the 300<sup>th</sup> birthday celebration, to which the state is committed, off the ground on time. The decisions forced upon the commission have been difficult and perhaps the Old Town-Indian decision has been the worst” (n.pag.). Roach appeals to the ethos of the state endeavor and the commission as beleaguered public servants. She constructs the commission as victims of circumstances whose success has been threatened by forces beyond their control. Like McDonald and Kilpatrick, she returns to the common place in Southern identity *doxa* as the victim. But she does this to appeal to what she sees as the



greater good: legitimating the South as a real presence in American history, so that “the Kiawah can rise again” (n.pag.) after the white South has come to acclaim first.

Interestingly, Roach and McDonald’s articles use the same photograph of a model of the proposed Pavilion. This visual rhetoric of the photograph is particularly compelling, as it positions the archeological dig and its coverage into relative (visual) silence. It demonstrates a tension between remembering and forgetting. Brundage points to this binary when he explains, “Within collective memories a dialectical exists between the willfully recalled and the deliberately forgotten past. Campaigns to remember the past by forgetting parts of it have occurred in many times and places” (6). This deliberate forgetfulness silences and makes invisible parts of the past as well wounds the present by making it blind to the truth. It blinds the public to what this site looks like at the moment of the dig. Although McDonald’s article does include images of the dig, his captions, like the dominant image of the Pavilion, foreground the Pavilion and not the historical dig in the readers’ minds. His caption beneath the dig is particularly compelling because of its position beneath a four-column width image of the Pavilion: “Construction at Pavilion Halted” (McDonald D1). The image’s caption does not describe the artifacts found in the hole<sup>13</sup> that the picture shows but rather describes the hole and the artifact as stumbling blocks to the park’s progress. Like Roach’s editorial, which also uses the stock photograph of the Pavilion model, it foregrounds the Pavilion’s importance to the reader rather than the historical discovery. If the artifacts have any presence in the reader’s

---

<sup>13</sup> Roach reports the following artifacts in her editorial: “Finds within the markings of the post holes have included burials, earthen pots, thousands of fragments of pottery, shell and stone tools, and a few stone arrowheads” (n. pag.).

mind, even visually, it is only as a hole with non-descript artifacts that have imposed themselves upon the Tricentennial Commission's dreams of legitimating South Carolina history in the face of anti-South bigotry.

These editorials construct the South as both a victim of liberal thinking and a victor who withstands cultural attacks. The commonplaces of the victim and later victor work as dual rhetorics of identification and division. While these reporters and editorialists use the language of victimization, they construct the Kiawah artifacts and commissioners like Zeigler and Murdock as threats to Southern history. The eventual opening of the park and the endurance of the commission's vision for a homogenous white history situates the South later as victor. The reader, who is actively invited to identify as Southern, understands the role of victim that Roach, McDonald, and numerous other writers constructed and perpetuated based on the shared sense of Southern-ness.

These roles are implicit in the Southern narrative of the Lost Cause of the Confederacy. In part, the Lost Cause is a collective memory that is being alluded to through rhetoric surrounding the park. In its reconstruction, the atrocities that led to the Civil War and the South's loss are forgotten in a rhetorical space that does not allow room for the existence of these because it looks at a pre-American past. In other words, they wrote out slavery and white atrocities to slaves by constructing a pre-Southern history that distances the South from post-1860 American history. Brundage points out that history-making is a rhetorical process: "Just as subversive versions of the past are regularly obscured, so too are the workings of historical memory—how it is created and disseminated—often intentionally concealed" (12). The rhetoric of victimization conceals the other side of the coin: that the surviving evidence of white history reveals not a victim

but an oppressor. But the victim needs public and permanent memorializing and vindication, both in print and in the landscape, and this becomes the park's purpose in the media rather than a place to discuss late seventeenth-century history. Charles Towne Landing becomes, rhetorically, the site for white triumph over anti-Southern rhetoric, of Southern survival in the face of unending threats.

This triumph invites the Southerner to identify simultaneously as the victim whose identity has been challenged but also as the victor when the park opens with the Pavilion built where the Commission always intended (*Final Report* 30). Charles Towne Landing represents one identity that forms when colonial history collides with 1960s and 1970s Southern identity: a threatened place, a threatened identity, a cause not so lost at all. The commission's decision to build the pavilion at a park that is supposed to exhibit pre-American history underscores the commission's need to unite two distinct time periods. Roach and McDonald's articles provide a unifying theme by arguing that the values of both could be lost if the commission conceded to pressure to move the pavilion. When the past was threatened, so too was the present, in the commission's perspective. Thus Charles Towne Landing represented two identities and merged, pre-American and twentieth-century Southern.

Brundage explains, "The narrative conventions of a group's historical memory provide individuals with a framework within which to articulate their experience, to explain their place, in the remembered past" (13). Charles Towne Landing provided the framework to assert not only the white victim identity but also to engage the public in a place to impose that identity upon others. It also gave South Carolinians a site that

articulated racial and regional triumph at its opening that only acerbated already heated race relations.

### **Keeping Research Discoveries Secret: The Conflict of Academic Integrity and Identification**

Concurrent with the public discourse about the Kiawah Great House, Tricentennial Commission-employed researcher Agnes L. Baldwin earnestly communicated with various members of the local media and historians at other historical parks, such as Colonial Williamsburg in Virginia, about how to handle the discoveries she made during her own research. She worried that disclosing her findings might challenge the positive colonial image the commission sought to construct and disseminate. She seems keenly aware of the role the commission intended research to fill. She notes to Manigault, “In order that your readers might realize that more goes on than controversy, I would appreciate it if you would turn over the enclosed information to the proper person and hopefully use it in some way” (n. pag., emphasis hers). As an official researcher for the Tricentennial Commission, Baldwin had written “a booklet” entitled *First Settlers of South Carolina 1670-1680*. The scope of her booklet coincides with the scope of Charles Towne Landing’s historical simulation. As such, much of her research corresponded with the archival work that archeologists Stephenson and South conducted. However, rather than emphasize her role as researcher, here, she instead seems to underscore her position to deflect attention away from controversy. In other words, her function as researcher is clearly secondary to her work as promoter.

The work of the critic/researcher—a hybrid role that Baldwin adopts in this letter—legitimizes the attention authorities pay to a cultural product and thereby argues

that the product deserves public attention. In *The Field of Cultural Production*, Pierre Bourdieu explains that this human performance is important of giving an object value:

The work of an object which exists as such only by virtue of the (collective) belief which knows and acknowledges it as a work art....it has to take into account everything which helps to constitute the work as such, not least the discourses of direct or disguised celebration which are among the social conditions of production of the work of art *qua* object of belief. The production of discourse (critical, historical, etc.) about the work of art is one of the conditions of production of the work. Every critical affirmation contains, on the one hand, recognition of the value of the work which occasions it, which is thus designated as a worthy object of legitimate discourse. (35)

According to Bourdieu, an object does not have value inherent to it. Instead, he argues that the discourse surrounding the object gives it value. Here, the Tricentennial Celebration and Charles Towne Landing are the objects in question. Because they are products *in production*, because they are unfinished, their worth as finished products in the future and their relevance can be repeatedly called into question. The producers' roles, therefore, are to give the objects value and relevance. The researchers are not simply analysts, in this case, but producers of a historical narrative. As producers, they have to justify the products existence and make the product desirable.

The problem, here, is that researchers such as South and Stephenson did not realize that they were bound by the production of the celebration and that their research was supposed to legitimate and add value to the celebration. Baldwin, however,

understands her role, but seems to find herself caught between two situations: one that values a researcher's objectivity (research that uncovers a narrative) and one that values a researcher's subjectivity (research uncovered to support a manufactured and rhetorical narrative). Baldwin attempts to straddle these two worlds by deflecting the controversy and therefore making the celebration seem more positive to Manigault's readers and to emphasize the credibility of her research.

In a letter dated October 23, 1969, to Peter Manigault, a journalist with Charleston's *The Post-Courier*, Baldwin seems hyper-conscious not only about the mundane nature of her research. She observes to Manigault, "Since my 'scientific and historical' findings will certainly not be entirely in keeping with preconceived [ideas] of our grandeur past, this too may cause controversy" (n. pag.). Baldwin's concern that the "scientific and historical" nature of her research—presumably indicating the academic nature of her investigation—will cause controversy because it is not "in keeping with" preconceptions about South Carolina's past suggests first of all that she was supposed to conduct her research to prove or to corroborate a particular narrative. She recognizes the expectation that she should be biased. Her concern about controversy also indicates that she is aware that she was unable to uncover evidence that could be used to reconstruct the historical narrative the commission had already constructed and disseminated. Furthermore, her direct confrontation of this fact and her qualifying language describing her research reveals her own defensive position in this situation. Despite using scare quotes around scientific and historical, she seems to use these words to defend her process as a researcher and to defend what she found as unbiased and therefore true.

However, her concern about the commission's and the Tricentennial Celebration's reputation for controversy raises the issue with research: rather than reify the mythology the commission constructed, research instead challenged the story of the early settlers on which so much of the celebration had been built. Research is certainly not always a glamorous endeavor, but for the commission, it was a means to uncover the glamor of the past. Clearly concerned with promoting and uncovering a grand past, Baldwin seems to want to deflect from the controversy (presumably, with the timing of the letter, the discovery of the Kiawah Great House) by pointing to the mundane nature of her discoveries.

Baldwin encloses in this letter a brief summary of her pamphlet, the list of her primary sources for her manuscript, a four-page long list of other primary sources titled "Letters and Accounts." In this summary, titled "First Settlers of South Carolina 1670-1680," Baldwin describes herself as "a South Carolinian with a lifelong interest in local history" and additionally describes her project as an "exhaustive study...based entirely on primary records" (1). Of the records, she says, "This study is an analysis of sixteen groups of public documents, thirteen published and three manuscripts in the South Carolina Archives. The latter records are in 17<sup>th</sup> Century script, difficult to read" (1). She argues that the purpose of her pamphlet is to analyze and to describe South Carolina's seventeenth-century settlers. She discovers in her findings report "that 55 of the first settlers were gentlemen and esquires, the leaders of the Colony" (1). In case her readers are unfamiliar with the terms, she takes care to define "gentleman," asserting that the word "at this time indicated a person of gentle birth; one who was entitled to bear arms

though not ranking among nobility” and that “esquire” indicated an “appointment to some government service” (2).

Despite the seemingly unimpressive nature of her findings, Baldwin attempts to use them to elevate South Carolina’s colonial past and present prestige. She seems to perceive her role as historian to bring prestige to the project, what Bourdieu would call *symbolic capital*. In *The Field of Cultural Production*, Bourdieu explains,

“Symbolic capital” is to be understood as economic or political capital that is disavowed, misrecognized and thereby recognized, hence legitimate, “credit” which , under certain conditions, and always in long run, guarantees “economic” profits...For the author, the critic, the art dealer, the publisher or the theater manager, the only legitimate accumulation consists in making a name for oneself, a known, recognized name, a capital of consecration implying a power to consecrate objects...and therefore to give value. (75)

Symbolic capital is the same as prestige, the value that a name or reputation carries. The park was supposed to generate economic capital by encouraging tourism but also symbolic capital by redirecting attention from the South’s negative reputation stemming from its past of slavery and racism. The controversies that arose from the park—the money seemingly wasted, the contentious debate about how to treat non-white European remains, the time schedule—did little to improve the state’s reputation among scholars and would-be tourists, or at least that was the fear. Baldwin seems aware that her role in this project is to help legitimate the project by bestowing upon it the stamp of historical accuracy.



She does this by connecting South Carolina's leadership to a semi-aristocratic, or at least landed gentry, heritage. Baldwin quickly notes that fifty-five of the "684 heads of families transplanted" in South Carolina "were gentlemen and esquires, leaders of the Colony" and that "[e]ight [of twenty-one] of the merchants were 'Gentlemen'" ("First Settlers" 1-2). Her attention to enumerating gentlemen and esquires initially seems a function of reporting her research. However, because she distinguishes them as leaders of the new colony and takes time to define these terms for her twentieth-century readers, she elevates the colonists to her readers. She also notes the gentlemen and esquires before describing the other settlers, such as the planters, servants, and tradesmen. In fact, although she mentions that some of the planters had originally been servants, she neglects providing any additional details about the tradesmen, giving them only a sentence of space.

Her meticulous detailing of the hierarchy and her attention to the upward mobility of servants to planters appeal to the commission's desire for historical evidence of the South Carolina's settlers' cultural value. To support the commission's claims that South Carolina and its residents played important roles in nation forming and in U.S. history, researchers needed to find corroborating evidence. Baldwin's research into South Carolina's first decade of European history uncovers some gentility of birth, but not necessarily nobility. However, it does appeal to the commonplace of the American dream, in which immigrants can advance because of the fresh start America affords them. Baldwin's noting that servants became merchants and landowners does not quite live up to the noble past that the commission sought to recover, but it does still fit in with their narrative of South Carolina as an ideal state of influential people who shaped a nation. In

uncovering and creating a narrative of an upwardly mobile and landed, gentrified history, Baldwin does not so much appeal to logos as create logos, or evidence, for the grandeur past she worries about supporting

Despite her seeming complicity in contributing to a narrative about a past that did not seem to exist, Baldwin expresses concern about historical accuracy in the reenactments and reconstruction plans for Charles Towne Landing and its seventeenth-century emphasis. While she is complicit in working with the narrative and seeking evidence to support it, she resists making the narrative manifest and therefore legitimate because she cannot find evidence for it. For Baldwin, evidence is clearly a matter of establishing existence, and she seems troubled that the commission plans to construct a village to represent a history in which she cannot believe because she cannot find proof of it. This is made clear in series of correspondences from I. Noel Hume, the Director of the Department of Archaeology from Colonial Williamsburg to Agnes Baldwin and also from Baldwin to Eugene Zeigler, who served on the Tricentennial Commission and who had also advocated for the preservation of the Great House site. The correspondence between Baldwin and Hume and Baldwin and Zeigler indicates her reluctance to promote the Commission's narrative and intentions because of her lack of evidence to support it.

In a letter dated May 13, 1969, Hume responds to Baldwin:

I feel that you were absolutely right in your assessment of the situation.

There just isn't enough to go on—no matter what Miss Williams of the

*Charlestown* [sic] *News and Courier* may say!....[Emmett Robinson's

model of the colonial village] is pretty and if properly designed and built

might well make an interestingly educational experience for children

learning about life in the seventeenth century. You all have to decide, of course, whether that is enough and whether there are not more worthy projects directly related to the history of Charleston and the history of South Carolina. (n. pag.)

The letter's context is unclear because the archives do not hold a copy of Baldwin's letter to Hume. His response suggests that Baldwin wrote arguing that the editorial support for constructing the European village seems ill-advised for a project seeking historical accuracy.

In a letter Hume writes to Baldwin on March 24, 1969, he reluctantly offers this advice about reconstructing the European village: "I am inclined to the belief that reconstruction (as opposed to restoring existing structures) is often more of a public relations or exploitation venture than a serious contribution to history" (1). Hume adds,

To ask the public to accept without question a hypothetical simulation of what we believe to have existed is, I feel, enormously presumptuous. To place a mock representation on the original location will inevitably destroy whatever is left of the site, making it impossible for archaeological studies to be conducted in the future and robbing the discerning visitor of the opportunity to commune privately with the past. (1-2)

Hume is an authority to whom many of the commissioners had reached for advice<sup>14</sup>. This makes Hume's judgment of the planned "hypothetical simulation" of the village one that the commissioners and Baldwin should respect, and it is clear from the ongoing

---

<sup>14</sup> See Chapter Three.

communication that Baldwin does respect and share Hume's opinion. More important, however, is the advice against reconstructing the village. Hume notes several problems, including destroying any evidence that future science could uncover as well as the irresponsibility of imposing an interpretation on a visitor. Hume suggests that such an interpretation underestimates the ability of the "discerning visitor" to interpret an archeological site for herself—much as Baldwin is seeking to do. This opinion indicates how less-biased historians may have perceived the commission's work and could have threatened it: by ruining the potential for prestige by questioning the commission's intentions and integrity.

In a letter to Zeigler, the Commission and Executive Committee member who supported Stephenson and South and the preservation of the Great House, Baldwin discloses that although she finds "our findings [to be significant]," that "we know almost nothing of the structures or dwellings in the first [European] settlement" (n. pag.). She explains, "In spite of these meager facts the Charleston group seemed insistent on having some type of village. I feel that any proposed village would of necessity be almost entirely conjectural and will ruin the site of Charles Towne forever" and later recommends, "I hope that we will at least be able to keep the village from being placed on the site of old Charles Town" (n. pag.). In her enclosed report, Baldwin opens her report to Zeigler with the authority of a primary historical source:

Mrs. B. Poyas, writing in 1851 in her 'The Olden Times of Carolina,' published in 1855, made this statement: "Old Town c. 1680...The inhabitants began not only to transfer themselves, but the materials with which their habitations had been built, across the Ashley River, so that at

this time [the nineteenth century]...all traces of that early settlement are completely eradicated.” (qtd. in Baldwin “Impressions” 1)

Baldwin later includes the voices of researchers over the next century who corroborated Poyas’ claims that the early settlement had been so early demolished for a more preferable and permanent site on the Oyster Peninsula.

Baldwin’s use of repetition and amplification of her findings indicates how she sought to absolve herself of the truth. While she could not bring herself to hide it, she also could not shoulder the blame for what might cause the controversy she so hated. Her repeated references to a history of sources—not simply her own findings but a history of findings—that this village not only did not exist the way the commission claimed but also had been completely demolished reveals perhaps how dangerous she felt her research to be. While she was supposed to help add credibility to the project, she had the power to destroy it because of what she had learned. However, Baldwin seems to recognize her own powerlessness in the situation as she seeks to cast blame on history and not on herself. She seems aware that her own credentials can be called into question because invokes the authority of others, such as Judge H.A. Smith, who wrote a 1915 account of Old Town and whom Baldwin describes as “one of our most careful researchers” (“Impressions” 1). Baldwin seems afraid to disclose her findings because her authority may be called into question, but she seems equally certain of the truth of her claims. This position seems to influence her correspondence, in the way she seeks the expert opinion of Hume from Colonial Williamsburg and the way she seeks to hide her own opinion in the historical claims of long-dead historians.

Baldwin's correspondence reveals the tenuous relationship researchers had with their subject matter and with their patrons. Scientific objectivity and academic integrity were both courted because of the symbolic capital they could add to the project, but the Commissioners and public pundits treated those same positions with suspicion because of their power to similarly discredit the project.

### **Seeking Redemption: The Researchers' Apologies as Strategies of Identification**

In August 1969, a month before the newspapers heralded headlines that touted Charles Towne Landing's demise at the hands of selfish researchers, Doctor Stephenson sought to reconcile with the commission. In a letter to Thomas Lawton on August 4, 1969, Stephenson first attempts to soothe any wounds by praising the commission:

I take this opportunity to again express to you, to Mr. Barnett, and to every member of the Tricentennial Commission, my sincerest appreciation for what you have done for archeology at the Charles Towne Site. Without your far-sighted action in supporting archeology here, the state would have lost one of its most valuable assets. Not only is this a site of historic and scientific importance, but it will be a physical structure for all of the people of the state and our out of state visitors to enjoy, where they can develop an understanding of what the birthplace of the state was really like. Your action will long be remembered with gratitude by the entire state. (1)

Stephenson's praise in this letter differs from his praise and excitement in the letter a year prior to Barnett. Here, Stephenson seeks not so much redemption alone as he seeks to

rejoin the community and persuade the commission to accept him as acting in their favor. Stephenson appeals to their wounded pride, which had been internally and externally attacked. Moreover, he situates them as the wise decision-makers who have thoughtfully considered archeology. Thus, he situates the commissioners in positions of power over him.

After this, and reporting on state of excavations at the European sites, Stephenson humbly turns to the “Indian structure,” which he admits “has caused a problem” (1). He provides the commission with two ways to handle the site: first to move the pavilion “200 feet or less, and the actual remains of the Indian structure would be saved for excavation and reconstruction, thus preserving not only the scientific and historic values but the public exhibition values as well” or to maintain the current plans “and fully excavate the Indian structure, prior to construction of the pavilion, thus preserving only the scientific and historic values and destroying the public exhibition values” (1). Stephenson’s attempt to persuade the commission to preserve the Kiawah structure is interesting in his exploitation of the benefit of tourism while juxtaposing its destruction in the loss of that benefit. Like Zeigler in his July letter, Stephenson appeals to reason, although he does so more calmly than Zeigler. Furthermore, rather than attack the commission’s judgment, he instead focuses on the benefits of allowing the excavation to transition into an exhibit at the park. In doing so, Stephenson seeks to align himself again with the goals of encouraging tourism and bringing money into the state.

Additionally, Stephenson seems to understand the importance of the seventeenth century to the commission and the Tricentennial project better than Zeigler. Stephenson asserts that the Great House is “a unique structure of the Keowah [sic] Indians, of the

period of the Charles Towne Colony, the very Indians who invited the English to settle at this place. This association with the colony adds greatly to its importance for the Tricentennial” (2). Stephenson wisely connects the Native American structure with the colony and even places them in a subservient position to the colonists. He argues that including the Great House as an exhibit and the Native American “cast” into the drama of the colonists will only benefit the historical story they are telling. In doing so, he acknowledges the commission’s privileging of the colony over the Native American. He also absolves himself of any misgivings that he intends to thwart the commission’s efforts to celebrate white history.

Although Stephenson still advocates for preserving and reconstructing the site, he argues in such a way that seeks to re-identify with the commission. Whether he does this because he truly believes in the commission’s goals or because, out of a spirit of curiosity, he wants to continue to working on the project, we will not know. What is clear, however, is his intention not only to appease the commission but to do so without seeming like he had been an aggressor. At no point does he cast judgment on the commission. Instead, he praises their insight, even though their insight will lead to what he sees as the lesser alternative, a crash excavation of the Great House site. His efforts focusing on reconciliation over winning for his side indicates how important identification is to a community, how fraught the relationship can be, and how defensive the rhetoric can become.



## Conclusion

Part of the defensive nature of identification is scapegoating. Scapegoating increases the persuasiveness of identification by positioning parties against each other into an “us/them” situation. Scapegoats, however, often do not choose to take part in their subjection, as we can see with Doctor Stephenson, and can seek to return to the community. To do so, they must humble themselves by emphasizing the desires of the community over their individual goals. Using Stephenson’s experience with the Tricentennial Commission provides us with an insight into how scapegoating can work as a persuasive method to draw people to the cause. Identification, here, is a strategy towards a broader, ongoing effort to attract more supporters into the identity. In the case of the Great House discovery, it clearly divided loyalties into a pro-Great House camp in opposition with a pro-Pavilion camp. While parties often talked in terms of timelines and finances, the repeated focus on the threat to the celebration indicates how these terms were code for racial tension. The parties may be better labeled, however oversimplistically, pro-White History and pro-Racially Inclusive History. Both sides perceive the other as threats to their parties’ goals. However, locating seemingly *real* threats are important appeals to persuade individuals to identify with the cause, which we can see happened with both sides. Thus, while scapegoating is an antagonistic strategy, it is imperative in rhetorics of identification because it contributes to the exigence and identifies an adversary.

## **Chapter Five: Celebrating the Seventeenth Century: Common Places in the Rhetoric of Identity through Charles Towne Landing and South Carolina's Tricentennial Celebration**

In its earliest stages of development and planning, the Tricentennial Committee agreed on at least one theme for the Tricentennial Commission: that Charleston's park and exhibition center would portray South Carolina's "earliest" history by recreating seventeenth-century structures and ways of life. Of course, the obvious problem with this assumption is that it excludes the history of those people, such as the Kiawah and other First Nation people, who lived on this land before the British arrived and before they imposed the name "South Carolina" on it. The seventeenth century, clearly, is not beginning of the South Carolina's history, both for the land and for the entirety of its people. In classifying the seventeenth century the starting point of South Carolina's history, the Tricentennial Commission effectively divided all pre-European history from the official, government-sanctioned narrative. Furthermore, I argue, this choice allowed white South Carolinians who perceived themselves as victims of attacks from the Civil Rights Movement and its sympathizers to construct a positive, heroic, epic narrative free of any associations of racism and eugenics by removing race from the story. Moreover, this is the point of focusing on the seventeenth century: whether consciously or not, the commission selected a century that emphasized the arrival of white colonists, which they seem to consider brought history and civilization to South Carolina.

To recreate seventeenth-century, white colonial life in South Carolina, the Tricentennial Commission hired an army of historians, archeologists, dramatists, and

architects. These scholars and professionals worked together closely to satisfy the Tricentennial Commission's vision for Charles Towne Landing, which they intended to set the tone for the rest of the exhibition centers and the entire year-long festival of South Carolina appreciation. At the beginning of the project's development, it is clear that the commission intended the dramatists and architects to consult with the historians and archeologists to authenticate their reproductions. The architects would build replicas of seventeenth-century domiciles and businesses, such as a carpenter's shop or a smithy. Based on archeological findings, agriculturalists might consult with the landscaping crew about planting, maintaining, and harvesting small farms or plots that would resemble colonial farming efforts. Finally, the dramatists would write scripts and design costumes based on information they gleaned from primary source documents. Hired actors would then simulate seventeenth-century life by performing the script and wearing the costumes.

Documents from 1967 through 1969—the most pressing and trying years of the commission's work—reflect its commitment to constructing villages and forts and to using actors to reenact seventeenth-century life in proprietary South Carolina. These details are painstakingly recounted in letters and records, particularly a Tricentennial Commission document titled "Committees of the Tricentennial Commission." In this document, the commission lists and describes various committees, which commission members would direct. In this chapter, I will pay close attention to three committees and their work manifesting replicas of the seventeenth century: the committee on "Scholarly

Activities,” the committee on “Commemorative Events,” and finally the committee on “Tourist Activities” (“Committees of the Tricentennial Commission”)<sup>15</sup>.

However, I now look at how these three committees worked together on what I see as a project to associate the seventeenth century with the progress and history of white South Carolinas and to erase and silence race and diversity from the narrative. As I have shown in previous chapters, and continue to develop in this chapter, the Tricentennial Commission worried less about accurate history, as their conflict with archeologists Dr. Stephenson and Stanley South reveal, and more about constructing a history that portrayed white South Carolina’s past in a positive light. I argue that the commission spun the seventeenth century as a trope to use rhetorically to challenge associations being made in public discourse, discourse that they perceived threatened South Carolina’s identity.

Between 1967 and 1969, the years leading up to the opening celebrations in April 1970, the Tricentennial Commission repeatedly defended their work by using “history,” and “the seventeenth century,” specifically, as reasons for the Tricentennial Celebration to exist. They were able to invent various reasons that utilized these terms as meaningful premises to support their proposition for Charles Towne Landing’s cultural importance. I see these and similar terms operating like Aristotelian “commonplaces.” I see the Tricentennial Commission frequently justifying their project because it is “historical.” The word historical—and all the synonyms or similar claims they make—implies a host

---

<sup>15</sup> I have already discussed activities that fell under the Committee on Scholarly Activities purview: Agnes Baldwin’s historical recovery efforts, as well as South’s and Stephenson’s archeological projects, for example.

of arguments subsumed by the word. The commission seemed to rely on the audience to infer the meanings and arguments implicit in the word. Based on their audience's acceptance of "history" as a reason and its own argument for the project's relevance, they felt they could move forward as victors. Therefore, the theory of commonplaces and their importance in rhetoric helps to build my own frame for the power that the trope of "the seventeenth century" seemed to wield in the years leading to the 1970 celebrations.

### **Chapter Outline**

In this chapter, I argue that "the seventeenth century" became a meaningful commonplace for the Tricentennial Commission. They often employed it as an appeal to logos by using "seventeenth century" as an argument of precedence. Similarly, they appealed to pathos when they used the past to evoke nostalgia. I argue that they used the seventeenth century to include and exclude certain populations from their historical narrative by comparing the past to present to establish historical precedence and to produce nostalgia. Furthermore, I argue that they appropriated the term "history" and its synonyms as codes for "white history." In previous chapters, I have explored how the commission manipulated research and pressured archeologists to yield to the commission's preconceived historical theories about South Carolina. I have also explored how they exploited connections with the United Kingdom to yoke their identity with one whose history seems more authoritative because of the weight of years and its reputation for austerity. In this chapter, I reconsider both of these methods of identity construction with the commission's use of the seventeenth century.

In this chapter, I first analyze how the Tricentennial Commission uses the commonplace of history to structure their arguments. I investigate how they attempt to validate their project by using conjectural questions to prove that their narrative did exist and therefore to create a definition or concept of how the South should be by drawing from questions of past conjecture. I assert that they use history comparatively to justify their nostalgic endeavors as well as to use the park as an argument that the past—a past before African Americans had voting rights and civic privileges—was better than the chaos of post-Civil Rights Era-America. Finally, I investigate how they employed “history” as a performative commonplace by interrogating commission-endorsed performances of the seventeenth century as methods of celebration.

### **How the Tricentennial Commission Used the Past to Define the Present**

Documents from 1968 make it clear that many of the commissioners and the Charleston committee members did not understand what seventeenth-century may have looked and been like. A letter dated October 23, 1968, from Charleston attorney Robert M. Hollings makes this confusion and misperception clear. He writes to Thomas Lawton, the Tricentennial Chairman, and James Barnett, the Tricentennial Director, after the committee members met on October 22, 1968, to consider proposals from architects about ways to develop the Old Town site that would become Charles Towne Landing. In his letter, Hollings expresses disappointment with the current proposals, but he also reveals why so many members of the advisory committee might share his feelings—a lack of emphasis on the past (1-2). He tells the two Tricentennial Commissioners,

Some other comments made at the meeting were that the building should reflect the European background of the settlers. This was exemplified in the sort of town that they build on this site; it was medieval in character, the houses being built solidly—one next to the other in the front of long narrow lots which provide an interior open block enclosed behind a defensive perimeter of houses. (1-2)

In this excerpt, Hollings' emphasis on "the European background" reveals to contemporary audiences the kinds of facts on which the commission's conjecture was based. For the commissioners and their local Charleston advisory committee, South Carolina history begins with white European settlers rather than the Kiawah who had lived on the Old Town site thousands of years prior to the British colonists' arrival to Albemarle Point. He reveals the commonly held opinion that South Carolina history began with the European settlers.

Additionally, he demonstrates how poorly the commission and its contracted employees understood the seventeenth century architecture, since he refers to buildings that are "medieval in character" (2). He conflates two eras. I interpret this conflation as a misunderstanding of and assumptions about their informing historical perspective. This assumption influenced the way the commission, its researchers, and later its architects began to shape the celebration generally and Charles Towne Landing specifically. They began their inquiry not from a question of all history but from a specific history, the European arrival. This starting point, then, reveals their assumption about the conditions that would make "real" history, or authoritative history: the agents of the past must be white. For the commission's purposes, it is clear that historical investigation excluded

pre-colonist history. This effectively positions all non-European cultures' past as non-history, or at least not authoritative. More importantly, because South Carolina history begins with the arrival of European colonists, then non-Europeans are excluded from South Carolina history because they are not European in origin. If European history is the precedent for what is historical, then the pre-European history is not historical and therefore excluded from the state narrative.

During the years of planning for the 1970 celebration, the Tricentennial Commission frequently compared the present with the past to argue that twentieth-century South Carolinians would benefit from unique opportunities to engage with history at Charles Towne Landing and during the opening celebrations. They used similar arguments when the celebrations started in April of 1970. The commission used these kinds of arguments so frequently that I draw two inferences. First the commission likely believed its own rhetoric. Additionally, they wanted others to believe in their view of history and to identify with each other as a community because that shared history and belief in its value were sites of consubstantiation. Although the commission's arguments implied division and even potentially fostered it, they seemed to intend these comparisons to operate as strategies of identification. They did not seem to recognize the ways they courted dis-identification in the way they drew historical boundaries.

The common topic of conjecture often seeks to establish boundaries or definitions. According to Crowley and Hawhee, "Contemporary rhetors resort of the topic of conjecture to describe the way things are: how people typically behave; what communities believe; how the world works. Such conjectures may include portraits of a community's history (past conjecture), as well as pictures of its future (future



conjecture)” (91). I would draw attention to Crowley and Hawhee’s repetition of the word “community” in their description of the common topic of conjecture. Communities are important to rhetoric. As both early and contemporary rhetoricians point out, rhetoric requires interaction between the speaker and an audience. Rhetoric involves building claims on *doxa*—the community’s common opinions—and seeking to build community onto the idea of consensus. Therefore, rhetoric essentially builds community by establishing community identities. I argue that the commission engaged in identification by its use of past conjecture. They invited their audiences to participate in the comparative process. They did this first in the planning stage primarily through written communication and media publicity. Later in this chapter, I examine how the commission’s use of performances of the seventeenth century invited some audiences to experience the comparisons the commission sought to make. Thus, I argue, historical parks such as Charles Towne Landing are sites of what I call “experiential rhetoric.” In experiential rhetoric, the rhetor’s success depends upon the audience’s physical engagement with the mode of delivery; the park or other interactive sites are strategies of conjecture, and the experience of walking through and engaging with the park’s materials are methods of delivery.

I consider the Tricentennial Commission (and, by extension, the South Carolina state government, which authorized and worked collaboratively with the commission) to be rhetors. Because of this consideration, I observe their efforts as rhetorical. They are rhetorical not only because arguments are imbedded in their use of history but because these arguments are politically, socially, and civically charged. From this point, we can analyze what they are trying to achieve by situating their use of “history” as a rhetorical

strategy. It seems that not only did the Tricentennial Commission seek to make a claim about what happened in the past, what kind of South existed in the late-seventeenth century, but they also sought to use that to argue about what kind of South should exist today. The commission used history as evidence for the arguments of identity implied in what they included and excluded from the three exhibition sites.

While the Tricentennial Commission and its goal—to celebrate South Carolina’s three-hundredth anniversary—were not explicit reactions to the Civil Rights movement, they use similar rhetorical strategies by emphasizing history to authenticate their decisions. Using history, then, seemed an important topic in formulating arguments of identity, and likely still is. However, in the mid-1960s and early-1970s, the Southern tradition and culture was under attack; thus, looking to the past as precedence seems to be the primary procedure for generating arguments to maintain tradition. History creates precedence, and from precedence, deliberative conjectural arguments can be made. However, the commission used the past selectively, and some of their records reveal that they did not accurately understand their selections.

The commission’s concern about linking the past to the present suggests that they were not only seeking to discover (or create, as I contend) what happened in the past but they also wanted to establish what should happen in 1970 and later. The exclusion of minority narratives and contributions from South Carolina history argues implicitly that under-represented groups do not belong to the South because they never did belong to the South. Focusing on South Carolina as a colony and, therefore, avoiding pre-American history and the racially-focused history of the Civil War and Reconstruction neatly neglects these groups’ contributions because the commission and the state could argue

that they did not contribute to the settlement and therefore to establishing South Carolina as a state.

This assumed starting point reflects how their procedure for making their argument was influenced by privileging white, European culture. Furthermore, Hollings' account of the opinions reflects the power of community opinion on factual discovery. Before the local advisory meeting, the statewide Tricentennial Commission had made clear its own position about what constitutes history: the first permanent settlement. From the earliest commission meetings, no one countered this as the starting point, nor did the local advisory committee at this 1968 meeting.

In fact, the commission questioned this assumption only twice: on September 21, 1966, and again in 1969 when Stephenson and South discovered the Great House. However, the first seeming opposition did not question 1670 as the point of origin but rather arresting their historical efforts at 1670. Charles Lee, the director of the South Carolina Department of History and Archives, encouraged the commission to consider 1670 not simply as the precipice of South Carolina history but rather as the actual point of origin for South Carolina progress. In this meeting on September 21, 1966, Lee introduced the commission to several historic trails throughout the state that the Historic Interagency Resources Council had approved the Archives to develop (1). Lee was not arguing with the starting point but rather that "300 years of history can be depicted through the development of historic trail" ("Minutes 9/21/1966" 1). He proposed that the commission work with the Historic Interagency Resources Council to develop these trails to showcase a span of history rather than a moment of history, and the commission unanimously passed this proposal (1). Despite Lee's early move to encourage the

commission to develop the celebration into a statewide panorama of history, clearly, by 1968, the focus on the Charleston exhibition site and the historical recreation had once again become the commission's dominant concept of the celebration.

It seems important to point out additionally that the commission intended the Tricentennial Celebration both to elevate the past but also to make a connection between the values and progress of the past with the present conditions of 1966. In the introduction to their book *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Memorials and Museums*, Ott, Blair, and Dickinson assert that rhetorical memory “[narrates] a common identity” (7). Additionally, they remark, “Public memory has been variously described as responding to needs of the present, serving the interests of the present, animating the present, serving as rhetorical resources of the present, and so forth” (12). In 1966, the South was under actual attacks about their policies and practices of racial discrimination; however, many Southerners perceived this national-scale criticism attacking not so much practices of racial discrimination but rather Southern traditions and ways of life.

In his book about Southern culture and beliefs leading up to and through the Civil Rights Movement in America, Jason Morgan Ward draws connections between racism in the South and its desire to assert “natural order” through segregation, noting, “For many white Southerners..., black subordination affirmed a natural order” (1). Natural order, then, is synonymous with “tradition,” and suggests perhaps even more power. As common places circulating within the Civil Rights Era-South, many Southerners used arguments of tradition as conjectural arguments that used historical precedence as premises for maintaining a status quo. Yet critics of the South and separate-but-equal laws argued that a tradition's relevance was contingent upon culture, and as culture

changed, so too would tradition. Like Southerners seeking to maintain legal practices of racism, Civil Rights activists could also argue against tradition by using historical arguments to demonstrate evidence of discriminatory traditions changing as culture changed. Arguments about “natural order,” however, were similar in form and frame with tradition, but they asserted the past as evidence not for culturally contingent traditions but on “the way things should be,” seeking to make change out of the question because it would be unnatural and therefore wrong, morally, ethically, and naturally.

By 1966, however, the Civil Rights Act had been passed, a signal that old ways of life and previous sites of consubstantiation were no longer as effective strategies toward identification. However, the Tricentennial Commission’s exclusion of particular histories and groups indicates that these ways of life and beliefs still resonated within the *doxa*. The commission seemed to seek new ways of achieving identification to a broader audience. By “a broader audience,” I mean a national audience. I interpret their attempts to use the Tricentennial Celebration to attract tourists as both drawing more revenue and re-identifying by changing the process of consubstantiation without changing the identification.

Although none of the records from the Tricentennial Commission collection suggest that the celebration directly responded to any reduced tourism numbers, the records contain evidence that the commission was particularly interested in enticing tourists. According to the document entitled “Committees of the Tricentennial Commission,” the Committee on Tourist Activities was supposed “to with the Historical Resources Division of the State Archives and with the State Development Board to lay out tourist routes through the state,....to make a survey of available accommodations in

motels and hotels, to make a survey of bus, rail, and air transportation facilities, to ascertain the need for opening new historical sites” (1-2), among other responsibilities. The relationship between tourism and history cannot be ignored in this case, because other documents tie this event with establishing a positive legacy for the state. In the commissions’ “Request for Permanent Improvement Funds for Land Acquisition and Development of the Tricentennial Parks in Charleston, Columbia and Greenville” prepared on March 1, 1968, the commissioners argue in their proposal to the Budget and Control Board that the commission’s cooperative work with “the Department of Parks, Recreation and Tourism, will be exerting every effort to make a really meaningful contribution to the legacy of our State, and to provide the special means of attracting and holding over many extra tourists and millions of additional revenue” (1). They raise the importance of tourism again in the document by justifying the three exhibition projects:

In effect, the Tricentennial Exposition Centers or Parks [which includes Charles Towne Landing] will be the show windows for the activities and attractions throughout the State. They will serve to lure the tourist from the highway and interest every member of the traveling family by the many exhibits and displays in the exposition buildings. These will be operating industrial displays, historical exhibits, motion pictures, gift shops offering South Carolina crafts and other souvenir wares, restaurants featuring local specialties and attractions for children of all ages. (1)

The commission informs the Budget and Control Board that they need a total of \$2,917,500.00 (5) alone for the Charleston park, which they declared would “emphasize the State’s history” (2). This includes \$437,500 (5) to acquire Old Town from the

Warings. They ask for \$733,000 less for the Columbia park, which was supposed to exhibit “South Carolina’s contributions to government and patriotism on both the State and National levels” (2). It is \$1,019,500 more than their request for funds for the Piedmont center, which they intended to showcase “the development of the State’s industrial might and...its space age future” (2).

It is clear from this request how much value the commissioners put into the attraction of history. Even before the other parks took on more historical flavors<sup>16</sup>, the value on history as a means to attract and persuade tourists to the state is made evident in how much more money the commission requested for the historically-themed Charleston park compared to the other two exhibition centers. This figure—nearly \$3 million—paired with the assertion that this celebration of history would create a legacy for South Carolina reveals the crux of the argument: South Carolina’s legacy already exists in its history, not in its present. Even more, its present is its past, because the commission intends to recreate history and make it present.

As I have pointed out earlier, and as other scholars of memorials have considered, memorials of past events are forms of epideictic rhetoric. They argue for the privileging or minimizing of certain values or activities in the present. I argue that these kinds of historically-informed cultural artifacts do more than use the past for arguments of precedence but rather argue for present existence. They conflate the contingencies of the past and the present. This conflation of past and present, as I have pointed out, makes the

---

<sup>16</sup> Eventually, all three exhibition sites showcased historical themes.

eras inseparable. For example, in a document title “The S.C. Tricentennial”<sup>17</sup> that summarizes the event, the writer demonstrates this temporal conflation: “Through interesting historical exhibits, we’ll spotlight the contributions our forebears made to the development of our nation. We will highlight our way of life—the gentleness of our land and of our people. In short, we will put South Carolina’s best—and most interesting!—foot forward” (“The S.C. Tricentennial” 3). The verbs and temporality shift through these sentences: the future tense in “we’ll,” preterit in “made,” and present implied in the verbless phrase “our way of life.” This kind of argument for memorials of the past indicates how temporality becomes conflated.

Temporal conflation is essential, I argue, for rhetorics of identity that use the past to shape their contemporary identities. In this dissertation, I have repeatedly forwarded my thesis that rhetorics of identity dependent upon historical memorials and commemoration are defensive rhetorics. Essential to this defensive rhetoric is the use of common topic of conjecture, which frames not only the reasons for constructing the entire celebration but also Charles Towne Landing. As I have pointed out, the common topic of conjecture is a heuristic that asks questions about existence. Typically, forensic uses of conjecture seek to confirm or deny that an event, person, or object existed in fixed and completed state in the past. However, this use of conjecture, which is common to the Tricentennial Commission and other historically-based celebrations, transcends temporality. It covers all time, past, present, and future. However, the repeated use of the indicative mood here suggests completeness and stability. This mood paired with the

---

<sup>17</sup> I have not found a purpose of this document, although it resembles some newsletters in the archives.



expansive temporality implies that the “way of life” that identifies South Carolinians is transcendent as well.

While the “way of life” of “gentleness” transcends time, it does not transcend place, and this, too, is an essential feature of rhetorics of identity as evidenced by the Tricentennial Commission’s work toward commemorative landscapes and history. Because “history” used in this way, in rhetorics of identity via commemoration and memorials, transcends time but is still fixed to a place, it becomes a kind of product through which others might identify the place and the community that stakes a claim to it. Because these arguments about the transcendent existence of identifying qualities are forensic in nature, they often manifest themselves materially. In the case of the Tricentennial Commission and Charles Towne Landing, history manifested itself in the park through archeological research intended to verify pre-existing claims about the past; in the reconstruction of seventeenth-century ways of life and products, such as the village the commission intended to build; in the various performances of seventeenth-century practices, such as costume balls and reenactments; and, finally, in the products in the gift shops. Through these material manifestations of seventeenth-century products and practices, the commission could identify twentieth-century South Carolina with values in the 1600s that they felt would provide a positive legacy. This legacy existed in the values associated with the products, for instance, gentility.

In commemoration, production of memory is not simply remembrance, which Blair and other rhetoricians have noted. Rhetors use products as evidence that values existed in the past; they use those same products, whatever they are, to argue from precedence that these values should and do exist in the present. This is clear in the nature

of verb tense in the passage I analyzed above. The blurring between past, present, and future “ways of life” in this summative document rests upon the assertion that these values are the traditions and natural order that survive the contingencies of time. These values become the legacy that tourists can invest in through their tourism. The legacy in the past is the legacy of the present, and it will extend into the future. As forms of evidence, these are material objects that can be remembered or purchased, and then associated with the legacy asserted through commemoration. In this way, the themes of “history” and “seventeenth century” become products and values accessible to twentieth-century tourists.

The legacy of the seventeenth century, according to the commission, exists still in the twentieth century, which is a reason for commemoration. Endurance must be celebrated. But the feature of endurance implied by the timelessness of the verbs used in arguments supporting commemoration suggests a struggle. For a legacy to endure, it must face a challenge. The implied challenge is a feature, I argue, of how conjectural arguments work in rhetorics of identity. The commission does not seek to identify what has challenged South Carolina’s legacy: it does not need to. Time, itself, is the suggestion, because the contingencies of time bring such sweeping cultural changes.

More importantly for my argument, the implied endurance of a legacy amplifies the defensive characteristics of rhetorics of identity. For the commission, not only have the values of seventeenth-century South Carolinians withstood the test of time, but they have combatted it. Endurance suggests struggle against a foe, even if it is unnamed. In seeking to prove that an enduring legacy existed for South Carolinians, the commission also invited contemporary South Carolinians to continue to fight to maintain the legacy

through commemoration. Commemorative sites like parks, then, that use history are sights that seek to battle time. Thus, even when rhetors do not identify a human or institutional agent as a threat, rhetorics of identity often utilize time when they argue from history. History, time, and legacies, as I have shown, then are commonplaces used in conjectural arguments not only to establish precedence and to create memory, but also as evidence of material that needs protection. Protection, then, becomes yet another way of life, an identifying feature.

To neglect them, the commission had to suggest a sense of community completion. Historical discovery of an established and well-developed community that did not rely on other pre-existing communities to help them develop South Carolina into the state they wanted to perceive it as in that late 1960s. Hollings' letter to Lawton and Barnett is, again, useful to show they used history to construct a completed historical narrative. According to Hollings,

The Committee also heard from Mr. Emmett Robinson, who has been making significant progress in his research of the Old Town site with particular respect to the layout of streets, the type of housing, the location of various facilities, the location of residences of specialized craftsmen, etc. The Sub-Committee feels that enough material is being assembled to justify a major effort in the re-creation of Old Town. It is the feeling of the Sub-Committee that it is here that the major tourist attraction will be. It is the opinion of the Sub-Committee that before budget allocations are solidified, commitments for the construction of the main building should not jeopardize the full development of the old village itself. (2)

Earlier in this chapter, I emphasized how the commission and the Charleston sub-committee used the common topic of past conjecture to establish precedence of identity. In this case, Hollings focuses not only on a pre-twentieth-century South Carolina identity but also on the importance of a completed settlement. Hollings notes that Emmett Robinson, a renowned local dramatist and faculty member of the Department of Drama at the College of Charleston, had discovered what kinds of villages would have existed in colonial American and interpreted some of his research as signs of a complete and permanent settlement.

Hollings' details about the streets, houses, and businesses suggest not only a settlement, but an established colony. Furthermore, it indicates a colony that the Europeans built. Earlier in the letter, Hollings suggests that South Carolina represents simply a transfer of Europe from the European continent to America. His details here amplify this sense of transfer. In other words, he sees this as not so much an American legacy but a global one, one that is complete and withstanding the changes of time. Implied in Hollings' details is the idea that existence requires protection for a continued legacy.

The commission used conjectural arguments that utilized "history" and "seventeenth century" as common places in a variety of ways. First and foremost, during a time when much of the South, including many South Carolinians, felt attacked, they defended their ways of life. They did this, however, by inviting identification rather than courting division, because their use of history made time the enemy rather than contemporary human agents. Furthermore, this use of time and history allowed the commission to manifest their exhibition sites, notably Charles Towne Landing, as ways

to manifest the historical values that they wanted to assert in the present. In this way, these recreations of the seventeenth century also become evidence for an enduring legacy.

### **Historical Investigation, Evidence, and Reenactment as Arguments of Degree: Who Is More Deserving of Commemorative Representation?**

Of course, the commission did not use the commonplaces of history and the seventeenth century only as evidence of a pre-existing legacy. Relying solely on conjectural arguments would not build a strong case for the tricentennial project or the park as long-term financial investments. Furthermore, because the commission intended the exhibition sites, particularly Charles Towne Landing, to become permanent historical parks, the commissioners needed to discover and articulate an exigence for commemoration as well as to defend their commemorative choices. Their conjectural arguments asserting South Carolina's historical and cultural legacy may not have built a strong enough case to win the millions of dollars they needed from various federal and state institutions to build the exhibition sites, nor would it have seemed a fitting justification for the drastic changes to Charleston's infrastructure to support the traffic for the Charles Towne Landing.

The commission used both explicit and implicit arguments of degree to solicit funds and support the project's relevance. These arguments were ways of asserting that the identity that the commission wanted to commemorate was more deserving than other identities that could be commemorated. In seeking both funding and land—in other words, various kinds of support—they forwarded a preferred identity, one that they felt had more cultural resonance over others. Their arguments were developed, in part, by

framing them as issues of degree, asserting that the tricentennial plans were more deserving than other plans for the funds. Additionally, as the commission began to develop Old Town into Charles Towne Landing and discovered Kiawah artifacts, they found that they often had to return to arguments of degree to support their decisions to bury the discovery site and privilege the European colony over the Kiawah remains.

Many rhetoricians investigating rhetorics of identity often frame their analyses in terms of memory and erasure. In “Memory’s Execution: (Dis)Placing the Dissident Body,” Bernard J. Armada boldly but traditionally claims, “Whenever an act of remembrance is produced or performed, competing memories are issued a death sentence, deflected by the former unless someone else comes along to keep the latter alive” (216). Armada and others argue that when one identity is privileged, others are forgotten. However, an analysis of the kinds of arguments of degree used in rhetorics of identity reveal that framing this debate dialectically between remembering and forgetting oversimplifies the means of persuasion and the negotiation of the variety of identities that circulate within a culture. I argue that rhetorics of identity that use commemoration and memorials on landscapes do not so much erase identities rather than argue that some identities are more deserving of a privileged status.

This is an important distinction from other arguments about the rhetoric of identity implicit in memorials and commemoration. I argue that this kind of rhetoric does not argue explicitly for erasure but rather for privileging. It should be noted that erasure or cultural forgetting can result from the circulation of more privileged identities, so I am not asserting that forgetting is not a risk or a problem. Rather, I am arguing that because rhetorics of identity are defensive in nature, they need other identities to make them

relevant. This is why so most, if not all, rhetorics of identity depend upon arguments of degree. This use of degree also underscores by primary assertion in this dissertation: that rhetorics of identity are inherently and explicitly defensive.

Sites that are historical, commemorative, or memorial are worthy exemplars of rhetorics of identity because of their unique use of history and comparative argumentation. These kinds of sites are inherently comparative. They ask people in the present to compare their “now” with the “then.” I agree with Ott, Blair, and Dickinson that places of public memory—like Charles Towne Landing—often seek to reify or challenge present conditions by using the past. But what has been neglected is how the past is used as arguments of degree to construct identities. These sites and the people responsible for them have to forward multiple arguments about the past, about the present, and about the need for a memory. They do this, in part, by careful comparison not only of past against present but of one identity against other. They construct identities through implicit and explicit comparisons. These sites use history not only as justification for commemoration but also as defensive mechanisms for ongoing support of the memory. These uses of history often create exigence by articulating counter identities against which they juxtapose their own claims of identification. This continuous comparison works to maintain an identity’s relevance and strength.

Arguments of degree not only seek to privilege one value or memory over another; they also invite the audience to judge changes and determine if these changes are beneficial to the communal identity. Crowley and Hawhee elaborate on this: “rhetors can argue that some state of affairs is better, more just, more honorable, or more expedient than another, or less so. Using the topic of degree they can also argue that changes in

these values have occurred over time: some state of affairs is less good than it used to be, or will deteriorate in the future” (93). I argue that the use of the seventeenth-century narrative is an argument of degree. By bringing the past into the present, the Tricentennial Commission compares the past against the present. Not only do they privilege one particular memory, but they also argue against other contemporary identities by making the past an exemplar of goodness. In other words, the rhetor may argue that one collective identity has deteriorated because it has forgotten the values of the past; then, the rhetor argues that the rhetor’s collective identity is therefore better and perhaps more faithful to the community’s ancestors because they have maintained certain traditions. This attendance to the past, then, not only elevates memory but also defends the identity the rhetor constructs by building comparisons.

I argue that the Tricentennial Commission engages in rhetorics of comparison by turning memory into history and making that history present in the park. They did this in multiple, concrete ways. The first was planning to turn the Waring property into Charles Towne Landing. Secondly, by transitioning the Waring property from Old Town into the state park Charles Towne Landing, it became a theater and a stage for the past to manifest in the present. These manifestations were also concrete ways they made the past present. They used films, *South Carolina Tricentennial Story* and *Carolina*, and reenacted colonial life. I also want to point out that Charles Towne Landing was not the only stage for these reenactments but made room for the rest of Charleston to become a stage for them. By manifesting the past, asking tourists to watch it, and inviting only certain people to enact it, the Tricentennial Commission authorized one memory as history and it



elevated one kind of way of life over others. It also defended this way of life against the cultural changes that threatened it—threats called time and modernization.

To forward my claim that rhetorics of identity are inherently defensive in the ways that they seek to privilege one identity and invoke its relevance against counter identities, and therefore must create and legitimate counter identities as threats, I will explore how the Tricentennial Commission invokes history in its arguments. They use the colonial past to make its particular narrative of identity more relevant and therefore more deserving of commemoration. Like other writers interested in identity—politically, socially, or rhetorically—Scott Romine concludes that regionalized identities, like “the South,” exist only in relationship with other political institutions, like global and national political institutions. I am forwarding a different view of rhetorical identity: to construct one identity, the rhetor must also create a counter identity. I will look specifically how arguments of degree about Charles Towne Landing and the Tricentennial Commission construct counter identities to legitimate their project and their narrative.

### **Rhetorical Nostalgia in Places of Public Memory**

I argue that we have perhaps oversimplified nostalgia and have resisted looking at its rhetorical effects. Baudrillard also seems to suggest that the rhetorical power of nostalgia has been neglected when he asserts that nostalgia takes hold when reality changes (12). Nostalgia is powerful, according to Baudrillard, because it always houses aspects of truth and the exigence for the material production of the past (12-13). Using Baudrillard to frame my investigation of nostalgia, I argue that nostalgia is often a material condition for persuasion. Because I want to interrogate how arguments of degree

rely on nostalgia, I will also look specifically at how the commissioners rely on comparing both the present against the seventeenth century but also the seventeenth century colonists against other inhabitants of South Carolina in the seventeenth century. This commonplace not only works as an argument of degree to support legitimating a memory, but it also seeks to reify cultural norms by focusing on white achievement.

### *Reenacting 1670 to Revive Values*

Joseph McGee, a member of the executive committee and main contact with for the Charleston exhibition site, reveals how upsetting the commissioners found criticism. In a letter to Travis Medlock of Columbia, South Carolina, on August 25, 1969, McGee opens by expressing his unhappiness with Medlock, stating, “I am really distressed to receive a copy of your letter of August 22 to Tom Lawton. It is another black cloud just when I thought we were beginning to see some bright rays” (McGee 1).

Medlock had a controversial role as a commissioner, often opposing the commission’s majority. In a letter dated August 22, 1969, to Thomas Lawton, Medlock joined a minority contingent in the commission that sought to slow down the 1969 excavation of the Kiawah Great House with hopes that the commission could incorporate this discovery into the Charles Towne Landing narrative (1). In this letter, Medlock often cites the commission’s reputation and how it affects the state’s reputation. He recounts a conversation with an un-named “gentleman” who told Medlock “that in his opinion much of our public image problem relates to ‘the tomfoolery’ of covering the site of great historic value” (1).

In response on August 25, 1969, McGee argues that “a great many people in Charleston were utterly frustrated in our efforts to develop a reconstructed village” but that they pressed forward, without making their progress public, because it was best for the project, the city, and the state (1). Although McGee later aligns himself with Medlock on the issue of the Great House, his use of the reconstructed village to serve the greater good is implied in his response and provides a useful insight into the rhetoricity of the seventeenth century to this project. What is interesting in this case, as in many cases of how commissioners use the seventeenth century rhetorically, is that they often locate history as a way to benefit the majority, although they leave their reasons undeclared. The absence of reasons suggests that commissioners like McGee expect their audience to understand how manifesting history in the present somehow benefits them.

This exchange among Medlock, Lawton, and McGee highlights what I believe to be the crux of the matter: restoring South Carolina’s reputation by comparing it to the exemplary past and arguing that the legacy is better than present but also is part of the present. The past is so monolithic that it must be recovered and reconstructed for the better good, even if the majority does not agree.

History, restoration, and recovery seem to be key terms in all of these arguments using history, but particularly so in these arguments of degree. In a script for a video about the Tricentennial Celebration entitled *South Carolina Tricentennial Story*, narrator and script author John Wrisley muses, “It’s fascinating to realize that this 300 year old site remained quietly tucked away through the centuries, almost as if someone had known all along that it would be brought to life for the Tricentennial” (3). This script indicates how the past can be made to seem monolithic and how rhetorical nostalgia can be.

Wrisley's meta-discourse here, telling his audience what is fascinating, insists that the past itself and the weight of time have the gravity that demands attention. Furthermore, he uses the juxtaposition of past and present in the figure of the unknown "someone" who knew that the past would be revived. Wrisley suggests a certain forward-thinking in the people who landed at Old Town, that they understood how important their arrival would be to the future state and nation, and that they sought to preserve it. In fact, the emphasis on preservation—the site "quietly tucked away...as if someone had known all along"—indicates the need for values to be revived.

Reviving values and arguing that values should be revived—topics which often form the subjects of deliberative and epideictic rhetorics—require the rhetor to juxtapose one value system with another. In Governor Robert McNair's letter at the beginning of the published *South Carolina Tricentennial Final Report 1671-1970*, he states that the parks, including Charles Towne Landing, "[affirmed]...our respect for the past, and our optimism in the future. It was an expression of our awareness that we, as South Carolinians and Americans, are committed to the ideals which have made our state and nation great....The courage of 1670, the boldness of 1770, and the endurance of 1870 are all elements of the spirit of 1970" (n. pag.). In affirming respect for the past and in affirming the values that McNair listed, particularly courage, McNair asserts that they have come back to life and have presence again. To affirm these values, they have to compare the past to the present, and one way the commissioners sought to do this was through methods: recovering history and enacting it.

Revival is a key theme in places of public memory that insist on constructing and defining an identity. Scott Magelssen asserts that twentieth-century historical

reenactments and performative memorials are particularly fraught with political and social anxiety as technology and global wars exerted pressure to change political institutions as well as individual civic practices (3). Furthermore, he explains, people feel an anxiety to find and to construct legacies that will withstand the constant waves of change. For those wealthy enough, they carved these changes permanently into the regional and national landscapes as a way to make their values and perceptions as equally permanent as the land (3). Historical recreations and reenactments, like the ones the Tricentennial Commission imagined and partially executed, not only manifest an interpretive past in the present, but they also seek as ways to identify a place with a community and the community's set values.

To espouse more strongly the values of the past that commission wished praise, the Tricentennial Commission produced a film, *Carolina*<sup>18</sup>, narrated by Alfred Drake. They intended employees at Charles Towne Landing to play this film to tourists<sup>19</sup>. The film does not feature any actors depicting the colonists but instead seeks to recreate the past by focusing the camera on historical buildings, various landscapes, and wildlife. The producers, Carols Ramirez<sup>20</sup> and Albert H. Woods, filmed these sites in between 1969 and 1970. They feature sites from the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century that still existed in the late twentieth century. By doing this, they not only bring the past into the present, but they suggest that South Carolinians cannot escape the past because it is the present.

---

<sup>18</sup> The Department of Archives and History owns a copy of the film on DVD.

<sup>19</sup> Not only does Charles Towne Landing currently play this film, but also other parks, such as Fort Sumter. At Fort Sumter, it is played at the marina where tourists pay for their tickets, purchase gifts, and wait for their ferry to take them to the fort, which is a small island. As of 2009, Fort Moultrie also played the video.

<sup>20</sup> Ramirez is also credited with the photography for *Carolina*.

*Carolina* tells South Carolina's story using romantic images of the state's landscape. Drake's voice is the only one the audience will hear. Additionally, because Ramirez and Woods did not cast any actors, the audience will not see any people. The film opens with a wide shot of water, suggesting the sea voyage from England to South Carolina's coast. After this, the film tells story about life on the land, moving from the hardship of making a home to the grandeur of plantations. It constructs this narrative by pairing Drake's narration with images of South Carolina landscapes and architecture. It focuses on sites of endurance and survival, such as trees and large homes, and avoids images of fields needing to be harvested. It employs tight shots of wrought-iron casts and wide shots of large homes.

*Carolina*, like *South Carolina Tricentennial Story*, constructs an ethos of the past that the present should envy and seek to emulate. Narrator Alfred Drake intones that the "fewer than one-hundred fifty people" who came from England to Albemarle Point cultivated "the good black soil" so that "days of plenty stretched far ahead into the future" (n. pag.). Because the future is unspecified, it suggests to the audience that perhaps they are living in days of plenty for which they are not responsible but rather their ancestors were. According to the film, the work and struggle of these ancestors made them "worthy of a gallant land" (n. pag.). This film provides evidence of worth by showing the audience images of structures in the present that these worthy people built. Not only has their worth left lasting marks on the land, but it also sets the bar for the audience to achieve a similar worth so that they will be remembered as worthy of South Carolina, even though they will not be given the opportunity to prove themselves with a dangerous journey to conquer the land.

The land here creates what Pierre Nora calls a *lieu de mémoire* in “Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire*.” A *lieu de mémoire* is a term that describes what happens when space and memory collide to construct a historical narrative of collective identity. Nora describes *lieux de mémoire* as embodied “memorial consciousness” (12). He asserts that history, as a discourse, “is antithetical to spontaneous memory” (9) because it seeks to reconstruct or recreate a moment or event. He says that they emerge because memory appears threatened and needs to be defended, but the defense often opposes memory because it historicizes it rather than allows it to be spontaneous (12). In this tension between memory and history, natural and unnatural, presence and absence, Nora finds place to be an important feature. He says, “What makes certain prehistoric, geographical, archeological locations important as sites is often precisely what ought to exclude them from being *lieux de mémoire*: the absolute absence of a will to remember and, by way of compensation, the crushing weight imposed on them by time, science, and the dreams of men” (20-21).

According to Nora, memory is present, but history is past, and his *lieux de mémoire* describes the tension between the two. This film and Charles Towne Landing are *lieux de mémoire* because they are both historical texts and memory sites. As historical texts, they seek to make permanent the past. This permanence is made explicit in the *South Carolina Tricentennial Final Report 1670-1970*. In it, the commission explains that they intend the exhibition sites, including Charles Towne Landing, to be permanent features that would “[e]ach... stress a particular century in the existence of the state” (11). They also note that the most important history is the one they wrote onto Old Town when it became Charles Towne Landing (*Final Report* 11). *Carolina* also seeks to

make the history permanent by organizing it into a cohesive narrative. However, they are memories because these histories are often not fixated on an event but rather on the land. Even in its statement that the sites were to be permanent, the commission does not isolate events or people but rather the state and more specifically Old Town as what they want to make permanent. The film's extended scenes that feature buildings, rooms, marshes, swamps, and forests—scenes sometimes simply overlaid with orchestral musical and absent of narration—invite the audience to remember stories they had been told or simply to remember a past that they imagine and create themselves.

Imbedded in these descriptions of the past from both the transcript of *The South Carolina Tricentennial Story* and the film is an argument about the identity of the place. Not only does the script demand that the audience wonder at the survival of the site, but they are also asked to consider its historical importance by the nature of the artifacts. In the script from *The South Carolina Tricentennial Story*, Wrisley lists the various archeological discoveries at Charles Towne Landing. He intones, “Archeologists located the exact perimeter of the first settlement and built a palisade exactly where the first one stood in 1670. And while they were at it the archeologists thoroughly searched the entire area and located the actual outline of the earthenworks and fortifications” (2). Wrisley's descriptions of the discoveries reveal a preoccupation with the importance of the colony's existence as important to the current Charleston. He uses words like “exact,” “exactly,” and “actual” to underscore not simply the discovery of these structures but also the location of them. Place, here, seems to be important, as these structure mark and *demark* the land.



It also makes arguments about what is important today by redirecting our attention from the present to the past. It uses the work of recovery to suggest that the South Carolina of the past has something important to offer in the future. The work of the present has to be justified through the use of the past. This example of the seventeenth—the reference to “this 300 year old site”—does not seem obviously comparative. It does not argue explicitly that the past is better than the present, but it does ask us to consider the thoughtfulness of the “someone” who tucked the site away safely. It also asks us to consider what we might learn from the past by discovering it.

The script does not ask us to find the site fascinating, but rather informs us that it is so. Nestled into this direction is the argument that if the past still exists, then it deserves to be considered fascinating. To find it fascinating, the audience must compare it with the present to observe how time is erosive if people do not treat history and tradition with care. In the film, the audience is told that South Carolina’s forefathers were worthy, which compels us to compare ourselves to them. Both texts argue that we need to care about South Carolina and treat its history carefully.

Care is certainly highlighted in this script, and it is care of tradition that is also underscored in the commission’s defensive rhetoric of identity. Caring for history, in this context, becomes a civic act. Being a caretaker of history—a historian—then is a civic obligation that the commission imposes upon all South Carolinians. Likewise, caring for history is heroic, because it is an act of preservation of something by time and by change. Because the commission was South Carolina history’s primary caregiver, its members were given a kind of cultural authority over it. But this begs the question: what are they caring for? According to the Tricentennial Commission, they cared for one particular

historical narrative, the one they have constructed and called valuable. But since history is so intangible and ephemeral, using the land as the substance of history gives the commission and South Carolinians something concrete to preserve. It also gave them a stage on which they could perform and display their histories.

Charles Towne Landing, then, becomes an important site of memory and history. By imposing “time, science, and the dreams of men” (Nora 21) on the site, the commission reveals that it perceives its history as one that is threatened and must be inscribed to be protected; however, much of the rhetorical texts they created to underscore their history—these videos and the landscape itself, in places empty marshland—acknowledges that some memories still have powerful presence in the late twentieth century. *Carolina* as a text argues that modern South Carolinians need to make themselves worthy of the land, but falls short of telling its audience how it should accomplish such a worth. However, the history of the park performed through recovery, reconstruction, and reenactment provide a methodology for that worth.

As Magelssen observes, the threats to memory and culture are often less institutional or embodied as they are simply changes caught up in the movement of time and culture. However, the nameless threat becomes less important than the *idea* of a threat that has been beaten by the rhetor before the audience, and the rhetor’s success is evidenced by the artifacts of history suggested by the performance. In other words, the rhetor who argues for an identity based on an uncovered and restored past does not

require actual artifacts to legitimate the reenactment<sup>21</sup>. The history, the commission's films, and later their authorized reenactments become evidence created in the present to prove a claim in the past. The narrative of history itself becomes an artifact and confirms not only the existence of a history that was lost but also the rhetor's work on behalf of the community he seeks to serve.

### *Recovery and Heroism*

Part of what makes the employing arguments of degree as historical recovery or restoration so interesting and compelling for audiences is that it situates the rhetor as heroes. The theme of heroism resonates with many, if not all, rhetorics of identity, and particularly in the case of the Tricentennial Commission's construction of Charles Towne Landing. The commission often used rhetoric that alluded to their endeavors as heroic, which implied that they, as the agents of recovery, were heroes. In this way, the commission asserted itself as a heroic figure during the 1960s when so many institutionalized traditions that white southerners valued came under scrutiny and attack.

The heroic figure that emerges through recovery deserves some critical attention. My primary assertion in this dissertation is that rhetorics of identity are inherently defensive rhetorics that frequently create an exigence for the rhetorical discourse by creating an aggressor and an attack that victimizes the rhetor. Thus it may seem

---

<sup>21</sup> I am not arguing that artifacts are not useful and important to historical performances that assert some kind of recovery and restoration. I am simply arguing that they are not always necessary for these performances and their arguments to exist and to be persuasive. While artifacts that corroborate the historical performance are helpful to legitimate both the rhetor's ethos as well as the performance's authenticity, I argue here that they are not always necessary to make the performance relevant. Regardless, it is clear from my investigation that the Tricentennial Commission desired to discover artifacts that supported the narrative of colonial Carolina that they forwarded.

contradictory for me to claim now that rhetors in rhetorics of identity that utilizes comparative heuristics of recovery assert themselves as heroic figures in the attack. Being a victim and being a hero are not mutually exclusive roles. Studying the rhetoric of identity that emerged from Charles Towne Landing provides a compelling opportunity to understand how creating opportunities for reenactments also provide rhetors the means to seem heroic.

Various commissioners often reminded critics and even supporters that they were recovering history, saving it from decay. Governor McNair called the celebration “an investment in the pride and self-confidence of our state” (*Final Report* n. pag.). McNair asserts that history has value and can add value to the present. In describing the historical recovery and memorializing efforts, he also suggests that someone had to have the means to invest in this pride and self-confidence. Additionally, he implies that South Carolina needed to invest in pride and self-confidence.

McNair never names an agent who invests in South Carolina’s pride and self-confidence by creating the tricentennial celebration. However, the inclusion of his letter in the *Final Report*, which the commission compiled and published, and his intimate participation with the commission associates the commission with the investment. His implication that the state needed pride and self-confidence makes room for the reader to perceive the investor as heroic, because the agent invested in and stored pride and self-confidence, and to invest is a heroic act. Perhaps because of the vast cultural changes during the 1960s, their efforts of revival seem more obvious and evocative. The focus on the site being “[brought] to life” (Wrisley 3) by the commission uses nostalgia to create a sense of appreciation for those parties who would uncover, recover, and repair the past by

restoring it to public memory. Situating the past as a damsel in distress and the rhetors as heroes additionally implies a threat, even if the threat is unnamed.

*Reenacting the 1670, the Cultural Exemplar and Performing History*

The Tricentennial Commission not only composed written arguments (including scripts for films and letters) that used arguments of degree to build their credibility as authors of South Carolina's identity; they also used performances in which people—sometimes professional actors they employed but equally often public figures—dressed in colonial clothing and simulated some kind of historical event. The period clothing and reenacted events composed commonplaces, or “statements that regularly circulate within members of a community” (Crowley and Hawhee 91). I argue that the rhetorical notion of commonplaces can be expanded from statements to images and performances that occur and are used among members of a community to construct an ideology.

The Tricentennial Commission used this temporal disruption to evoke a longing for a lost identity that they argued was regal, genteel, aristocratic, and brave. The Tricentennial festivities commenced in April 1970 in Charleston, and would move inland to the Midlands and Piedmont exposition sites throughout the year. Charleston's celebrations, however, were the grandest and longest, with an intense month of activities: a parade with ornate floats and period costumes, the opening of Charles Towne Landing, the Lords Ball<sup>22</sup>, a high tea and costume contest, and a reenacted battle at Fort Dorchester. However, shortly before the park opened, plans to build a village at Charles Towne Landing were cancelled because “the archeological investigation failed to

---

<sup>22</sup> It was often called the Lords Proprietors Ball as well.

establish the exact foundations of the structures themselves, [and] it was decided that a conjectural reconstruction would be undesirable” (*Final Report* 28-29). The commission did, however, include an “authentic full scale replica of a 17<sup>th</sup> century trading ketch” (29) near the settlement site. Despite this early exclusion of reenactments from the park<sup>23</sup>, the commission managed to reenact history outside of the park and intimately associate these performances with both the celebration and the park itself. Many of these events—the parade, the ball, the tea, and the reenacted battle—either invited an audience to watch costumed actors create impressions of the past or to dress up themselves and enact a romanticized past. These events were perhaps the most publicized reenactments as well as the most publicized tricentennial events.

I will analyze the media coverage of the rhetorical performances of the Lords Proprietors Ball and the parade. There were many reenactments to choose—a battle at Fort Dorchester, various school pageants, tea parties, et cetera—but these two events received the most public attention. Furthermore, they showcase two different approaches to reenactment pageantry: the parade was a public event, but the ball was exclusive by invitation only. All of three of these events, however, proposed a romanticized history of the seventeenth century. These events that celebrated the tricentennial idealized the seventeenth century by constructing it as void of issues of race, misogyny, and civil rights. These events highlighted the heroism and gentility of South Carolina. The reenactments created a longing to restore these virtues in the present, and this longing created a complimentary sense of absence. Furthermore, these reenactments are

---

<sup>23</sup> By the 1980s, a conjectural village had been constructed with actors performing village life in Charles Towne Landing.

arguments of degree because they suggest that the past was a better time than the present. This, I argue, the need to argue that the present is deficient, is a key feature in rhetorics of identity and underscores the antagonistic, defensive quality of this genre of discourse.

Many scholars and actors of these performances often call them reenactments or living history. The Tricentennial Commission's use of Charleston and the Charles Towne Landing opening ceremonies provided South Carolinians various opportunities to reenact or to watch reenactments of the colonial past. Although the commissioners planned for Charles Towne Landing to feature actors simulating daily life in the colony when the park opened, these performances did not come to fruition until after the opening ceremony. Instead, the commission threw a "Lords' Ball," tea and costume parties, and school events where South Carolina residents, mostly those in the Charleston-area, could dress up and pretend to be their venerated ancestors.

These performances deserve close critical attention because the deliberate focus on the colonial past seem to resonate meaningfully with the commission and in media coverage of the various reenactments associated with the opening of Charles Towne Landing and the Tricentennial Celebration. The commissioners and Charleston's local committee intended Charles Towne Landing to memorialize and provide a stage for its pre-American history<sup>24</sup>. In this section, I argue that visual and performative rhetorics associated with the Tricentennial Celebration that depict the seventeenth century are

---

<sup>24</sup> The Midlands site in Columbia was supposed to depict South Carolina's progress at 1770, and the Piedmont site was supposed to stage history from 1870. Each site, then, represented a century of South Carolina history, although the division seemed to allow the commission to showcase the best of South Carolina's history and avoid many references to the Civil War.

ways of employing rhetorical commonplaces to reinforce South Carolina's desirability, both in the past and present, and to repair a tarnished reputation.

By inviting and at times encouraging South Carolinians to reenact the colonial past, they were inviting them to embody a particular history and particular set of values. Because the commission selected the colonial past as worthy of reenactment, this history became a more permanent feature of celebration and also became the most visible century. Implied in this choice was the veneration of certain values and ideals that, by being embodied and enacted, were made present and relevant in 1970. Reenactments are performances that make memory history by authorizing it. Each performance inscribes history onto bodies that represent a collective and onto a place with which the collective should identify.

Reenactments do not emerge from a vacuum. They come from both real and fictionalized histories. In "Present Enacting Past: The Functions of Battle Reenacting Historical Representation," Leigh Clemons notes that reenactments have two purposes that share equal importance, entertaining and educating (10). She calls these kinds of reenactments "living history" (11). Reenactments at once make memory permanent and authoritative while also creating new memories both for the performers and for the audience.

Clemons notes that while reenactments should entertain and educate, they also create impressions of the past (10). She further muses that living historians<sup>25</sup>, specifically

---

<sup>25</sup> In this chapter, Clemons explains, "The desire for authenticity divides the reenactment community into two basic camps: the 'farbs' and the 'hardcores'" (11). Farbs, she asserts, are not as strictly concerned with the impression as authenticity while hardcores "go to tremendous lengths to make their impressions as authentic as possible" (11). Describing the kind of reenactment community to which Charles Towne



those who reenact battles, want to shed light on the everyman (10). She asserts that “This focus on the ‘average Joe’ allows reenactors to sidestep the major ideological arguments that surrounded” the event being reenacted (10). Many South Carolinians invested in the tricentennial were concerned about appealing to the common person. In her letter to Thomas Lawton, Mrs. S. Henry Edmunds, the Director of the Historic Charleston Foundation, attends to the need for reenactment of the village to appeal to all rather than some. She remarks, “I, and everyone here I talk with, is bitterly disappointed about the allocation of funds for the development of the original settlement prototype at Old Town. Such an ‘attraction’ is badly needed to create a better-rounded tourist package...[because] [w]e are heavy on attractions that have a specific, rather than a wide appeal” (1). However, the difference here is that the commission and even Mrs. Edmunds do not speak of representing the common man now but rather the common man in the past, and even more, they speak of history as an attraction to draw tourists. Mrs. Edmunds does refer to “everyone here,” suggesting that she represents the voices of a large contingency. That said, these attractions, like the more formal reenactments, also entertained and educated.

But entertainment and education can happen in forms other than reenacting and embodying the past. So why are reenactments so compelling, and why were they so important to the Tricentennial Commission in particular? What would reenacting colonial

---

Landing employees belonged in the 1970s, when the park opened and even today is not one of my concerns in this dissertation. However, based on Clemons’ use of Tony Horowitz’s definitions of farbs and hardcores, I would categorize the living historians at Charles Towne Landing and in Charleston during the 1970 celebration as farbs. Today, the living historians employed at Charles Towne Landing who reenact the shooting of canons do not always stay in character and actively compare the past to the present when they speak to the audience.

South Carolina give to the celebration and its tourists? Jean Baudrillard's theory about simulations adds insight not only into the rhetorical power of commemorative events and sites, but also reenactments. In *Simulations*, Baudrillard explains that simulations are "substitutions of signs of the real for the real" (4). Simulations are problematic, he continues, because they disrupt the real (5). He says that simulations not only "feign[s] to have what hasn't" but actually "produces" some of what one does not have, or provides the sense that the desire has been fulfilled by the simulation (5). It blurs the line between "true" and "false" because the simulation seems to produce real things, real feelings, and real satiation, when it does not (5). The imagery of the real destroys or murders the real, degrading it rather than elevating or amplifying it (10).

Reenactments are complicated simulations. They are simulations that seek to substitute signs of what was real in the past in the present. However, this temporal distortion, the conflation of past and present, of the real and unreal, creates a sense of absence. In turn, the agents responsible for the simulations want that absence to create desire for what is absent and lacking and to find satiation in the substitution. The substitution of the past for the present, however, cannot ever truly satisfy the absence and the desire, because the past is gone. Reenactments, then, do not satisfy desire, but create an insatiable longing, and it is this longing that creates a rhetorical unrest and dissatisfaction with the present.

### *The Tricentennial Parade*

The Tricentennial Parade<sup>26</sup> occurred on Saturday, April 4, 1970, at 11 AM. Several well-known local and national commercial industries sponsored the parade, including Blue Cross Blue Shield. According to an advertisement for the Tricentennial Parade in *The News & Courier* on April 3, 1970, newscaster Frank Blair, a South Carolina native, hosted the parade when it aired live on three local television stations (n. pag.). Several articles in *The News & Courier* covered the parade ahead of time, one article boasting that “At least four million people are expected to view the Tricentennial parade” (Williams “Four Million” n. pag.). The parade featured floats and local dignitaries who were dressed in both contemporary and seventeenth-century clothing.

The parade is not a traditional reenactment, and most living historians would take umbrage with my inclusion of it under a discussion of reenactments. Reenactments frequently portray a particular battle or a style of living. This parade simulates neither situation in the strictest sense of the definition. For example, no one is reenacting a parade from the seventeenth century. There is no conceit that this is a historical even reconstructed for observation in the present. However, I find the blurring of temporal boundaries and temporal identities in the parade similar to the kind of blurring and disruption that historical reenactments cause. The people dressed in period costumes have a double identity, characterizing at once both their present identities as well as a past identity that they have assumed and, in some cases, seemingly internalized. Frequently, the host, Frank Blair, refers to these people not by their present identities but as their past.

---

<sup>26</sup> I watched a VHS recording of the parade at the South Carolina Department of Archives and History.

He and his fellow announcers speak about these historical characters in the present tense rather than the past, suggesting the effectiveness of an impression that transcends history and seeks to become memory. The temporal disruption, the past in the present, and the effectiveness of the costumed personalities then suggest a more informal kind of reenactment that deserves critical attention.

The parade was intended to celebrate South Carolina's birthday and to herald what made South Carolina great. It also suggested what values could be restored to South Carolina. General Mark Clark, the former president of The Citadel, marshaled the parade. Opening the parade with General Clark reinforces the legacy of heroism that the Tricentennial Commission used as a commonplace. It also underscores the commission's own heroic efforts of making the celebration a reality. Furthermore, connecting military success with Charleston and South Carolina's histories to their present suggests a kind of heroic, militaristic heritage. This heritage is alluded to by other reenactments, including a battle pageant of Fort Dorchester ("Fort Dorchester Echoes to Battle") and other military-related reenactments. Clark's presence as the marshal who leads the parade implies a relationship between South Carolina's military past with its present. It also associates South Carolina with a military character, one that echoes the commonplace of heroism and courage that the commission frequently used in their correspondence as they designed the project and during the anniversary year when they discussed it.

While General Clark's presence underscores the theme of wartime heroism, he is not a figure dressed in period costuming. Dressed in late-twentieth century dress uniform, he represents the best of South Carolina's present. Although Clark seems to hallmark the best of South Carolina, I contend that he is evidence of what is normal for the state. His

militaristic and professional success, his dapper presence in his dress uniform, as the “normal” South Carolina resident then puts the rest of the country to shame. Other states are represented in the parade. Georgia sent a float as a gift to South Carolina. Thus, it is not a stretch to claim that South Carolina sought to compare itself against the rest of the country, to show itself better even at its most “normal,” and finally to do this to restore its image in America.

The use of temporal disruption as an argument of degree is perhaps most greatly observed by the figures who followed General Clark: various local men of prestige dressed as the Eight Lords Proprietors. The Eight Lords Proprietors were the Duke of Albemarle; Anthony Ashley Cooper, the Earl of Shaftesbury; the Earl of Craven, Sir George Carterate, Sir John Colleton, John Lord Berkeley, the Earl of Clarendon, and Sir William Berkeley. These men portraying the Eight Lords Proprietors follow General Clark and future Charleston mayor Joe Riley, at the time a popular businessman. Their presence indicates a kind of nostalgia in which the past is responsible for the wonders of the present. These men yoke their successes and identities in the present with the Eight Lords Proprietors by dressing as them. Their arrival in period garb is jarring when juxtaposed with two men wearing modern clothing.

By opening the parade with such admirable public figures—particularly men in two influential professions, the military and the business world—the commission and their coordinators seek to associate South Carolina and its people with these successes and values. The audience is supposed to acknowledge General Clark and Joe Riley as the idealized reflections of themselves and share in their success by watching and celebrating them. Admiration creates a connection, because it suggests an appreciation for

characteristics that we desire and sometimes recognize in ourselves. The Tricentennial Commission evoked this by opening the parade with figures of success and admiration, figures who would symbolize a heritage rather than a legacy, which is a characteristic arrested in the past. A heritage is inherited and moved forward, while a legacy is mythologized in memory. The commission creates that sense of heritage by having local celebrities dress and parade as the Eight Lords Proprietors. They suggest that these men are founding fathers. They represent the beginning of tradition and heritage, in which General Clark and Joe Riley participate.

In a previous chapter about the rhetorical significance of calling on South Carolina's British heritage, I discussed how the commission sought to distance South Carolina's history from America by attaching its past to a British ancestry. Some of that identification is at work in this procession of South Carolina leaders. If these men are the state's founding fathers, and they are British, then South Carolina's identity complex. It has connections beyond America. It has connections with an empire. Conversely, the state also appeals to American patriotism, made evident by a float that declared, "Independent Government in South Carolina 1776 Second in America" (*Final Report* n. pag.). These men symbolize a complex manifestation of values: competing nationalisms and competing temporalities that need to converge to make the past the point of consubstantiation in this argument of degree.

Part of the argument of identity that is observable in the parade is not only the focus on the origin of the founding fathers but also the racial makeup of the participants. Several floats and groupings of people seem to suggest diversity while actually emphasizing segregation. One float, "The Happy Raine" float, showcased local celebrity

“Happy Raine.” Happy Raine portrayed a Native American on Charleston’s local Channel 5 television station. As Happy Raine’s float moved down the road, Blair remarks that so many of South Carolina’s landmarks and towns have retained their “Indian names” (n. pag.), noting Santee and Cheraw. Shortly after this float follows one that the City of Charleston sponsored: a cornucopia with people standing in it. The people are dressed as British settlers, played by an all-white cast, or at least a cast that does not include anyone who is supposed to represent a non-British origin. A sign on the float boasts, “The true wealth of Charleston is in its people” (parade video). However, the people who create Charleston’s wealth as depicted on this float does not include African Americans nor any representation of the First Nations that once populated the area and helped the settlers when they arrived at Albemarle Point. Their style of dress suggests British (or European) ancestry. Additionally the absence of the ways the commission represented other ethnicities reveals how state authorities perceived the richest citizenry: the white residents.

In these ways, the commission could exclude African Americans and even Native Americans from the origin narrative that they sought to construct through the parade and the tourist experience at Charles Towne Landing. This makes the origin story even more rhetorical. The commission creates a sense of desire for the gentility of the past but also its ingenuity and progress, while they also make an implicit but visual argument for retaining the segregation and privileging the contributions of European ancestry over those of others. Reenacting the past in the present allows rhetors like the commission, rhetors seeking to construct an identity for a collective, are able to create a double identity that allows for simultaneous exclusion and inclusion in the collective identity.

This doubleness implies that while the identity of the present is not the same as the past, the present is not disconnected from it. The comparison of the origin story with the present induces the audience to draw connections between forefathers and the current conditions of the state. This is clearly something that happens with the alternating reenactors of the past with the participants of the present. This alternation between the white-washed past with the superficial diversity of the present in the parade suggests an origin of whiteness and white progress, excludes under-represented groups, and elevates the legacy of white citizens.

### *The Lords' Ball*

Exclusion—racial exclusion and a white legacy, in particular, but also social and economic more generally—is a key hallmark of the commission's use of reenactments in its narrative of South Carolina's identity. The intersection of exclusion and nostalgia as complimentary rhetorical strategies are most observable in the media coverage of the Tricentennial Commission's "Lords' Ball" and the mayor's reception, which were held April 10, 1970, in Charleston's Municipal Auditorium and the Manigault House, respectively. A calendar of the Tricentennial Festival events in *The News & Courier* published on that date mentions the ball and notes in parentheses, "Invitation" (n. pag.), revealing that it was not open to the general public. In her article "300 Years of Fashion Seen at Lords' Ball" published April 12, 1970, Women's Editor Betsy Moye remarks about the ball, "The climax to Tricentennial observance week in Charleston was a glittering affair, adorned by costumes dating from the 1600's with a sprinkling of modern day pants suits and minis, midis and maxis" (1-C). Moye and other journalists do not



describe how guests were chosen to receive invitations, but some of the captions of the articles' pictures suggest that many guests were local politicians, celebrities, and blue bloods.

Moye explains that some guests attended the ball in modern clothing while others came in seventeenth-century styles. It is unclear whether or not the invitations specified who should or should not dress in period clothing, although the photographs in media indicate that most of the guests, if not all of them, understood that the ball was a formal event and came dressed accordingly. According to Williams, "More than 600 Charlestonians had been invited to the mayor's reception and most got into the spirit of the Tricentennial year by donning a costume" ("Elegant Past" n. pag.). Most people wearing period costumes were Tricentennial Commissioners and committee members, such as Charleston's mayor J. Palmer Gaillard and his wife (Figure 1.1).



Figure 1.1 An image titled "A Handshake and a Smile for M'Lady" from *News and Courier* published April 11, 1970, of costumed guests at the Lords' Ball. Photo by Swain.

Many images, like “A Handshake and a Smile for M’Lady” (Figure 1.1), capture commissioners and advisory committee members in period clothing. In Figure 1.1, photographer Swain captures Charleston City mayor, J. Palmer Gaillard, and his wife, along with an unnamed “lady,” interacting at the Lords’ Ball. The commissioners and public officials were frequently photographed in costume and smiling for the camera. The prevalence of commissioners and other officials in period clothing in photographs suggests that these were the people most likely to dress up and reenact seventeenth-century colonial life. However, Mayor and Mrs. Gaillard’s clothing (Figure 1.1) is certainly not the kind worn to build houses, to cultivate and harvest crops, or to make candles. They are the styles of the aristocracy, not the common person working to build colonial infrastructure. Thus, these styles privilege wealthier colonists. These are fine costumes, the kind that would be worn to a ball. Clearly, the commissioners and advisory committee members were proud of their hard work. They were also the ones most frequently showcased enjoying the experiential history that they had staged.

I am concerned, then, with *who* is experiencing the Tricentennial Celebration and who is *not*. While all South Carolinians could participate in most of the events, the kinds of events that were open to costumes were often most frequented by the state’s wealthy elite, like Gaillard. They could afford the expensive costumes and could take the time to prepare themselves and enjoy the events. The prevalence of these public officials in photographs wearing formal, seventeenth-century styled clothing signals an economic divide. The people who were already wealthy acted like the wealthy colonists. Most, if not all, of the most common people and features of colonial South Carolina remained unseen.

Like the parade earlier that week, the reception and the ball are recreational reenactments. They are less concerned about leaving impressions of history and of the everyday person and more about cherry-picking ideals and values from the past to elevate the present. What makes these reenactments so interesting is that while the commissioners and Charleston's local politicians sought to play at reenacting the past, they blur the line between play and reenactment with the obvious duality of temporality and identities. Furthermore, most, if not all, reenactments seek to recreate a specific moment, such as a battle or court proceeding. They are bounded by time and events. This event, as many journalists note, included guests whose impressions spanned South Carolina's three-hundred years of history since the British colonized the area. This means that not only did the ball not recreate an actual event, but it also did not recreate a specific time. Instead, it sought to conflate all time together. Furthermore, the level of guests' commitments to leaving impression ran the gamut of fervor. Like many serious or "hardcore" reenactors, the guests tried to leave impressions of the characters they played. Williams notes that one of the most memorable guests "was a tall, whiskered confederate Army officer who said he was Stonewall Jackson. He really was Citadel athletic director Eddie Teague" ("Elegant Past" n. pag.). Other guests seemed happy to dress up without acting out a part.

This kind of reenactment, that intersects time and creates rather than seeks to reconstruct it, is not unique to Charleston or the Tricentennial Commission. Other places, such as Historical Jamestown and Williamsburg, rarely enact only actual historical events. Sometimes, these places often simply showcase historical living, letting the employees embody characters improvise living daily life, without referring to specific

events. It seems like the Tricentennial Commission sought to include both traditional reenactments and these more general ones, but the generalized reenactments often devolved into a parade of eras rather than a specific time.

When I consider reenactments—both those described as “hardcore” and the kind I have described above, which I consider “dabbling” in reenactment—I am moved to analyze the rhetoric of the performance. Typically, scholars who discuss “performance” rhetorically frame their analysis using Judith Butler’s theories. However, I am interested in using Diana Taylor’s work *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. Taylor seeks to add to the lexicon of performance studies by locating the gaps in understanding how performance contributes to public memory. Furthermore, Taylor detaches performance from the gender binds that Butler creates, which is useful for my larger consideration of the performances I analyze in this dissertation, because my understanding of how rhetorics of identity become persuasive and engage in the production of knowledge is not limited to constructs of gender and sexuality.

In *The Archive and the Repertoire*, Taylor argues that embodied communication, or performance, fills in the gaps for when writing and perhaps speech cannot suffice. She asserts, “Not everyone comes to ‘culture’ or modernity through writing. I believe it is imperative to keep reexamining the relationships between embodied performance and the production of knowledge” (xix). Taylor finds the term “performance” useful in analyzing communication and production of knowledge because it

also constitutes the methodological lens that enables scholars to analyze evens *as* production. Civic obedience, resistance, citizenship, gender,

ethnicity, and sexual identity, for example, are rehearsed and performed daily in the public sphere. To understand these *as* performance suggests that performance also functions as epistemology. Embodied practice, along with and bound up with other cultural practices, offers a way of knowing. (3)

Taylor argues that the ways people engage with the world—consciously or unconsciously, scripted or not, organized or spontaneously, ritualized or otherwise—are performances. These performances are not only ways that scholars can know the world in which their subjects can inhabit: these performances are also ways that the subjects know their world, produce knowledge, and disseminate it. In other words, events are performances, and they are rhetorical because they are loaded with meaning, they shape and create culture, and they create knowledge.

If events are performances that produce knowledge by making arguments about reality, about history, about culture, then that makes the Lords' Ball an event that produces knowledge about both the past and the present. What knowledge were South Carolinians producing about the past and the present at the ball through the organization of the event and their participation at it—or lack thereof? Taylor asserts that we can find answers to these kinds of questions because “[p]erformance and aesthetics of everyday life vary from community to community, reflecting cultural and historical specificity as much in the enactment as in the viewing/reception” (3). The ball, I argue, is an event—an experiential rhetoric—that should be analyzed to understand what the commission and South Carolina government were arguing about the identity. Through the ball and other events associated with the larger Tricentennial Celebration and more specifically with the

opening of Charles Towne Landing, we can understand how identity became a kind of knowledge that was practiced through methods of inclusion and exclusion, from the difference between enacting and viewing, because these roles create hierarchies.

The ball, unlike most of the events associated with the opening of Charles Towne Landing, which marked the beginning of the year-long Tricentennial Celebration, is noted as “invitation” in the write-up “Today’s Events” in the *The News & Courier* published April 10, 1970 (n. pag.). *The News & Courier* lists most of the other books as “public,” denoting open and free, or “admission,” still open to the public, but guests would have to pay an admission fee. This means that for most of the events, guests could come to watch or participate. The parade and other events, such as the Fort Dorchester reenactment<sup>27</sup>, were open to the public. However, even with these “public events,” there was a marked difference in participating/reenacting and viewing/receiving. This is clearly evident in the footage of the parade. The television viewer is clearly positioned as “audience” and not “participant” or “rhetor.” However, the parade has at least two viewing audiences: the television audience and the audience that was present at the parade and watched along the streets. The streets and the television sets create actual divisions between participant and audience. This division, however, is relatively traditional, with participants recognized as performances and the objects of attention. They control the subject, or content, of the event; however, at a parade, the audience

---

<sup>27</sup> Fort Dorchester is an eighteenth-century structure in Dorchester County, South Carolina, which neighbors Charleston County. According to an article “Fort Dorchester Echoes to Battle” published in Charleston’s *News and Courier* on April 12, 1970, re-enactors from “The Order of the Arrow and the Charleston and Camden chapters of the 63<sup>rd</sup> Regiment of Foot” re-created “the fading years of the French and Indian War—a time when Cherokee Indians took to the warpath against settlers and traders who encroached on Indian lands” (1-D). The article carefully details how the re-enactors create scenes from British history. I discuss this re-enactment in more detail in chapter four.

present at the site often feels engaged as they cheer on the crowds. The hierarchal difference seems to dissipate at parades.

The commission's use of invitations for the Lords' Ball creates a hierarchy between participant and viewer that is more stark and meaningful at the Lords' Ball than at the parade. Guests received invitations from the commission and the local Charleston committee, but the reasons why some South Carolinians were chosen over others is never disclosed in newspapers or any documents contained in the archive. However, descriptions of the guests provide some insight into some of the guests. Various captions to photographs reveal that local and state politicians, Charleston elite, and some British aristocracy who had come to Charleston (descendants of the Lords Proprietors) received invitations to the ball. These invitations, however, seemed to come with a price. In a rather defensive editorial "Tricentennial Success," the editors explain the opening ceremonies were successful partly because "There weren't any free-loaders" (8-A). They remark, "For example, [Charleston] Mayor J. Palmer Gaillard paid for a ticket to attend the Lord Proprietors Ball" (8-A). It is unclear, then, if invitations solicited guests to pay for admission, or if anyone could attend who could afford the price of a ticket. However, every calendar article in *The News & Courier* until this editorial marks the event as "invitation," suggesting some kind of limited guest list.

The defensive tone to the editorial when addressing the Lords' Ball seems incongruous with the silence about the guest list in previous articles that covered the event. As I have discussed in previous chapters, many South Carolinians had criticized the Tricentennial Commission and its supporting county committees almost from the beginning of the project in 1966. This criticism continued even during the opening

ceremonies and even in *The News & Courier*. This is noteworthy because, generally, favorable opinions of the commission. Despite this support, the paper occasionally published criticism of the commission, even during the opening celebrations. *The Spartanburg Herald*, while optimistic about the opportunity for the state to stage a celebration of “perhaps the most dramatic history of all of the states of America,” bemoans that “the principal attractions—tourist centers in Charleston, Columbia, and Greenville—are caught up in a morass of inept planning and poor implementation” (4). *The News & Courier*’s editorial, however, seeks to challenge such criticism, not of the event, but of the people who planned it.

*The News & Courier*’s first defense is financial, pointing out that the commission and local officials helped to finance the Charleston events with their own, private income. This reference to using personal finances to participate in the Tricentennial Celebration events seems to provide evidence to the audience that the commission did not benefit or receive or expect special treatment. Imbedded in this defense of these officials, authorities, and commissioners, however, is coded criticism of tastes that are often not associated with wealth. For example, the editors contend, “The celebration was dignified. The Local Events Committee rejected unbecoming contests, cheap trinket sales and anything else that would reflect unfavorably on the Tricentennial” (Waring, Rider, Harrigan, and Donehue 8-A). While Waring, Rider, Harrigan, and Donehue do not explain what kinds of proposed contests and “trinkets” the committee rejected, the emphasis on “unbecoming” and “cheap” suggest that these events and products were the opposite of what Charleston residents did see and visit, like the parade and the ball. This criticism of unnamed rejected proposals coupled with the praise of Lords’ Ball indicates



that taste was coded classism. The invitations, then, are products that emerged from the Lords' Ball that are imbedded cultural tastes, preferences for certain people, their mores, and their wealth. The editors' defense of the commission and committee is also a defense for elevating certain people and neglecting others through exclusion.

The ball's glowing reviews and the pictures of guests in fancy costumes reinforce the rhetorical performance of elitism and the rhetoricity of the media coverage. This sort of event, which requires an invitation along with the purchase of ticket, immediately excludes various people from attending and participating in the event as reenactors, as non-reenacting guests, or as viewers. The guests—whether “playing” at reenacting by wearing seventeenth-century (or later periods) costumes or not—represent a demographic that the commission suggests is most desirable and aspirational. The guests pictured in the articles (see Figure 1.2) are people who were not only found deserving of an invitation; they also can afford to pay the admission fee and afford to purchase costumes or modern ensembles for the event. The media coverage of this event make the guests appear worthy of viewing and enviable. All the events surrounding Charles Towne Landing and the Tricentennial Celebration's grand openings were aimed at commemorating public memory. Many of these events also created public memory, even when these events were not open to or accessible by the entire public. This includes the ball. The honor that came with receiving an invitation and in being documented by the paper is both didactic and epistemological. It teaches *The News & Courier* readers what they need to do to be someone worthy of such recognition: be wealthy, be a politician, be a high-ranking military officer, or be a British aristocrat. Thus, it reinforces an already existing social and economic hierarchy.



Figure 1.2 An image of the article "300 Years of Fashion Seen at Lords' Ball" by Betsey Moye and photograph attributed to "Jordan." The image demonstrates the mix of period and contemporary clothing and the dominant presence of white guests.

Most of *The News & Courier*'s readers—or at least those who were not invited or did not attend the ball—would have not have been in the position of gazing at the ball. They would have been removed from the position of audience. However, the media coverage locates readers into the position of audience members of an event most readers could not access. While many readers had opportunities to be audience members at Tricentennial Celebration events in various ways, this article positions them as passive audience members. At the parade, in particular, the audience could cheer and clap. They could feel that they were in a position of emotionally supporting the parade members by being present. The audience, in this case, does not have to be present, and this absence decreases their agency and even their potential to invest in the events (literally, in terms of purchasing an admission ticket, and figuratively, concerning emotion connection to and investment in the celebration). The invitation, even though it may come with a price, indicates cultural prestige, or symbolic capital. The ability to pay for the ticket suggests not only a recognized prestige but also the means to accept and matriculate with such a demographic. Receiving the invitation, then, seems like an honor.

The Lords' Ball is an unnatural event for late-twentieth century America and South Carolina. Even more unnatural is the opportunity to dress in seventh- and eighteenth-century period clothing. However, the “natural” rules of a ball seem to apply, namely that only certain individuals associated with social, political, or economic prestige. Prestige, or symbolic capital, becomes the qualifying feature to receive an invitation. It suggests that the people who receive invitations are deserving of it. Using the antiquated system of a ball—an unnatural even in a modern setting—allows the commission and the local Charleston committee to elevate certain individuals and certain

practices that they deem fitting. By locating this elevation within the rules of a ball, no one, not even the media, seems to question why this opportunity was available to certain people. The ball, then, is a way to reinforce and reproduce a social hierarchy in a way that is unquestioned.

This also makes the guests seem more powerful, more in control of their environments. In this case, the guests become both viewers and objects, continually watching each other and being the objects of a gaze. Viewing, in many cases, is as powerful as enacting. However, the audience that has been excluded from the ball—namely, the majority of newspaper readers in Charleston and its surrounding areas—is situated passively. But the guests are positioned as people of power, who can both observe and be observed. Their power is that they are both watcher and watched; therefore, they seem like authorities of culture as they watch, judge, and are watched in return. This hybrid state of being viewer and object simultaneously situates the guests as rhetorical performers who are both texts and rhetors. They are texts to be read and analyzed, but they are also rhetors as their performances create the text of themselves. This rhetorical performance emerges from both the habitus while also reproducing the habitus. In other words, while it is a product of the culture in South Carolina, a culture that valued dignified events and class, it also reproduces that culture by replicating itself in the very performance.

More controversially, I argue, it produces knowledge about South Carolina, about its people, and about what the commission, many of whom served in state and local government positions, wanted Americans (and South Carolinians) to know about the state and its people. The habitus provides a stage for performance of South Carolina, of South

Carolínians. Providing a stage, carving out an opportunity, but doing so in way that seems unquestionable and unconscious is important to effective rhetoric of identity.

While some South Carolínians in 1969 struggled to accept a South Carolina identity that rejected the Kiawah heritage when the commission authorized construction to bulldoze the Great House site, they more readily did not question the picture of South Carolina that the ball and the media coverage presented. Not only did the media not question the implicit classicism of the ball; they did not seem to question the implicit racism either.

Based only on the evidence that I could access about the ball in the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, I cannot say unequivocally that commission did not invite any African American politicians, private citizens, or military elite to the ball. What I can observe from the limited materials I have collected—mostly newspaper articles that covered the ball and photographs in *The News & Courier* of some guests—is the prevalence of Caucasian guests. Additionally, most of the media coverage of South Carolínians wearing period clothing depicts white South Carolínians and white commissioners dressing up for publicity. While some events, such as the parade, included under-represented participants, many events, including the ball, seem absent of these minority groups, namely African Americans and Native Americans. In fact, most representations of Native Americans were performed by white participants, such as the group of school girls in who dressed playfully, irreverently, in popular but inappropriate and inauthentic Native American costumes.

I argue that the organizers of the ball, whether consciously or not<sup>28</sup>, presented their perfect image of South Carolina. The ball with its temporally confused stage—the past and the present—was a way to omit people from the image who they did not desire, namely, people who had only recently been granted full rights: African Americans. The ball, the images from it, and its media coverage are cultural projections. In “Displaying Race: Cultural Projection and Commemoration” in *Rhetorics of Display*, Victoria J. Gallagher asserts that cultural projects of race in the New South reveal competing identities (178-9).

I argue that the images of the ball, which showcase only white guests in formal period and modern evening wear, are hegemony at work to reassert an image of the South that many white Southerners feared was disappearing, namely, the white South and the traditions they saw associated with their dominance. The ball was one event celebrating three-hundred years of history. The absence of African Americans in the photographs does not so much draw attention to the whiteness of the guests but rather away from them. It suggests that the people responsible for history and in positions to celebrate it are people who look like the ones in the images. People who look different do not share in the celebration, and they have no place in it because historical representations of them are absent from the images and absent from reenactment.

The rhetorical situation of the ball contributes to the seeming unquestioned predominant presence of white South Carolinians. The ball is a genre of delivery of a message. Rather than a written text or a speech, the delivery is a performance delivered in

---

<sup>28</sup> There is no evidence in writing, no letters or notations in minutes from commission meetings, that ever disclose or even suggest that African Americans were not invited to the Lords’ Ball.

a particular space. The performance itself is unique because it is anachronistic, but tailored to fit two time periods. The ball seems to be an event pulled from the seventeenth century and into the twentieth. It creates a kind of temporal confusion, as the two centuries (and smatterings of representations from the eighteenth and nineteenth, according to some coverage) converge to celebrate South Carolina's legacy to the nation and to the world. The reenacted presence of the seventeenth century seems to exclude under-represented groups from enacting history and celebrating it.

From the beginning of the commission's work, it was clear that they were intent on constructing a narrative about the elegance and desirability of the past. The ball and the period clothing function as commonplaces that evoke meaning and resonate. Reenacting the seventeenth century and a seventeenth century ball allowed the commissioners and guests to relive an inaccurate memory of the past. This memory represented their ideal present, in part, the beauty and elegance by which they characterized the seventeenth century, but also the seeming absence of racial diversity. The colonists who settled briefly where Charles Towne Landing was built were British, and they were white. They did, however, bring slaves with them, many from Barbados. Because they were slaves, Africans living in the Carolina colony would not wear fancy clothing or dance at balls. Thus, their absence from the twentieth century ball seemed natural, unquestioned, because they likely would not have been present in the same way as the British colonists. Their absence is an embodiment of the struggle African Americans still faced even in post-segregation South Carolina. Their unquestioned absence is a rhetoric of exclusion, and the whiteness of the guests constructs an image of

South Carolina that functions as a commonplace, a meaningful representation, of how many South Carolinians perceived the state.

## **Conclusion**

Representations of history are primarily rhetorical, and typically they are common features in rhetorics of identity. Material manifestations and performances of the reconstructed past are methods of making arguments about the present, as well as the past. They can be deliberative, ways of making arguments about the future, as well as epideictic. They not only are products of the habitus of the present, but they can also create, reproduce, or challenge the values, behaviors, and social institutions of the present. As such, these rhetorical texts deserve critical attention.

Few scholars of rhetorics of identity, material rhetorics, and rhetorics of space have applied classical rhetorical theories to their studies of how material objects and space/place construct rhetorics of identity. This chapter seeks to understand how rhetorics of identity engage in defensive and antagonistic tactics when they use the past rhetorically. In this chapter, I have shown how the Tricentennial Commission used the trope of the seventeenth century in various rhetorical strategies, as common topics, until “the seventeenth century” became a commonplace that resonated with meaning about the present.

The opening celebration of the Tricentennial Celebration was perhaps the commission’s least criticized work. I believe that this is, in no small part, because South Carolinians could begin to see and interact with the materials and spaces that the commission had been planning. Until the opening celebrations in Charleston, the



commission's work had received mixed opinions from the public, although the Charleston press was often biased in its favor. However, the manifestations of the representations of the past and the opportunities for the public—sometimes broadly, but in cases like the Lords' Ball in exclusive cases—gave tourists the chance to interact with rhetorical texts that the commission constructed to create the identity. These experiences helped the audience to internalize the commission's message about South Carolina. These experiences were ways for audiences to consubstantiate with one another, feeling a shared investment in a shared experience.

However, because the events did not always have accurate, appropriate, or any representations of certain populations, including Native Americans and African Americans, there is a sense of dis-identification. In other words, the absence of material, representation, and opportunities to experience and participate in performance creates knowledge of what South Carolina was and was not: white and rich, which were synonymous with dignified, and the peoples absent were the opposite, even if the reality contradicted this image that circulated in the press and in public memory. Memory can become fact, unquestioned and powerful, and from fact it can be used as appeals to logos. This is why rhetoricians need to pay more careful attention to how they discuss commemoration that involves performance and reenactment. Commemoration of history that uses historical performances and reenactment can provide opportunities for identification and dis-identification that have ramifications for how race and ethnicity are perceived.

## **Chapter Six: Conclusion: Toward a Theory of Identification as Negotiation, Not a Binary**

While Charles Towne Landing was the crowing jewel of the Tricentennial Celebration in 1970, and remained a popular park site through the 1970s, the state's commitment to it waned. By January of 1981, engineers speaking on behalf of park management asked the Parks, Recreation and Tourism Commission in South Carolina to provide \$230,000 "to repair and maintain facilities at Charles Towne Landing" (Gibson 1B). In the article "Funding Sought for Facelift at Charles Towne Landing," reporter Hugh E. Gibson lists the structures in need of attention, including the visitor services complex, the theater, the exhibit pavilion's geodesic dome, and the roadways (1B). Furthermore, he reports that the director of Parks with the Parks, Recreation and Tourism Commission, Raymond M. Sisk, said that "unwise decisions" were made in 1969 that resulted in the problems the park faced in 1981 (1B). However, in July 1981, the South Carolina House cut funds intended for renovations at Charles Towne Landing. These decisions represent a sense of apathy about the way the park served the community, but it also indicates how the Tricentennial Commission's negotiation of identity and the manifestation of that negotiation no longer resonated with the state.

After Hurricane Hugo damaged Charles Towne Landing in September 1989, park employees, various crews, and volunteers invested time and money into salvaging the park (Bradshaw 1-A); however, their efforts were merely a Band-Aid on a festering wound. A study of public opinion in Charleston concerning Charles Towne Landing conducted in 1996 found that the park no longer appealed to the public (Bartelme 1-A). Bartelme reports, "the state park has buildings that are eyesores, exhibits that are boring,

a zoo that lacks credibility and a gift shop with tacky things for sale” (1-A). In this article, the current Director of Parks, Recreation and Tourism says, “‘It’s time we had a change in direction’” (qtd. in Bartelme 1-A). She shares, “people ‘cannot state succinctly the mission and purpose of Charles Towne Landing’” (9-A). Among the complaints were concerns about the quality of the research supporting the historical exhibits, including the historical village that was built after the park’s grand opening (Bartelme 9-A).

By 2000, the dome and pavilion were demolished after both having been closed since 1989 (Porter “Time” 1-B and Porter “Pavilion”). *The Post and Courier* reporter Arlie Porter had been covering Charles Towne Landing for several years. In his article “Pavilion, Dome To Be Demolished Charles Towne Landing,” he reports that a new manager been installed at the park and that the state had renewed its commitment to the site by granting \$13.6 million to the park “for improvements” (n. pag.). He states, “For the first time, an exhaustive archaeological dig will be conducted at the site of the original settlement of Charles Towne in 1670” (“Pavilion” n. pag.). He asserts, “For 30 years, the state park has tried to be all things to all people, essentially serving as a 663-acre playground, while its rich history was overlooked” and boasts “Fischer [the new manager] wants to put an end to car shows, ‘hog-jogs’ and festivals that are irrelevant to the park’s history. Instead, the park will focus on education and a well-researched, hard-hitting and honest interpretation of its history, including its Native-American and African-American history” (“Pavilion” n. pag.).

What is interesting about Charles Towne Landing’s story after its grand opening and after the Tricentennial Commission was dissolved is how the site ceased being a stage for history and became, instead, “all things to all people” (Porter “Pavilion” n.

pag.). In other words, it was not a site of memory but a site of meaningless “things.”

Because of this, it ceased representing the people. I argue that the problem here is not so much that the site itself was irrelevant, but rather the narratives and materials that defined it—the manifestation of memory—were too limited and too selective to the point that they were irrelevant.

When the park opened for the Tricentennial Celebration in 1970, it was successful because it negotiated identities and identifications that aroused a sense of consubstantiation. This sense of identification came in the shared past of the origin story. The origin story and the way it was displayed at Charles Towne Landing were relevant products, memories, and stages, because the association with the celebration of South Carolina’s founding as a state could appeal to multiple identifications not only in South Carolina but nationally and even, to an extent, globally. It was an identification that negotiated multiple political identities rather than one based on constructing binaries.

In many ways, the focus on the Anglo-centric origin story was a practice in benign exclusion through identification. By choosing to begin history with the story of the British colonists landing at the Charles Towne Landing site, the commission negotiated a complex relationship among identifications. Clearly, the focus on the British emphasized the contributions of white South Carolinians. However, the celebration could not and did not entirely deny that Native Americans and African Americans were crucial to the history they were celebrating; instead, they often neglected these populations’ actual contributions, which diminished their roles in this narrative. They avoided the most controversial relationships by emphasizing origins and therefore minimalizing discord. By telling the story of the beginning and the end (the present), they could skip the middle,

the Civil War, Reconstruction, and even the Civil Rights Movement. This origin is still a practice in exclusion and is still a way to practice racism. Additionally, the discovery of the Great House in 1968 and the way the commission handled the discovery are evidence of racial discrimination. But the origin story also suggests an invitation for South Carolinians to find a way to share in the rewards of the founding fathers, even if the invitation is to identify in ways that appealed to the white, patriarchal hegemony constructing the park.

Furthermore, the commission's construction of the park negotiated not only multiple local identifications but also political identifications. The commission sought to appeal to and identify with both citizens in Britain and the United States. Pragmatically, this was a public relations and marketing move. But it also reveals the complicated nature of identification. The commission, as an entity charged with authority by the state legislature, was activated to construct sites of memory and history. The appeal to both American and British histories and antecedents suggests the complicated situatedness of identification. South Carolina history was a history of many countries and nationalities. The Kiawah had lived on much of the Carolina coast. The Spanish had already made attempts to wrest the coast from the Kiawah, but the British felt that they had rights to that land already. After the British had firmly controlled the land, then it was the site of conflict between the British and the colonists. By emphasizing its British roots as well as its American history, the commission utilized the park to argue for a hybrid identity made of at least two nationalities. While this was certainly a controversial appeal, it was successful for marketing. The British legacy seemed to appeal to a sense of heritage, while the appeal to South Carolina's role in American history attracted patriots. On

opening day, American politicians, South Carolina legislators, and British nobility stood together at Charles Towne Landing as symbols of a shared past and a shared interest in the present and future.

While the focus on the British/American origin story was so successful in 1970 at attracting support and tourists, it was too defensive and too exclusive. It was too defensive and antagonistic because of the unarticulated but clearly influential concerns and fears about racial identities. By the end of the twentieth century, the Anglo-centric histories were not reflective of the more diverse public. By “more diverse public,” I do not mean that South Carolina’s demographics became more racially diverse; it was already racially diverse. I mean that the face of South Carolina was no longer represented publicly only by people who looked like the Tricentennial Commission. Ever so slowly, the public image changed to reflect better the state’s demographics. South Carolina’s public image was changing, not only to the nation, but to itself. This change in the image also changed the memories. It begged the question: what about the people who were in South Carolina in 1670 who were not British and white? It begged not for negotiating multiple national identities but multiple racial and ethnic identities. It begged for an identity that was not defending itself against criticism but rather that was more honest about the reality of its people.

Porter’s article about the demolition of the pavilion and dome reveals the need for history to reflect the changes in memory. In his article, he quotes Charles Towne Landing’s manager, Fischer, saying, ““we’re looking forward to the rehabilitation and rebirth of a very special place”” (“Pavilion” n. pag.). Part of that rehabilitation was providing South Carolinians with the “honest interpretation of its history, including its

Native-American and Africa-American history” (“Pavilion” n. pag.). Fischer’s use of “place” here suggests that the rhetoricity of place is and should be mutable because it is a reflection of public memory and public consumption. The changes in Charles Towne Landing from its grand opening in 1970 through the major renovations reveal that the rhetoric that defines a space as place change the way a place is perceived and utilized by the citizens it is intended to serve.

Additionally, it is important to understand that Porter and Fischer’s rhetoric about Charles Towne Landing is itself a rhetoric of identity and still demonstrates the defensive features that I claim are essential to this kind of rhetorical situation and genre. Their invocation of honesty is a defensive strategy. This invocation appeals to both ethos and pathos, but this appeal is a different quality of defensiveness. Here, we see Porter and his interview subject, Fischer, defend a history that had been excluded, namely the history of under-represented groups. They deliberately include these histories as part of South Carolina’s greater historical narrative. In doing so, they point to the consequences of the mythology of origins that the Tricentennial Commission had constructed. These consequences are a dishonest representation which resulted in a less appealing and less credible history that, in turn, affected the tourism of the park. Interestingly, however, their obvious omission of an antagonist is similar to the commission’s own defensive strategies three decades earlier.

This appeal is a method of identification in at least two ways. First and foremost, it argues against historical exclusion in favor of historical inclusion. Secondly, it avoids creating a binary—dividing or dis-identifying itself against one entity—by omitting an opponent. If we read this rhetoric of identity as I suggest we should, then we can see how

negotiating identities rather than selecting a primary identity allows for a more nuanced way to analyze this genre of rhetoric and helps us to understand how rhetorics of identity and seeking identification achieve what Burke believed rhetoric could do: heal division rather than create it.

Meanwhile, they are also arguing in defense of South Carolina's ethos. Should the park provide a more honest interpretation of history, then South Carolina will move toward rehabilitation. I would argue that the rehabilitation is not simply an improved image but rather an improved and more attractive identification, one that negotiates more identities and is therefore more inclusive and more effective. The way Charles Towne Landing would be redefined by this more inclusionary and more honest history is reflective of the change in a more honest local character, one that is itself also prepared to be more inclusive in terms of the way it imagines its community.

The language of reparation, rehabilitation, and rebirth are crucial commonplaces not only used in the park but also in the coverage of it. In his article "Neglect Obscures State's Early History," Jason Hardin reveals that the state, Charleston county, and city officials were invested in providing a history that emphasized identification and not division. In Hardin's article, he reports councilperson Paul Tinkler saying: "'Right now, the typical tourist views Charleston's history as a Civil War history...But we also have to be aware of and tell the story of Charleston's very early history, beginning in 1670 or earlier. That story is not being told right now'" (1A). Tinkler's discomfort with "the typical tourist views" of Charleston—and Charleston as representative of South Carolina—is implied in his reference to the Civil War. The Civil War only reminds tourists of South Carolina's deeply imbedded institution of racism and its history of



employing racially divisive strategies in its efforts toward identification. His interest in its “very early history” is not only a suggestion of a more honest history because it could and should include a history of pre-European colonization but also one that seeks to unify rather than divide, to repair rather than harm. However, like the commission before, Tinkler is seeking to avoid unpleasant histories, like the Civil War. This time, however, his words suggest shame. This suggestion of shame indicates a movement toward a more honest perception of history. The problem, however, is that the continued effort to avoid these histories continues to make room for the same exclusion the commission practiced.

Hardin’s language in this article emphasizes that the “neglect” of history was symbolic of injury and harm in his organization of the article. A section of the article with the heading title “The Diagnosis” emphasizes the destruction of the pavilion. This demolition is symbolic of excising a sign of division, the structure that quite literally covered the very early history that the new plans sought to uncover. This rhetoric of illness and rehabilitation suggests a willingness to confront a corrupt identity and to repair it by means of excision of dishonest historical representation.

Informed by the themes of honesty and education, the park management reopened Charles Towne Landing in August 2006 (“Charles Towne Landing Reborn”). Today, it remains the most visible and lasting remnant of the Tricentennial Commission’s 1970 celebration, but it is a different park negotiating even more identities. In the 2008 *Post and Courier* article “Exploring Traditions: Charles Towne Landing to Look at Life in Centuries Past,” David Quick reports that Charles Towne Landing hosted an event that provided historical reenactments and interpretations of *all* of South Carolina’s holiday traditions—Christian or otherwise:

To do so, organizer Terry Conway, a regional interpretative coordinator for the state parks, tapped cultural experts from across the region to demonstrate those traditions through storytelling, dancing, music and living history displays.

Experts include Gullah storytellers Elaine Nichols and Sharon Murray, costumed historical interpreters living in a “common house” demonstrating English customs and Will Moreau Goins, storyteller and chief of the Cherokee Indian tribe of South Carolina.

While the Cherokee as a distinct tribe didn’t really live in the Low-country, Goins says they had a trade path roughly along current-day Interstate 26 between Columbia and Charleston and that they mixed with indigenous settlements along that path that included the Etiwan, Kisabo, Santee, Edisto and Yemassee. (Quick 1D)

This report of how the Landing worked with various cultural interpreters and how these interpreters acknowledged historical myths and possible inaccuracies in representation reveals the commitment to negotiating identity toward identification rather than division. This suggests that identification relies not on exclusion but rather inclusion, on negotiation rather than division, and on a multi-faceted origin story. Furthermore, I would argue that South Carolina’s willingness to disrupt their original origin story—one with a definitive European starting place—has implications for how Southerners can and, in some cases, do approach rhetoric of identity, particularly in the twenty-first century.

## Implications

Places of public memory are stages for performing identifications. These performances occur in several ways: through the research that informs the park's structure, landscape, and design; through the planning of the site; through interpretative reenactments; and finally by how the public uses it. The public's use of land is a type of consumerism, and this is often emphasized at places of public memory where money is exchanged for admission and visitors can purchase mementos at gift shops. In *Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*, Jean Baudrillard explains, "Consumer goods thus present themselves as *a harnessing of power*, not as products embodying work. And, more generally, once severed from its objective determinations, the profusion of goods is felt as a *blessing of nature*, as a manna, a gift from heaven" (32). Consuming a product, even a product like a park, which a consumer cannot own and take home and display in the house, provides a sense of authority, of sharing in a larger authority. They consume knowledge and ownership. It is this sense of authority that comes from consumption, I argue, that is part of the consubstantiation that makes a place of memory a site of identification. It provides a way for consumers to share together in some "blessing," to invest in history, by imagining themselves as taking part in it through the act of briefly inhabiting it and feeling a sense of ownership.

A site of public memory is only relevant as long as the memory and identity it houses and interprets promise to satisfy a desire and fulfill a demand. This is the "blessing" to which Baudrillard refers. The memory must be seen as a blessing for the site to continue to serve as living memory and memory relived. As long as a product seems to promise some kind of blessing or goodness, then it will continue to be

consumed. I would also argue that the sense of “blessing” here is a sense of identification, a sense of community. If that memory no longer negotiates commonplaces and history that speak to the community, then the memory does not aid in identification. We can see this with Charles Towne Landing’s decline starting in 1981. It ceased being a site of memory and became, instead, a site without purpose or relevance.

In her book *Contemporary Southern Identity: Community through Controversy*, rhetorician Rebecca Watts shares an optimistic projection for the South in the twenty-first century. She uses South Carolina Senator Strom Thurmond as a representative anecdote for the South’s trajectory. She observes, “At the peak of his career, Thurmond ran for president on a platform rooted firmly in the defense of Southern states’ right to remain segregated” (154). But she also notes that he was the first senator from the South to hire African Americans to work as his staff and reminds her readers that he fathered an illegitimate child with a black woman (154). She uses Thurmond as an example of how the South can embody controversy and to forward her claim that through controversy, parties can come to identify with each other. She argues that the South has been “ordered” by division rather than identification, but that it has shifted into an order for identification instead (156). She does not argue that problems of racism are fully resolved, but she seeks to resituate new controversies about race in the South as rhetorics moving toward rather than away from identification.

While I share Watts’ optimism for the South, I find her analysis troubling for two reasons. First and foremost, like many rhetoricians, she uses Burke’s terms of identification and division as binaries that exist in a dialectical relationship with each other. This is because we, as a field, often arrest on one or two passages in which Burke

discusses identification. For example, in *A Rhetoric of Motives*, Burke asks, “Where are we now?....Since identification implies division, we found rhetoric involving us in matters of socialization and faction” (45). But earlier in *Rhetoric of Motives*, Burke describes rhetoric/identification as a prescription for division:

Identification is affirmed with earnestness precisely because there is division. Identification is compensatory to division. If men were not apart from one another, there would be no need for the rhetorician to proclaim their unity. If men were wholly and truly of one substance, absolute communication would be of man’s very essence. It would not be an ideal, as it now is, partly embodied in material conditions and partly frustrated by the same conditions; rather it would be as natural, spontaneous, and total as with those ideal prototypes of communication.

(23)

Burke also argues, “In pure identification there would be no strife. Likewise, there would be no strife in absolute separateness....But put identification and division ambiguously together, so that you cannot know for certain just where one ends and the other begins, and you have the characteristic invitation to rhetoric” (*RM* 25). These passages suggest that rhetoric/identification is a means to overcome division. Furthermore, while we as a field typically read division as opposition—which it can be—we should also consider reading it as “separateness,” of a sense of separation as well as longing for some kind of shared cause. Rhetoric’s consequence, then, is providing a site of sharing while also locating what makes us as an imagined community separate and divided.

In this dissertation, I seek to challenge traditional rhetorical readings of rhetorics of identity, particularly those rhetorics that manifest as sites of history and public memory. I do this because the ways we have been talking about them are framed as a conversation about binaries: rhetorics of identity either seek identification or division. These readings have been useful in legitimating rhetorics of identity and material rhetorics as valid subjects for robust study. However, they have perpetuated what I argue is a superficial reading of Burke. This use of Burke leads to oversimplified understandings of rhetorics of identity, namely how they create their exigencies and how they manifest effects and consequences. While rhetoric should be partisan, this does not mean that there are only two choices or two ways of arguing, for or against. Partisanship suggests bias and alliance, not choices.

Therefore, I argue that not only do these approaches to rhetorics of identity limit how we can interpret material symbols of identity but they also perpetuate a political and civic discourse that relies on division. A better way to analyze rhetorics of identity is to examine how they construct their exigency, or in other words, how they locate separation, and then how they seek to overcome it. While rhetorics of identity may still result in a construction of identity dependent upon binaries, our reading that seeks to understand separation will allow us to understand the consequences and goals of identification better. This is because we will have a better idea of why rhetorics of identity may seek to create binaries or why they seek other methods of identification. It will also help us better understand how these methods of identification construct an imagined community through symbols and performances.

This dissertation, then, provides a case study of a way rhetoricians can apply this different interpretation of Burke's explanation of division and identification. Rhetorics of identity in the South provide a compelling site of study because so much of the scholarship on the South—including Watts' rhetorical study—focuses on binaries: Confederacy versus the United States; whites versus African Americans; civil rights versus separate but equal. I do not argue that these binaries do not exist. I argue that there are more complicated readings of identity. Because the use of binaries is so prevalent both in Southern symbolism and in scholarship on the South, I saw the South and Charles Towne Landing as rich sites of rhetoric for a more challenging reading of identification.

In seeking to challenge traditional readings of rhetorics of identity and materiality, I also attempt to respond to Carole Blair's call for the field to develop a language and reference point to enhance our studies. In doing so, I return, in part, to a traditional rhetorical lexicon. I focus on identifying exigencies, categorizing the genre of rhetoric by considering how rhetorics of identity might be epideictic rhetoric, and by analyzing the common topics and commonplaces that manifest in language and in the symbolic use of materiality, place, and performance. I also add language to our study, including the term "experiential rhetoric," which seeks to make sense of how identification urges consubstantiation through "acting together" (Burke *RM* 21).

Through my case study, I argue that because rhetoric of identity does, indeed, seek to overcome division, it must use antagonistic and defensive rhetorical products. This is because rhetorics of identification must at least provide a sense of division or separation as an exigency for the rhetorical product. Furthermore, I argue that while this is the goal of rhetoric, it is not always the consequence of it. Moreover, I argue that

rheterics of identity usually do not use binary and conflicting alliances but rather negotiate multiple identities, histories, and origins in order to try to locate an identity that provides a new alliance. I would point out that this does not mean that the rhetorical product cannot result in an alliance dependent on relationships that are binary in nature; what I am arguing is that this binary can result from a more complex and complicated negotiation of history and mythology. This dissertation provides rhetoricians studying identity a more robust method of employing rhetorical analysis and discussing the effectiveness of identification at site of memory.



## **Works Cited**

- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. New York: Verso, 2006. Print.
- Anderson, Dana. *Identity's Strategy: Rhetorical Selves in Conversion*. Columbia, SC: U. of South Carolina P., 2007. Print.
- Armada, Bernard J. "Memory's Execution: (Dis)Placing the Dissident Body." *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials*. Eds. Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian L. Ott. Tuscaloosa: The U. of Alabama P., 2010. 216-237. Print.
- "Archeologist: Concern 'Sometimes Almost Detrimental.'" *The State* [Columbia] 11 September 1969: 1B+. Print.
- Baldwin, Agnes L. Tricentennial Commission Researcher. "First Settlers of South Carolina 1670-1680." SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219005. South Carolina Tricentennial Commission Correspondence and Project Files. Box 1. Folder Agnes Baldwin. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- - -. "Impressions of the First Settlement: Charles Town 1970." SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219015. South Carolina Tricentennial Commission Correspondence and Project Files. Box 1. Folder Agnes Baldwin. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- - -. Letter to Peter Manigault of the Post-Courier Newspaper. 23 October 1969. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219015. South Carolina Tricentennial Commission Correspondence and Project Files. Box 1.

- Folder Agnes Baldwin. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- - -. Letter to Eugene Zeigler of the Executive Committee of the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission. 18 March 1969. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219015. South Carolina Tricentennial Commission Correspondence and Project Files. Box 1. Folder Agnes Baldwin. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- Barnett, James. Executive Director of the Tricentennial Commission. Memorandum to the Executive Committee. 18 July 1969. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219005. South Carolina Tricentennial Commission Minutes. Box 3. Folder Executive Committee Memo July 18, 1969. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- Bartelme, Tony. "Ugliness Found at Landing." *The Post & Courier* [Charleston, SC] 30 January 1996. 1-A+. Print.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*. London: Sage, 1998. Print.
- - -. *Simulations*. New York: Semiotexte, Inc., 1983. Print.
- Blair, Carole. "Contemporary U.S. Memorial Sites as Exemplars of Rhetoric's Materiality." *Rhetorical Bodies*. Eds. Jack Selzer and Sharon Crowley. Madison, WI: U. of Wisconsin P., 1999. 16-57. Print.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*. Cambridge: Harvard U.P., 1984. Print.

- - -. *The Field of Cultural Production*. Trans. Richard Nice. New York: Columbia U.P., 1993. Print.

Bradshaw, Laura. "Landing's Look Changed by Hugo." *The Evening Post* [Charleston, SC] 29 December 1989. 1-A+. Print.

Broome, F. William, Executive Vice President of Charleston Trident Chamber of Commerce. Letter to Robert E. McNair, South Carolina State Governor. 10 March 1967. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Records. Series S219001. Tricentennial Commission Correspondence of Chairman 1960-71. Box 2. Folder 1: Personal Lawton, Thomas O. Jr., Tricentennial Chairman Correspondence June 1966. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.

Brundage, W. Fitzhugh. *The Southern Past: A Clash of Race and Memory*. Belknap P. of Harvard UP, 2008. Print.

Burke, Kenneth. "An Eye-Poem for the Ear, with Prose Introduction, Glosses, and After-Words." *Late Poems, 1968-1993*. Eds. Julie Whitaker and David Blakesley. Columbia, SC: U. of South Carolina P., 2005. 3-28. Print.

- - -. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: U. of California P., 1984. Print.

- - -. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Communication: Ethical and Moral Issues*. Ed. Lee Thayer. Gordon and Breach Science 1973: 263-75. Print.

Campbell, W. Russell. Manager of Public Relations Department, Charleston Trident Chamber of Commerce. Untitled Press Release. 2 January 1967. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence. Box 2. Folder 1 Personal, Lawton, Thomas O. Jr.

- Chairman Correspondence June 1966. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- Carolina*. Dir. Carlos Ramirez and Albert H. Woods. Narrated by Alfred Drake. South Carolina Tricentennial Commission, 1970. Film.
- “Charles Towne Landing Reborn.” *The Post and Courier* [Charleston, SC]: 19 August 2006. N. pag. 19 November 2010. Web.
- Clark, Gregory. *Rhetorical Landscapes in America: Variations on a Theme from Kenneth Burke*. Columbia, U of South Carolina P, 2004. Print.
- - -. “Transcendence at Yellowstone: Educating a Public in an Uninhabitable Place.” *Rhetorical Education in America*. Eds. Cheryl Glenn, Margaret M. Lyday, and Wendy B. Sharer. Tuscaloosa: The U. of Alabama P., 2004. 145-162. Print.
- Clemons, Leigh. “Present Enacting Past: The Functions of Battle Reenacting Historical Representation.” *Enacting History*. Eds. Scott Magelssen and Rhona Justice-Malloy. Tuscaloosa: The U. of Alabama P. 2011. 10-21. Print.
- “Commission Meeting Minutes 8/11/1966.” 11 August 1966. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219005. Tricentennial Meeting Minutes 1966-1971. Box Folder: Commission Meeting Minutes 8/11/1966. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- “Commission Meeting Minutes 9/21/1966.” 21 September 1966. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency Record. Series S219005. Tricentennial Meeting Minutes 1966-1971. Box 1. Folder: Commission Meeting Minutes 9/21/1966. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.

“Commission Meeting Minutes 8/ 6/1969.” 6 August 1969. SC Tricentennial

Commission Agency History Record. Series S219005. South Carolina  
Tricentennial Commission Minutes. Box 3. Folder Tricentennial Commission  
Minutes August 6, 1969. South Carolina Department of Archives and History,  
Columbia, South Carolina. Print.

“Commission Meeting Minutes 8/14/1968.” 14 August 1968. SC Tricentennial

Commission Agency History Record. Series S219005. South Carolina  
Tricentennial Commission Minutes. Box 1. Folder Commission Meeting Minutes  
8/14/1968. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South  
Carolina. Print.

“Commission Meeting Minutes 9/11/1968.” 11 September 1968. SC Tricentennial

Commission Agency History Record. Series S219005. South Carolina  
Tricentennial Commission Minutes. Box 1. Folder Commission Meeting Minutes  
9/11/1968. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South  
Carolina. Print.

“Commission Meeting Minutes 9/21/1968.” 21 September 1968. SC Tricentennial

Commission Agency History Record. Series S219005. South Carolina  
Tricentennial Commission Minutes. Box 1. Folder Commission Meeting Minutes  
9/21/68. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South  
Carolina. Print.

“Committees of the Tricentennial Commission.” SC Tricentennial Commission Agency

- History Record. Series S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence. Box 2. Folder Committees. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- “A Concurrent Resolution to Welcome the Right Honorable the Earl of Shaftesbury and the Right Honorable the Countess of Shaftesbury to the State of South Carolina and To Extend Sincere Greetings from the Citizens.” 12 January 1967. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence of the Chairman. Box 2. Folder 2 Personal, Lawton, Thomas O. Jr. Tricentennial Correspondence. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- Cooper, Anthony Ashley, the Earl of Shaftesbury. Letter to J. Palmer Gaillard, Jr., Mayor of Charleston. 3 January 1969. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence. Box 1. Folder November 1968 – March 1969. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- Crowley, Sharon, and Debra Hawhee. *Ancient Rhetorics for Contemporary Students*. 5<sup>th</sup> ed. Boston: Pearson, 2012. Print.
- Dewey, John. *Art as Experience*. Perigree Trade, 2005. Print.
- Dickinson, Greg, Carole Blair, and Brian L. Ott. “Introduction.” *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials*. Eds. Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian L. Ott. Birmingham: U. of Alabama P., 2010. Print.
- Duncan, Alderman. President of Southern Publishers, Inc. Letter to Thomas O. Lawton,

- Jr., Chairman of the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission. 5 April 1969. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence of the Chairman. Box 1. Folder April 1969-September 1969. South Carolina Department of Archive and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- Edmunds, S. Henry. Director of the Historic Charleston Foundation. Letter to Thomas O. Lawton, Jr., Chairman of the Tricentennial Commission. 2 January 1969. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency Record Series. Series S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence. Box 1. Folder November 1968 – March 1969. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- Edwards, Thomas J. Associate Editor of *South Carolina Antiquities*. Letter to James R. Barrett, Director of the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission. 22 July 1969. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence of the Chairman. Box 1. Folder April 1969-July 1969. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- “Fine Birthday Start, But Much Is Missing.” *Spartanburg Herald* [Spartanburg, SC]: 7 April 1970. 4. Print.
- Gallagher, Victoria J. “Displaying Race: Cultural Projection and Commemoration.” *Rhetorics of Display*. Ed. Lawrence Prelli. Columbia, SC: U. of South Carolina P., 2006. 177-196. Print.
- Gibson, Hugh E. “Funding Sought for Facelift at Charles Towne Landing.” *News*



- and Courier* [Charleston, S.C.] 23 January 1981: 1B. Print.
- Glenn, Cheryl. "Rhetorical Education in America (A Broad Stroke Introduction)."
- Rhetorical Education in America*. Eds. Cheryl Glenn, Margaret M. Lyday, and Wendy B. Sharer. Tuscaloosa: The U. of Alabama P., 2004. vii-xvi. Print.
- Goldfield, David. *Southern Histories: Public, Personal, and Sacred*. Athens and London: The U. of Georgia P., 2003. Print.
- Graves, Rachel, and Brian Hicks. "Emotions Run high as Flag Comes Down."
- Charleston Post and Courier* [Charleston] 2 July 2000, final ed.: n.pag. Web.
- Halloran, Michael S. "Writing History on the Landscape: The Tour Road at the Saratoga Battlefield as Text." *Rhetorical Education in America*. Eds. Cheryl Glenn, Margaret M. Lyday, and Wendy B. Sharer. Tuscaloosa: U. of Alabama P., 2004. 129-144. Print.
- Hardin, Jason. "Neglect Obscures State's Early History." *The Post and Courier* [Charleston, SC]: 26 May 2002. 1A+. Print.
- Hartley, Mike. News Editor at WBTW-TV in Florence, South Carolina. Letter to James Barnett, Director of the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission. 22 July 1969. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence of the Chairman. Box 1. Folder April 1969-July 1969. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- Hollings, Robert M. Old Town Liaison Sub-Committee. Letter to Thomas O. Lawton, Jr., Chairman of the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission, and James M. Barnett, Director of the Tricentennial Commission. 23 October 1968. SC

Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. Box 1. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence. Folder May-September 1968. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.

Hume, I. Noel, F.S.A. Director, Department of Archaeology at Colonial Williamsburg. Letter to Mrs. Agnes L. Baldwin. 24 March 1969. Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219015. South Carolina Tricentennial Commission Correspondence and Project Files. Box 1. Agnes Baldwin Folder. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.

- - -. Letter to Mrs. Agnes L. Baldwin. 13 May 1969. Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219015. South Carolina Tricentennial Commission Correspondence and Project Files. Box 1. Agnes Baldwin Folder. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.

---. Letter to James Barnett, Tricentennial Commission Executive Committee Member. 8 May 1969. Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence and Project Files. Box 1. Folder April 1969 – July 1969. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.

Lawton, Thomas. Chairman of the Tricentennial Commission. Letter to Anthony Ashley Cooper, the Earl of Shaftesbury. 6 February 1967. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence of the Chairman, 1966-70. Box 2. Folder 1: Personal, Lawton,

- Thomas O. Jr. Tricentennial Chairman. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- - -. Letter to Don Meany, Vice President of News at the National Broadcasting Company. 4 October 1967. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. Box 2. Folder 1 Personal, Lawton, Thomas O. Jr. Tricentennial Chairman. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia South Carolina. Print.
- - -. Letter to the Honorable J. Palmer Gaillard, Jr., Mayor of the City of Charleston. 17 January 1969. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence. Box 1. Folder November 1968 – March 1969. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- - -. “South Carolina: America’s Oldest New Frontier.” SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. Box 2. Folder 2 Personal, Lawton, Thomas O. Jr. Tricentennial Correspondence June 1967-September 1969. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina.
- Kilpatrick, James J. “Anti-South Bias Still Strong: If Dixie Likes It, It’s Bad.” *The State* [Columbia, SC] 14 September 1969: D2. Print.
- Lesser, Charles H. “Introduction to the Reprint.” *The Shaftesbury Papers*. Ed. Charles H. Lesser. Columbia, SC: South Carolina Historical Society, 2000. Print.
- McDonald, William. “‘Great House’ Threatens Tricentennial Dreams.” *The State* [Columbia, SC] 14 September 1969: D1+. Print.
- McGee, Joseph H., Junior. Vice Chairman of the South Carolina Tricentennial

Commission. Letter to Thomas O. Lawton, Jr., Esq., Chairman of the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission. 30 July 1969. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence of the Chairman. Box 1. Folder April 1969-July 1969. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.

- - -. Letter to T. Travis Medlock. 25 August 1969. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence. Box 3. Folder August – September 1969. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.

McNair, Robert E. South Carolina State Governor. Letter to F. William Broome Executive Vice President Charleston Trident and the Chamber of Commerce. 21 September 1967. Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. South Carolina Tricentennial Commission Correspondence 1966-70. Box 2. Folder 1: Personal, Lawton, Thomas O. Jr. Tricentennial Chairman. South Carolina Department of Archives, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.

Magelssen, Scott. "Introduction." *Enacting History*. Eds. Scott Magelssen and Rhona Justice-Malloy. Tuscaloosa: The U. of Alabama P., 2011. 1-9. Print.

Medlock, T. Travis. South Carolina Tricentennial Commissioner. Letter to Thomas O. Lawton, Jr., Chairman of the Tricentennial Commission. 22 August 1969. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence. Box 3. Folder August – September 1969. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.

- Moye, Barbara. "300 Years of Fashion Seen at Lords' Ball." *The Post and Courier* [Charleston, SC]: 12 April 1970. 1-C. Print.
- Murtagh, William J., Keeper of National Register. Letter to James M. Barnett, Executive Director, South Carolina Tricentennial Commission. 7 October 1968. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency Record. Series S219001. South Carolina Tricentennial Commission Correspondence. Box 1. Folder May-October 1968. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire." *Representations* 26 (Spring 1998): 7-24. Print.
- Porter, Arlie. "Pavilion, Dome to Be Demolished Charles Towne Landing: The Park, Which Is Scheduled to Get \$13.6 Million From the State Will Focus More on History and Less on Recreation." *The Post and Courier* [Charleston, SC]: 21 May 2000. N. pag. 19 November 2010. Web.
- - -. "Time Ravages Charles Towne Landing." *The Post and Courier* [Charleston, SC]: 22 November 1998. 1B+. Print.
- Powell, Douglas Reichert. *Critical Regionalism: Connecting Politics and Culture in the American Landscape*. Chapel Hill, NC: U. of North Carolina P., 2007. Print.
- Prelli, Lawrence J. "Rhetorics of Display: An Introduction." *Rhetorics of Display*. Columbia, SC: U. of South Carolina P., 2006. 1-38. Print.
- Proposal for Permanent Improvement Funds [Draft]. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence. Box 2. Folder 1 Personal, Lawton, Thomas O. Jr. Chairman

- Correspondence. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- Quick, David. "Exploring Traditions: Charles Towne Landing to Look at Life in Centuries Past." *The Post and Courier* [Charleston, SC]: 11 December 2008. 1D. Print.
- Report of the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission: 1670-1970: Final Report.* Columbia, SC: R.L. Bryan P., 1971. Print.
- "Renewed Charles Towne Focus." *The Post & Courier* [Charleston, SC] 23 May 2000: n.pag. Print.
- Roach, Hortense. "Little Remains of Great House." Editorial. *News and Courier* [Charleston] 24 August 1969: n.pag. Print.
- Romine, Scott. *The Real South: Southern Narrative in the Age of Cultural Reproduction.* Baton Rouge: Louisiana State U.P., 2008. Print.
- "S.C. House Cuts Funds for Parks." *The Evening Post* [Charleston, S.C.] 15 July 1981: 2-B. Print.
- "The S.C. Tricentennial." SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence. Box 2. Folder 1 Personal, Lawton, Thomas O. Jr. Chairman Correspondence. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- "South Carolina Tricentennial Commission Request for Permanent Improvement Funds For Land Acquisition and Development of Tricentennial Parks in Charleston, Columbia, and Greenville." 1 March 1968. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence.

- Box 2. Folder 1 Personal, Lawton, Thomas O. Jr. Chairman Correspondence.  
South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina.  
Print.
- Stephenson, Robert L., Director of the University of South Carolina Institute of  
Archeology and Anthropology. Letter to James M. Barnett, Executive Director of  
the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission. 25 Sept. 1968. SC Tricentennial  
Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. Correspondence of the  
Chairman. Box 1. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia,  
South Carolina. Print.
- - -. Letter to Thomas Lawton, Chairman of the South Carolina Tricentennial  
Commission. 4 August 1969. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History  
Record. Series S219001. Box 3. Folder August – December 1969. South Carolina  
Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.
- Swain. “A Handshake and a Smile for M’Lady.” 1970. Photograph. *News & Courier*  
[Charleston, SC]: 11 April 1970. N. pag. Print.
- Taylor, Diane. *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the  
Americas*. Durham and London: Duke U.P., 2003. Print.
- “Today’s Events.” *The News & Courier* [Charleston, SC]: 10 April 1970. N. pag. Print.
- “Tricentennial Parade.” Advertisement. *The News & Courier* [Charleston, SC]: 4 April  
1970. N. pag. Print.
- Ward, Jason Morgan. *Defending White Democracy: The Making of a Segregationist  
Movement and the Remaking of Racial Politics, 1936-1965*. Chapel Hill: The U.  
of North Carolina P., 2011.

Waring, Thomas R., Cowl Rider, Ashley Harrington, and J. Douglas Donahue.

“Tricentennial Success.” *The News & Courier* [Charleston, SC]: 27 April 1970. 8-

A. Print.

Watts, Rebecca. *Contemporary Southern Identity: Community through Controversy*.

Jackson: U. of Mississippi P., 2008. Print.

Williams, Barbara. “Architects Begin Laying Plans for Old Town Site.” *News &*

*Courier* [Charleston] 4 July 1968: 1B+. Print.

- - -. “Elegant Past Revived at Reception and Ball.” *News & Courier* [Charleston,

SC]: N. pag. Print.

- - -. “Four Million to View Tricentennial Parade.” *News & Courier* [Charleston,

SC]: N. pag. Print.

- - -. “Old Town Dirt Rich with Relics.” *News & Courier* [Charleston, SC] 26 July

1969: 1-B. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series

S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence. Box 2. Folder 1:

Personal, Lawton, Thomas O. Junior Chair Correspondence. South Carolina

Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.

- - -. “Pavilion on Site of Ruins Approved.” *News & Courier* [Charleston, SC] 7

August 1969: 1A+. Print.

Wrisley, John. “South Carolina Tricentennial Story.” 24 September 1970. SC

Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. SC

Tricentennial Commission Correspondence. Box 3. Folder 10 Lawton, Thomas O.

Jr. S.C. Tricentennial August 1 – December 30, 1970. South Carolina Department

of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.



Zeigler, E.N. Senator of the South Carolina State Senate. Letter to Thomas O. Lawton, Jr., Chairman of the South Carolina Tricentennial Commission. 21 July 1969. SC Tricentennial Commission Agency History Record. Series S219001. SC Tricentennial Commission Correspondence. Box 1. Folder April 1969-July 1969. South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, South Carolina. Print.

## **Vita**

Deidre Anne Evans Garriott was born in Charleston, South Carolina. She received her Bachelor of Arts in Liberal Studies of English (2004) and her Master of Arts in English (2007) at Florida Gulf Coast University in Fort Myers, Florida. She entered the University of Tennessee as a doctoral student of English in 2008, and will graduate in May 2013 upon completion of her dissertation.