

2017

Potential Republicans: Reconstruction Printers of Columbia, South Carolina

John Lustrea

University of South Carolina

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



Part of the [Public History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Lustrea, J.(2017). *Potential Republicans: Reconstruction Printers of Columbia, South Carolina*. (Master's thesis). Retrieved from <http://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/4124>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact SCHOLARC@mailbox.sc.edu.

Potential Republicans:
Reconstruction Printers of Columbia, South Carolina

By

John Lustrea

Bachelor of Arts
University of Illinois, 2015

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of Master of Arts in

Public History

College of Arts and Sciences

University of South Carolina

2017

Accepted by:

Thomas Brown, Director of Thesis

Mark Smith, Reader

Cheryl L. Addy, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

© Copyright by John Lustrea, 2017
All Rights Reserved.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to my dad. Thanks for supporting my love of history from an early age and always encouraging me to press on.

Acknowledgements

As with any significant endeavor, I could not have done it without assistance. Thanks to Dr. Mark Cooper for helping me get this project started my first semester. Thanks to Lewis Eliot for reading a draft and offering helpful comments. Thanks to Dr. Mark Smith for guiding me through the process of turning it into an article length paper, and thanks to Dr. Brown for his extensive and patient help during the last two years. Justin Davis, my parents, and my dear fiancé also deserve acknowledgement for talking through the project with me and keeping me sane.

Abstract

If the project Reconstruction was to succeed in the South, Republicans needed a significant minority of native white Southern support. The printers of Columbia, South Carolina seemed like a promising group of potential Republicans. They were members of an urban skilled trade that had a long history of activism. There were several immigrants and native Northerners among them. Plus, the Republican presence in the South created the possibility of more jobs and patronage money for them. All the relevant data suggests that the printers of Columbia could have been scalawags, but they ultimately were not. My research shows that the patronage money never reached their hands. The large degree of familial relations and close associations in the printing community through the typographical union, the workplace, and other fraternal orders likely helped nudge them away from the unknown entity of the Republican party lest they be socially ostracized. Though the Republicans did not get the backing they needed from the printers, they did change the way state printing was carried out by creating the Republican Printing Company. Instead of newspaper editors with more social status than printing experience, printing companies unrelated to newspapers whose owners came from much more humble origins carried out state printing. The main interaction between Republicans and the printers of Columbia did not translate to political support.

Table of Contents

Dedication	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Abstract	v
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Why Were the Printers Potential Republicans?	2
Chapter 2: Why Did the Printers Not Become Republican Supporters?	18
Chapter 3: The Change in State Printing	29
Conclusion	34
Bibliography	35
Appendix A: List of Printers, Pressmen, and Compositors	38
Appendix B: List of Stationers, Bookbinders, and Other People Connected to the Print Industry	46
Appendix C: List of Union Officers by Election Period.....	48
Appendix D: South Carolina State Printing Appropriations by Year	50
Appendix E: List of South Carolina State Printers by Year	53

Introduction

Scholars sympathetic to Reconstruction have often looked at it through the lens of what might have been. The remarkable gains in political and social equality for African-Americans from 1865-1877 were considerably curtailed when Southerners removed the Republican party and the Democrats assumed power. Afterward, those hostile to the goals of Reconstruction and those skeptical about its prospects changed the dominant narrative of the period to the inevitability of white supremacy in the South.¹ That reading of history obscures the potential scenarios in which the project of Reconstruction could have continued and perhaps flourished. If the Republicans were to stay in power, they needed at least a significant minority of white Southerners to support them (derisively nicknamed scalawags by Democrats). There are many theories about why that support never materialized, and I will be advancing another. This study argues that the printers of Columbia, South Carolina were a promising base of potential Republicans who did not ultimately join the party. Explaining that failure might suggest why the Republicans did not receive more support and thus why Reconstruction failed to endure.

¹ Hyman Rubin III, *South Carolina Scalawags* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), xxvi.

Chapter 1: Why Were the Printers Potential Republicans?

The American Civil War was fought in part to determine the dominant labor system of the nation. Southerners seceded from the Union to ensure the survival of slave labor, and Northerners fought to preserve the Union as a bastion of free wage labor. Over the course of the conflict, in the name of military necessity, the Emancipation Proclamation and, later, the Thirteenth Amendment abolished slavery for good, ensuring that free labor would characterize the nation's workforce henceforth. The resulting Northern victory heralded the challenging process of reuniting the nation. The Republican party had not existed in the South prior to the war. To survive there, it would need more than the support of new African American voters or transplanted Northerners.²

If Reconstruction was going to work anywhere, it would most likely succeed in South Carolina due to the high percentage of black voters. In a state with a clear majority of newly enfranchised voters who obviously favored the Republicans, failure of Republican political power would be a crushing blow to the overall effort of Reconstruction throughout the South. The main obstacle for the new government was the fact that the white population of the South had fought bitterly to ensure the Republican's largest group of voters were kept in a state of perpetual subordination. Any government based upon the African-American vote would have tenuous legitimacy in the eyes of many native white

² Rubin, *South Carolina Scalawags*, xvi.

Southerners unless enough local whites could be enticed to become scalawag Republican supporters.³

Scalawags had a variety of reasons for supporting the Republican party, but “their common characteristic was the conviction that they stood a greater chance of advancing their interests in a Republican South than by joining with Reconstruction’s opponents.”⁴ Scalawag governor Franklin Moses Jr illustrates this point well. Though he came from a wealthy family, as a Jew in South Carolina with a mediocre war record Moses’ future was not particularly bright in 1865. As historian Benjamin Ginsberg has described it, “his ambitions thwarted in the old white South, Moses aspired to construct a new black South Carolina in which he would be a leader.”⁵ Extensive scalawag support would be hard to come by since there were many social dangers and occasionally physical dangers for openly advocating in favor of the Republicans in the white South. As we will see, the Republicans would have to search for pockets of potential allies in the hostile environment of the post-bellum South.⁶

The scholarship on scalawags has “focused on five principal questions: What kind of people were they? How many of them were there? Why did they become Republicans? How effective were they? And what happened to them?”⁷ The primary concern of this paper is what kind of people they were and why they became Republicans. Hazardous answers to those questions allows one to pinpoint potential bases of Republican support

³ Rubin, *South Carolina Scalawags*, xv-xvi.

⁴ Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America’s Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877* (New York: Harper & Row, 1988), 297.

⁵ Benjamin Ginsberg, *Moses of South Carolina: A Jewish Scalawag during Radical Reconstruction* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2010), 8, 19-34.

⁶ James Alex Baggett, *The Scalawags: Southern Dissenters in the Civil War and Reconstruction* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003), 3, 6.

⁷ Rubin, *South Carolina Scalawags*, xvii

and thus other potential outcomes of the Republican tenure in the South during Reconstruction. In the Jim Crow South, scalawags were hidden and disowned in early regional histories because they were looked upon as traitors to the white race. “The redeemer Democrats drove the scalawags into obscurity. The redeemers and their advocates left only memoirs of the scalawags’ worst exemplars, associating the scalawags with corruption and the black man in politics, historically the kiss of death in Southern politics.”⁸ They were not acknowledged or even described at all in early accounts of Reconstruction. More recently though, the scalawag has become a less “shadowy figure” as Hyman Rubin III, the authority on South Carolina scalawags, calls him. It is now possible to answer some of the historiographical questions about scalawags thanks to excellent research conducted primarily in the past fifty years.⁹

South Carolina scalawags fit into several different profiles. The largest group were the upcountry Unionists. This group generally opposed secession and owned few slaves. The Republican party offered upcountry Unionists an opportunity to expand political authority beyond the antebellum lowcountry elite who traditionally held it.¹⁰ “Prior to 1867, the state did have *potential* white Republicans – many more, in fact, than it ever had

⁸ Baggett, *The Scalawags*, xii; Richard L. Hume and Jerry B. Gough, *Blacks, Carpetbaggers, and Scalawags: The Constitutional Conventions of Radical Reconstruction* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2008), 6.

⁹ Rubin, *South Carolina Scalawags*, xviii-xix; For exemplary studies on scalawags see Elizabeth Studley Nathans, *Losing the Peace: Georgia Republicans and Reconstruction, 1865-1871* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1968); Warren A. Ellem, “Who Were the Mississippi Scalawags?” *Journal of Southern History* 38, No 2 (May 1972) 217-240; Sarah Woolfolk Wiggins, *The Scalawag in Alabama Politics, 1865-1881* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1977); James Alex Baggett, *The Scalawags: Southern Dissenters in the Civil War and Reconstruction* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2003); Richard L. Hume and Jerry B. Gough, *Blacks, Carpetbaggers, and Scalawags: The Constitutional Conventions of Radical Reconstruction* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2008) (this study in particular features a wealth of statistical data on the 1,018 participants in Constitutional conventions of the late 1860s); Frank J. Wetta, *The Louisiana Scalawags: Politics, Race, and Terrorism during the Civil War and Reconstruction* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2012).

¹⁰ Rubin, *South Carolina Scalawags*, xix-xx.

actual white Republicans. Upcountry farmers and Charleston artisans, country lawyers and urban shopkeepers, these men had a common deep mistrust of secessionist prewar elite and their political vehicle, the Democratic party”¹¹ Those of the upcountry typically thought of the old political order as responsible for the mistake that was the Civil War. If they obtained power, they intended to spread the political wealth more than their predecessors. The upcountry Unionists were initially championed by James L. Orr of Anderson County, the governor of South Carolina from 1866-1868. They oversaw the passage of measures that limited the number of representatives in the state legislature per county to twelve, a reduction from Charleston’s twenty. Their efforts to redistribute political power began the process of Reconstruction in South Carolina.¹²

Besides upcountry farmers there was another smaller group of scalawags. “Republicans also attracted a number of urban and small-town artisans and...foreign-born urban workingmen.”¹³ This group was more concerned with modernizing the South and growing industry. Though numerically a smaller group throughout the South, the urban workmen and artisans still had great potential to bring about change. Since they labored in an urban environment, slavery played a comparatively smaller role in their workplace, though they obviously encountered it every day in countless ways. They were the sort of people who had a lot to gain from the Republican economic philosophy which encouraged hard individual work as a means to success. The printers fit neatly into this scalawag profile.

¹¹ Rubin, *South Carolina Scalawags*, 1.

¹² Rubin III, *South Carolina Scalawags*, 16-17.

¹³ Foner, *Reconstruction*, 299.

Historians Eric Foner and Heather Cox Richardson have provided useful explanations of Republican values both before and after the Civil War that would-be supporters would have to embrace. Free labor was the central focus for the Republicans. The greatest evil of slavery in their eyes was that slaves were not paid for their efforts and had no opportunity to advance beyond their present situation. By making hard labor the work of slaves, it became degraded and undesirable in Southern society. “The most cherished values of the free labor outlook – economic development, social mobility, and political democracy – all appeared to be violated in the [antebellum] South.” Republicans hoped to restore the dignity of free and labor provide equal opportunities for social advancement, provided people supplied enough individual effort.¹⁴

Republicans argued the South would be far more economically prosperous with free labor instead of slave labor. Their reasoning was that slave labor denied the slave the education, incentives, and opportunity which made free labor work. Republicans also blamed the lack of education and the mentality that labor was something to be performed by slaves rather than something to be proud of, for the plight of poor whites in the South. The party depicted substantial social mobility as uncommon in the South. Slaves obviously could not rise to a higher status, aristocratic whites held most of the power and wealth, and poor whites were stuck in the middle unable to rise to any other position. Free labor, the Republicans claimed, would enable greater social mobility because people, especially the freedmen, would have greater incentive to work and advance.¹⁵

¹⁴ Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), 40, 50.

¹⁵ Heather Cox Richardson, *The Death of Reconstruction: Race, Labor, and Politics in the Post-Civil War North, 1865-1901* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 7-8; Hume and Gough, *Blacks, Carpetbaggers, and Scalawags*, 2.

While Republicans expected these qualities to manifest themselves among the freedmen, they earnestly hoped for them to appear throughout the South. In short, would-be Republican advocates would have to endorse black wage labor as well as social mobility purely based on hard-working merit. Hard work, frugality, and self-advancement were not unknown traits of many native white Southerners, particularly those who worked in skilled trades like printing.

The printers of Columbia appeared to be a promising place to find potential Republican supporters. Besides adhering to Republican values of individual improvement, they had several characteristics that singled them out as potential scalawags. First, Republican patronage money was a significant factor in the growth of the printing trade in Columbia following the Civil War. A brief sketch of the printing industry in Columbia will illustrate this. In 1860, the city was home to about 8,000 people and three Democratic daily newspapers, the *Daily Carolina Times*, *Daily South Carolinian*, and *Daily Southern Guardian*, each with a separate weekly edition.¹⁶ During the Civil War three new religious weeklies appeared in Columbia, the *Confederate Baptist*, *Southern Lutheran*, and *Southern Presbyterian*. The *Southern Presbyterian* extended the operations of a much older quarterly journal, the *Southern Presbyterian Review*. Of these six papers to exist in Columbia prior to 1865, two lived beyond the war's conclusion and only one paper, the *Southern Presbyterian*, lasted beyond 1867. The South had already dramatically lagged behind the North in terms of newspaper production on the eve of the Civil War. In 1860, the 11 states that would become the Confederacy contained a third of the US population, but only an eighth of its

¹⁶ John Hammond Moore, *Columbia and Richland County: A South Carolina Community, 1790-1990* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1993), 211.

newspapers.¹⁷ The devastation of the Civil War only worsened that ratio, and Columbia was no exception.

In the aftermath of the Civil War, the Southern press made a remarkable return considering the circumstances. Here, Columbia provides another excellent example of the print industry's resilience. Following the infamous burning of Columbia by Union General William T. Sherman, much of the city and its economy lay in ruins. All print-related industries of Columbia were either destroyed, like Walker, Evans, & Cogswell, which did important financial printing for the Confederate government, or moved, like the *Southern Presbyterian* which took its operations to Augusta, Georgia in October 1864 not to return until December 1865, but the press would not be stopped. Mere weeks after the fire, on March 21, 1865 the appropriately named *Columbia Daily Phoenix* defiantly emerged to continue to bring news about the war's closing months and declare the resilience of the printing trade. The *Phoenix's* proprietor, enterprising Julian Selby, found a slightly damaged printing press in the rubble of the *South Carolinian* office where he had previously worked, but type was only discovered in Abbeville and ink and paper in Greenville. Within a few weeks, Selby procured a more functional printing press in nearby Camden.¹⁸

The *Daily Phoenix* was the first of many papers to materialize in Columbia after 1865. After the *Southern Presbyterian* returned to Columbia in December 1865, several other religious publications joined it. The *Working Christian* (Baptist) and *Temperance*

¹⁷ Richard H. Abbott, *For Free Press and Equal Rights: Republican Newspapers in the Reconstruction South*, ed. John W. Quist (Athens: The University of Georgia Press, 2004), 40.

¹⁸ Julian A. Selby, *Memorabilia and Anecdotal Reminiscences of Columbia, S.C., and Incidents Connected Therewith* (Columbia: The R.L. Bryan Company, 1905), 101-105.

Advocate (Methodist) had the shortest runs with six years apiece.¹⁹ The *Lutheran Visitor* (Lutheran) and the *Christian Neighbor* (Methodist) both began in 1868 and lasted until the early 1900's.²⁰

During Reconstruction, there were several short-lived newspapers which did not last beyond a year. If one had the capital to purchase the necessary items, he could often run the paper at a financial loss for a few months hoping profits might eventually offset the debt. The true test was making it last beyond six months, as those that did usually ran more than a year. In 1870 the South boasted 33 percent more daily newspapers than it had in 1860, but of the journals reported to exist in the 1870 census, almost 2,000 of the 5,871 had vanished by 1880.²¹ Columbia is representative of this pattern. The *Daily American Patriot* (1866), *Daily Advertiser* (1871), and *Columbia Daily Sun* (1873) are just a few examples of local papers that began and ended their runs within a year. The early days of the *Daily Phoenix* illustrate a problem that would face many emerging newspapers. Initially the *Phoenix* accepted food staples in lieu of cash subscriptions owing to Columbia's material shortages following the fire.²² Often thrown in as an amusing detail in the *Phoenix*'s story, the problem of Southern post-war poverty would prove to be a very serious roadblock to many papers. Revenue needed to come from other sources than subscription money. Job printing, advertisements, and government printing contracts would account for substantial portions of the income necessary to make newspapers last beyond a few months.

¹⁹ 1871-1877 and 1870-1876 respectively; The *Temperance Advocate* was associated with the *Christian Neighbor*.

²⁰ Initially titled the *Lutheran and Visitor*

²¹ Abbott, *For Free Press*, 41-43.

²² Moore, *Columbia and Richland County*, 212.

The Republican presence in the South offered a direct benefit to the recovering printing trade. On a basic level, the arrival of two-party politics meant a whole new set of newspapers would have to open for the Republican party to succeed. Without a Republican publication to “disseminate information ignored by mainstream newspapers, engender a sense of community among party members, and to legitimize the party in the eyes of its opponents,” Republicans could not expect to gain extensive support.²³ The existence of additional newspapers translated to the creation of more printing jobs. The *South Carolina Republican* was one of the first major Republican newspapers in the state. It was founded in Charleston, but was produced in Columbia from 1869-1870. Its publisher, Joseph Waldo Denny, was awarded the state printing contract to support local publication efforts friendly to the administration, but before long, the *South Carolina Republican* was forced to close due to a shortage of funds.²⁴ It was succeeded in 1870 by the *Columbia Daily Union*, edited by L. Cass Carpenter of Connecticut. In January of 1873, another Republican daily, the *Daily Evening Herald*, arrived to compete with the *Daily Union*. The *Evening Herald* was opposed to Republican governor Franklin J. Moses, whom the *Union* supported. Rival candidate Daniel H. Chamberlain was eager to support an anti-Moses paper. By May, the *Evening Herald* had bought the *Daily Union* and merged the two papers to form the *Daily Union-Herald*, eventually edited by James Thompson, another Northerner, from Pennsylvania. Funds began to dry up without direct state support from Moses, and several months later, the *Union-Herald* sold half of its ownership to Moses himself for \$12,000. When Chamberlain was elected governor in

²³ Abbott, *For Free Press*, 4; Mark Wahlgren Summers, *The Press Gang: Newspapers and Politics, 1865-1878* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1994), 222.

²⁴ Abbott, *For Free Press*, 64, 84.

1874, funding became much more consistent as it came from the state directly. After the Republicans were voted out of office in 1876, their newspapers did not last long. With the demise of the *Union-Herald* in 1877, Republican newspapers would be absent from South Carolina for quite some time.²⁵

Beyond the creation of more newspapers, Republican control of the state government meant they chose who received the state printing contract (along with many other patronage positions and contracts).²⁶ State printing had existed long before the Civil War, but the Republicans had it in their power to see to it that state patronage money went directly to a group of people who had several reasons to endorse the new regime. Ultimately, a new company, the Republican Printing Company, was created expressly to handle state printing rather than awarding the contract to a local newspaper. The creation of a new company resulted in the creation of more printing jobs.

The number of publications was not the only aspect of the printing trade to expand during Reconstruction. The number of people involved grew as well. Columbia city directories and U.S. censuses paint a portrait of who was involved in printing during Reconstruction.²⁷ To be as broad as possible in my survey of the printing trade, I looked not only for printers, compositors, and pressmen (those who physically labored in press rooms) but editors, publishers, bookbinders, and stationers.²⁸ In total I discovered 130

²⁵ Woody, *Republican Newspapers*, 34-42.

²⁶ It was the job of the state printer to make copies of state senate or house reports, bills being considered or passed, and other official government business to be externally or internally read. If the state printing was too slow, legislative proceedings could be held up. Various companies and individuals would aggressively vie for what promised to be a lucrative contract. Republican control of the state government meant that the party could have a direct impact on the flourishing of certain printing institutions.

²⁷ They are obviously not perfect since they do not cover every year and some people may not have made it into these documents. Nevertheless, they are the best source to indicate about how many people were involved and who they were.

²⁸ Printers and compositors were largely synonymous terms. Both referred to the job of setting the type on a printing job and double checking for mistakes. The pressmen actually operated the printing press. They took the completed panel of typeset, inked it, and pressed it onto the newsheet. They were also responsible

relevant names, 107 of which were printers, compositors, or pressmen. The 107 printers, compositors, and pressmen (whom I will call printers for convenience) conducted the actual labor in the pressroom and I will largely speak about them. Of my five years of reference, 1860, 1868, 1870, 1875 and 1879, the year 1875 had the most printing names listed, seventy-eight, and 1868 the fewest with twenty-one suggesting a stark reduction in employment opportunities for printers immediately after the Civil War followed by a remarkable resurgence. There are some names that appear on all four documents and others that only appear on one. A total of thirty-one names appear on multiple documents.

The list of names gathered from the four city directories and the census of 1870 formed the basis for my investigation of how the Republicans and the printers could have been mutually beneficial to each other. The direct benefit of the Republican presence in Columbia as manifested in more jobs and patronage money meant that printers had plenty of financial reason to support the Republicans. That presence became most apparent when contrasting the data between 1875 and 1879 after Republican newspapers and patronage had been forced out of the state. In 1875 there were seventy-eight names associated with printing, but in 1879 there were only fifty-seven listed, hinting that the absence of the Republicans hurt the print industry.²⁹

The printers of Columbia were also a promising base of Republican support because of their personal stake in the question of labor. Printers generally had a long history of labor activism and were one of the first trades to unionize in the United States, the

for a final typo spot check. Printers could either be paid by the day or by the piece of type set (per 1,000 ems) depending on the proprietor. Typographical unions began to admit pressmen to membership in 1858. See George A. Tracy, *History of the Typographical Union: Its Beginnings, Progress and Development, Its Beneficial and Educational Features Together with a Chapter on the Early Organizations of Printers* (Indianapolis, International Typographical Union, 1913), 172; Cathleen Ann Baker, "The Press that Cotton Built: Printing in Mobile, Alabama, 1850-1865" (PhD diss., University of Alabama, 2004), 190-197.

²⁹ See Appendices A and B for lists of all the names.

National Typographical Union being founded in 1836.³⁰ The National Typographical Union was a fairly progressive institution, addressing the inclusion of African-Americans and women by 1869. South Carolina in particular was a hotbed for printers with the earliest typographical union in the state formed in Charleston in 1834, predating the national union. Columbia had a very active local typographical union (Typographical Union No 34), which hinted at a concern for the maintenance of dignified free labor. Even though unions were often associated with Democratic politics, the strong presence in the slaveholding South of typographical unions suggests that printers could have been a group sympathetic to the goals of free labor ideology.

It can be confirmed that at least thirty out of the 107 printers were a part of Typographical Union No 34. The vast majority of that information comes from lists of elected officers posted in local newspapers.³¹ No list of the entire membership was ever posted, so any numbers beyond the listed officers and the few regular members I could identify cannot be confirmed. People like Thomas L. Mood and Frederick H. Marks Jr. represent the frustrating lack of data about the union. Both lived in Columbia from 1860 to 1875 and beyond. Mood was a member of a local rifle club, and Marks was the patriarch of a printing family (his brother, Edward B. Marks, and son Richard Stuart Marks worked with him at the *Daily Phoenix* and his daughter, Frances, was married to Josiah Patton, a foreman in the pressroom of the Republican Printing Company). I have no evidence of their involvement with the typographical union, but their deep roots in the Columbia printing trade and other local activities suggest they would have to be active

³⁰ The name changed to the International Typographical Union in 1869 after organizing members in Canada.

³¹ See Appendix C for a list of elected officers and the relevant column of Appendix A for a list of known union members.

union members if not elected leaders. So while I can only confirm that about a third of those involved with printing were in the local union, the real percentage surely was more substantial. Nineteen of the thirty confirmed union members appeared multiple times on directories and censuses, creating a correlation between permanence and leadership. Eight of those nineteen members were in leadership positions with other fraternal organizations as well such as the Knights of Pythias and the Improved Order of Red Men, which demonstrated the intense local involvement of those who remained in Columbia throughout their adult lives.³²

At least one member of the local union, William E Anderson, was a Republican. He was elected secretary and treasurer in 1869.³³ Additionally, two men, James Diseker and William W. Farrow, who worked at the Republican *Union-Herald* were union members. Association with Republican papers did not necessarily mean political agreement, but their admittance into the union and their election to leadership positions showed a degree of acceptance. Even a tenuous Republican presence in the local typographical union suggests that some potential existed for there to be a connection between the local typographical union and the new state government.

The printers also manifested several qualities that Republicans themselves admired. In the spirit of the free labor work ethic, many printers managed to work their way up to more prestigious positions. Most came from very modest means. Of the 107 printers, forty-three rented rooms, hinting at degree of poverty.³⁴ A printer typically started his work as an apprentice. From there, he moved up in the profession through hard work and

³² See Appendix A.

³³ *Daily Phoenix*, October 13, 1872.

³⁴ See Appendix A.

self-improvement. Many made lifelong careers out of printing, ending up a pressroom foremen or even, in the case of Charles Calvo Jr. and Josiah Patton, owning their own printing companies.

It was not uncommon for printers who had spent most of their lives working in Columbia to keep working until a few years before their deaths. This fierce devotion to the work of printing was exemplified in the life and death of Edwin Forde, a charter member of the local typographical union. Over the course of his professional life in Columbia he worked for the *Daily Register*, Calvo & Patton printing company, *The State* newspaper, and other publications. Until three months before his death in January, 1921 at age seventy-six, Forde was a foreman in the pressroom at *The State*. He only ceased coming to work when he was physically unable to do so. Clearly individual improvement and hard work were important values in the life of Edwin Forde and other printers like him.³⁵

The significant number of printers involved in local fraternal organizations further singled them out as possible Republican supporters. At least eight printers were involved in leadership positions of fraternal organizations in Columbia.³⁶ The actual number of involved printers was likely even higher since, as was the case for the typographical union, no membership lists were published and all that was available were lists of elected leaders. Even though most did not allow black membership, organizations like the Knights of Pythias and the Improved Order of Red Men, groups in which printers were overrepresented among the leaders, were sites where socially and professionally ambitious and mobile people met and interacted. Miles B McSweeney, a member of the

³⁵ *The State*, January 18, 1921.

³⁶ See Appendix A.

Knights of Pythias while working in Columbia as a printer during Reconstruction, would go on to be governor of the state in 1899. He was an exceptional example, but the son of an Irish immigrant orphaned at a young age demonstrated the sort of social mobility possible in a world based upon a commitment to free labor.

Studies of nineteenth-century fraternal orders like the Knights of Pythias generally agree that while they promoted the perpetuation of white segregated society and “idealized hierarchy,” they also promoted ideas of social mobility and the mixture of people from various economic backgrounds.³⁷ So though most fraternal organizations were usually closed to African Americans and entrenched social and racial hierarchies, the sort of civic engagement and social mixing they promoted aligned closely to many cherished Republican values. There was at least some common ground for these white Southerners and Republicans to meet on.

In addition to incentives for supporting Republican rule, several of Columbia’s printers had no special connection to the Southern Democratic order. At least twenty-one of the 107 Columbia printers were not from South Carolina, and eleven of those were either from the North or first or second generation immigrants.³⁸ Especially in the case of the immigrants, these people were less committed to the existing South Carolina political hierarchy or the system of slave labor like other classic scalawag types such as upcountry farmers. Even if immigrants did not have Republican leanings, they did not necessarily have any more incentive to vote Democratic. And those that came from the North, even

³⁷ Mary Ann Clawson, “Fraternal Orders and Class Formation in the Nineteenth-Century United States,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* Vol 27, No 4, (Oct, 1985), 673-674; Jason Kaufman and David Weintraub, “Social-Capital Formation and the American Fraternal Association: New Empirical Evidence,” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* Vol 35, No 1, (Summer, 2004), 36.

³⁸ See Appendix A.

staunch Democrats, generally were firmly committed to the idea of free labor, so they too were not pre-disposed to have strong ties to the traditional South Carolina ruling class.³⁹ Plenty of known scalawags, despite decades of living in South Carolina, had originated outside the state, such as Columbia mayors John Alexander and John Agnew and alderman William Mooney.

The Schorb family exemplify an immigrant family the Republicans could have reasonably targeted as possible supporters. John George Schorb immigrated from Germany in the first half of the nineteenth-century. His son Dewey was born in 1856, shortly after John moved to Columbia to start working as a printer at the *Southern Presbyterian*. When Dewey came of age he joined his father as a printer. In 1895 Dewey became the foreman of the Bryan Printing Company until his death in 1905. During his life in Columbia, Dewey was a member not only of the typographical union but also the Junior Order of American Mechanics, and he was a charter member of the Wade Hampton Lodge of Odd Fellows. Like many printers, Dewey spent most of his life in Columbia, working in the printing trade until his death. He participated actively in several local organizations. He also advanced from a lower position to a more managerial one based upon hard work. Each of these facts lend themselves to Republican support.⁴⁰

³⁹ Richardson, *The Death of Reconstruction*, 8-9.

⁴⁰ *The State*, March 24, 1893; *The State*, April 16, 1905.

Chapter 2: Why Did the Printers Not Become Republican Supporters?

While we have scant information about what this group of printers' ideology was, demographic data and their few recorded actions can give us clues as to what that ideology was. Firstly, the lack of documentary evidence showing any involvement with the Republican party at a basic level suggests a rejection of Republican values. Apart from William E Anderson, who served as a supervisor of election in 1872 for the Republicans in Richland county, none of the printers actively supported the Republican Party in any documented way. Beyond that, the only recorded political activity of the group at all was their collective action through the typographical union. Few, if any, were active in local politics on either the Democratic or Republican side, so though filled with potential Republicans, the printers did not end up directly advancing the new government.

The fear of being ostracized may have kept many from openly backing the Republican party. Threat of physical violence may have even played a role, though that was less common in urban environments. The fear of being shunned went beyond merely the cold shoulder. Employers would sometimes discriminate actively against known Republicans. People could even be kicked out of social clubs. In 1868 Franklin J. Moses and Thomas J. Robertson were expelled from the Euphradian society at the University of South Carolina for their association with Republicans. Even though that was a student organization and Moses and Robertson were alumni, that manner of directed dishonoring could be expected. That manner of shunning likely scared the printers extensively since

many were involved in organizations and clubs throughout the city. Clearly the typographical union was a little more tolerant since the one documented Republican of the group was freely elected in both elections in 1869 to a leadership position, but how far that acceptance went is unknown.⁴¹

Whatever momentum was generated in the local typographical union by the election of Republican printer William E Anderson had fizzled out by 1872. The union was once again controlled by mainstays of the Columbia community who had deeper ties to longstanding residents and were more active in city activities. People like William Anderson and John G Schorb were replaced by Charles Calvo Jr, Horatio Emlyn, and Miles McSweeney. Many of this new group that controlled the union from 1872 onward were employed by the Democratic *Phoenix* and appeared to have Democratic politics.⁴² Interestingly, all the documented instances of collective action came after 1872 when the leadership shifted. While the local typographical union could have become a force for Republicanism given registered Republicans and upwardly mobile immigrants were in power, it instead became a force for conservatism.

An example of the newer priorities of the local union can be observed in the creation of the *Daily Register* which began publication in July, 1875. The new newspaper stated its purpose was to “supply a demand long felt in Columbia – the publication of a thoroughly conservative paper.”⁴³ In one of its first issues, the *Register* explained how it came into being. “The *Columbia Register* is published daily by a number of practical printers lately engaged on one of the dailies in this city, who found it necessary to engage

⁴¹ Richard Zuczek, *State of Rebellion: Reconstruction in South Carolina* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1996), 52-53; Rubin, *South Carolina Scalawags*, xxiii; Baggett, *The Scalawags*, 3, 6.

⁴² See Appendix C and Appendix A.

⁴³ *Daily Register* July 28, 1875.

in a business with more prospective success than the one they had just abandoned. Finding that their labor was not remunerated with that promptness that should characterize any well regulated business, they felt the necessity of seeking other engagements.” Supposedly, the *Register* was “forced into this measure of competition by circumstances over which we had no control.”⁴⁴ It was surely no coincidence that the *Register* in its early days had an office almost directly across the street from the *Daily Phoenix* and that printers associated with the *Phoenix* in city directories began working at the *Register*. An article reprinted from the Republican *Union-Herald* confirms that the *Register* “is published by a number of the best hands who have been until recently employed on the *Phoenix*.”⁴⁵ Perhaps even more revealing, an advertisement for the first regular meeting of the local typographical union since founding of the *Register* appeared in that newspaper on July 31, 1875. No ad appeared in the *Daily Phoenix*, the paper that had traditionally conveyed messages for the union. Instead, what appeared in the *Phoenix* on July 31 was a job notice encouraging young aspiring printers to apply for work at the *Phoenix*.⁴⁶ Later that same year, the owners of the *Register* bought the *Daily Phoenix* and forced it to close by 1877.⁴⁷ This is a rare documented example of collective action by the Columbia printers, and one that was turned against a “friendly” Democratic paper. There is no evidence to prove the union was behind the abandonment of the *Phoenix*, but it would not be unreasonable given that several of the printers involved were known union leaders.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ *Daily Register* July 30, 1875.

⁴⁶ *Daily Register* July 31, 1875; *Daily Phoenix* July 31, 1875.

⁴⁷ Moore, *South Carolina Newspapers*, 199.

That manner of collective action was precisely what Republicans detested about unions.⁴⁸ If those printers had kept working hard at the *Phoenix*, free labor ideology suggested, then their individual commitment to that work would have ultimately led them to a better situation. Instead they employed collective action to forcefully create a better situation for themselves rather than earn it, as good free laborers of the Republican mold would have done. In any case, this instance of documented collective action from the local union showed that rather than agitating for things the Republican party would have approved of, such as integration and increased opportunities for fellow workers, the printers used their power to unjustly create a better employment situation without doing the necessary work.

Another documented instance of collective action from the printers was hostile to the Republican value of equality of opportunity in the workplace. African American printers in Columbia found it challenging to find work in many cases. During Reconstruction, five black printers appeared in the 1870 census and the 1875 city directory.⁴⁹ The 1870 census reports four out of thirty-two involved with the print industry were African Americans: John Franklin, Isaac Thompson, John Williams, and Albert Wing. They all were between the ages of eighteen and twenty-seven. Thompson, the youngest, was not in the 1875 directory and presumably left Columbia. Franklin, Williams, and Wing were all in the 1875 directory, but only Williams was listed as a printer. Wing was listed as a laborer, which likely denotes downward mobility. Franklin had no listed occupation, which probably was not a favorable change either. David Gray, a new black printer, had arrived in the 1875 directory meaning there were only two black printers instead of four

⁴⁸ Richardson, *The Death of Reconstruction*, 85.

⁴⁹ Those were the only two documents to ask people their race.

as in 1870. This could be the result of the depression of 1873-79, or it could be that early black hopes of breaking into printing were meeting resistance (or both).

It is unclear if there were other black printers beyond the five listed in these two documents, but an article written by the *Daily Phoenix* about the Republican Printing Company hints that there might have been more. The local union, which supplied workers to the Republican Printing Company, refused to work with any black printers and threatened to have its members quit if any African-Americans were hired.⁵⁰ Company foreman and former typographical union president C.J. McJunkin flatly denied that any “union or non-union colored printer” applied for jobs with the Republican Printing Company.⁵¹ The Columbia union was not unique in this sentiment. The *Daily Republican*, in Charleston, SC did hire black printers, but the members of the Charleston Typographical Society refused to work in the same room as them.⁵² The National Union began addressing this issue in 1869. A black man applied for membership at the local Washington, DC union (Columbia Typographical Society). While he was admitted, the National Union did not make any decision about whether other black printers could apply. In 1870, the union decided that the matter should be left to the discretion of local chapters. Though not particularly groundbreaking, this decision was unusual. Most unions either barred blacks from entering altogether or forced them to create their own segregated local chapters. The fact that typographical unions were left the option of admitting African American workers did not alter the racial landscape in the South, but it

⁵⁰ *Daily Phoenix* December 6, 1873.

⁵¹ South Carolina General Assembly, *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of South-Carolina: Special Session, Commencing Tuesday, October 21, 1873* (Columbia: Republican Printing Company, 1873) 196.

⁵² Robert H. Woody, *Republican Newspapers of South Carolina* (Charlottesville: The Historic Publishing Co., Inc., 1936), 29.

does reveal that there was a possibility of cooperation between printers and Republicans.⁵³

Clearly the resistance to integration was not indicative of Republican sympathy among the printers of Columbia. Like the closing of the *Phoenix*, this sort of collective action was precisely why Republicans found unions distasteful. In their eyes, collective action allowed workers to be lazier than they might have been if they were all working as hard as possible for their own betterment. Unions were only a positive force if they actively worked to keep a level playing field open for all potential workers to rise. In other words, Republicans valued unions that were unlike Typographical Union No 34.⁵⁴

While the printers did not become scalawags in any significant numbers, the question remains why they did not. As previously mentioned, there was every reason to believe they may have given their profession, backgrounds, fraternal involvement, social mobility, and commitment to unionization, but their obvious rejection of several basic Republican principles raises several questions. The suggested answers speak to the benefits of granular analysis.

One of the potential reasons for printers to support the Republicans was the wealth of new patronage money. From what we know of the Republican Printing Company, that money did not find its way to the printers. The diary of Josephus Woodruff, the South Carolina Senate clerk and co-owner of the Printing Company, outlines the flow of money. Woodruff's writings clearly indicate he did not interact with the printers on the shop floor very often, and it is likely that Albert O Jones, the South Carolina House clerk

⁵³ Tracy, *History of the Typographical Union*, 239, 248, 258; Eric Foner, *Reconstruction*, 479.

⁵⁴ David Montgomery, *Beyond Equality: Labor and the Radical Republicans 1862-1872* (New York: Knopf, 1967), 196, 230-233.

and other owner, did not either. Woodruff, who lived in Charleston and only came to Columbia for business, would relate instructions for what needed to be done by the Printing Company to his chief foreman, Josiah Patton.⁵⁵ Patton would then inform the printers and oversee their work in the pressroom, so there was little, if any, direct contact between Republican officials and printers. Woodruff claimed in his diary that he did his best to make sure the printers were paid on time, but the payment coming from the Republican government was not always forthcoming. Even when it was, it was not substantially more than they could have made elsewhere. Every week Woodruff would shake down the state treasurer, Francis Cardozo for \$250 to pay “the hands.” There were times however, when money was not so forthcoming from Cardozo, which frequently prompted Woodruff to write “the printers will have to live on faith.”⁵⁶ This indicates that the printers were presumably not benefiting from the Republican government in any great financial way. As mentioned before, we do know that several printers working for Republican Printing Company (probably all) were members of the local union, and the unreliability of the pay surely did not endear the Republicans to the printers.

Another potential deterrent for would-be Republicans was the tight-knit nature of the Columbia printing community. Several intermarriages, fathers and sons, and pairs of brothers meant that more so than to any political entity, these people had to be loyal to each other. Close analysis turns up evidence of these relationships which may have nudged the printers away from Republicanism in several small ways.

⁵⁵ Josephus Woodruff, *Behind the Scenes in the Reconstruction Legislature of South Carolina: Diary of Josephus Woodruff*, ed. Robert H. Woody (Baton Rouge: Franklin Press, 1936), 8, 25-26.

⁵⁶ Woodruff, *Behind the Scenes*, 10.

Genealogical research revealed a striking number of instances of intermarriage between some of these families. Seven printers' families that were otherwise unrelated to each other became related in Columbia by marriage. Additionally, eleven groups of fathers and sons, brothers, and an uncle and nephew were included among the 107 printers.⁵⁷ Printing then, was clearly a family affair. Historian James Baggett notes many scalawags were quite familial. "Kinship ties through blood and through marriage abounded among scalawag officeholders...Many families had more than one member who held office as a Republican."⁵⁸ That same idea worked in the opposite way with the printers. The ties of family and friendship probably served to prevent them from politically engaging with the Republicans. It would be much harder for one person to break from a family's politics rather than go along with them.

Josiah Patton is illustrative of this. Patton was born in 1832, and moved to Columbia from Albany, New York sometime before 1860. He did not serve in the Confederate armed forces. He worked as a printer in Columbia from his arrival before the Civil War at least through the 1880's and likely until near the time of his death in 1899. Listed as a pressman in 1860 and 1868, he was in 1875 foreman of the Republican Printing Company. Following the dissolution of the Republican Printing Company, Patton paired with Charles Calvo Jr (another long-time printer in Columbia) to start Calvo and Patton printing company associated with the Democratic *Daily Register*. Here again, Patton's profile makes him appear to be prime scalawag material, but he did not become one. A less noticeable factor that may have dissuaded any latent scalawag feelings was his marriage to Frances Marks, the daughter of Frederick Marks. By marrying into a well-

⁵⁷ See Appendix A and Appendix B for a list of familial relationships.

⁵⁸ Baggett, *The Scalawags*, 31.

established Columbia family, it was unlikely that Patton's politics would differ dramatically from the Marks's views.⁵⁹ Not only then would Patton have to face being ostracized by people he knew around town, his immediate adopted family would likely be at odds with him if he chose to endorse the Republican party.⁶⁰

The Forde family was at the center of another network of printers who were drawn together through a combination of work, marriage, and family. Edwin Forde, born in 1844 the son of an Irish immigrant, was one of the founding members of the local typographical union. His younger brother Charles, twelve years his junior, joined him as a printer working at the *Daily Register* when he came of age. The familial relationship between the two and their involvement in the local union already created powerful links between the two, but when their sister Mary Agnes Forde married fellow printer Horatio N. Emlyn, their family circle expanded to include more printers.

Born in 1844 in Charleston, Horatio N. Emlyn moved to Columbia just prior to the Civil War. He initially worked at the *Daily Phoenix*, but Emlyn may have been one of those in favor of leaving the *Phoenix* for the *Daily Register* since he later became associated with it along with his brothers-in-law. Emlyn was quite involved in local activities. He served for two years (four election cycles) as secretary and treasurer of the local typographical union and was elected to be the representative of Typographical Union No. 34 at the International Typographical Union conference in 1875.⁶¹

Additionally, Emlyn was elected to leadership positions in both the Knights of Pythias and the Improved Order of Red Men in 1874 and 1875. As if all that were not enough,

⁵⁹ They were well known in town since Frederick's father and Frances' grandfather Dr. Elias Marks who in 1828 founded the Barhamville Academy, also known as the South Carolina Female Collegiate Institute.

⁶⁰ See Appendix A.

⁶¹ *Daily Phoenix*, April 25, 1875; Appendix C.

Emlyn co-led the “Mechanics and Farmers Building Loan Association of Richland County” with William J. Duffie, a local bookseller.⁶²

The only other documented printer besides Emlyn to hold leadership positions in the typographical union, the Knights of Pythias, and the Improved Order of Red Men was Charles Calvo Jr. Calvo Jr. was the son of Charles Calvo Sr., older brother of Eugene Calvo, and business partner with the Josiah Patton, who married into the Marks family which included several printers. He served as president of the local typographical union twice and once each as vice president and secretary and treasurer. Calvo Jr. was a central figure not only in the printing community, where he worked his way up from an apprentice printer to a business owner, but through his activity with fraternal organizations several other city residents likely knew him.⁶³

In summary, the two Forde brothers were linked to Emlyn through marriage. Each family had ties to the typographical union and to other fraternal societies where they encountered other printing families like the Calvo’s who had a business connection to Josiah Patton who was linked to the Marks family through marriage. When tracing the connections between these printing families, it becomes clear that the ties between printers went far beyond the workplace.

More than familial relations held the printing community together. The bonds of friendship ran deep between the printers in Columbia. James Woodrow, editor of the *Southern Presbyterian*, and employer of John George Schorb and his son Dewey, conducted the funeral of John George. Not just any employer would conduct the funeral of an employee. Methodist minister John W. Elkins, son of long-time Columbia printer

⁶² *Daily Phoenix*, March 3, 1873.

⁶³ See Appendix A and Appendix C.

John A. Elkins, conducted the funeral of Miles B. McSweeney. The aforementioned John A. Elkins served as a pallbearer at the funerals of Charles Calvo Sr. and Edwin Forde. In each obituary of a printer, all the members of the local typographical union were requested to attend in a body to honor their members in death. Many printers belonged to fraternal organizations like the Knights of Pythias, the Odd Fellows Lodge, and Woodmen of the World that supported their newly deceased members. The Woodmen of the World paid for printer Eugene Calvo's tombstone. The mutual connection of printing brought these men together in both life and death. These connections and relationships held great capacity to shape ideology. Though it cannot be confirmed that ideology was subordinated to kinship the deep ties that did exist likely nudged the printers away from the unfamiliar entity of the Republicans.⁶⁴

The significant numbers of printers in other fraternal orders also helped tie this group of Southerners together. Aside from seeing each other in the workplace, many printers saw a lot of each other during club meetings and activities. Friendships likely developed through the extensive shared experiences these men had. The group dynamic of the printers probably only further served to enforce the prevailing social norms of Democratic support. If anyone was interested in backing the Republican party his social life was liable to be severely disrupted. As with the family dynamic, it was always easier to follow the group than be a lone dissenter. Additionally, even if the Republicans could offer printers various benefits, they were the unknown quality in an equation that included their already well defined community. For all these reasons, Republican support was not forthcoming from the printers.

⁶⁴ *The State*, March 24, 1893, November 8, 1894, September 30, 1909, January 18, 1921; See Appendix A and Appendix B.

Chapter 3: The Change in State Printing

Even though the printers did not prove to be Republican supporters, the printing trade was still significantly impacted by the Republican rule in South Carolina. That effect can most easily be seen in the arena of state printing, one of the most important aspects of the trade in Columbia during Reconstruction.⁶⁵

The type of individual who carried out government printing changed during Republican rule. Historically, printing was often a stop on the way to another business career or a political one. Prior to the Civil War, those that became influential in the trade and were chosen as state printers were often wealthy literati with little actual printing experience and grand social aspirations who were destined for a second career elsewhere.⁶⁶ Charles P. Pelham was typical of that group. He was a professor at South Carolina College from 1846-1858, teaching Roman literature, political economy, and history. Pelham edited the *Daily Southern Guardian* along with the previous state printer E.H. Britton from 1858 through the paper's demise in 1865. Critically, Pelham and Britton's status as editors did not necessarily indicate they had any real experience working in a pressroom.⁶⁷

⁶⁵ See Appendix E for a list of South Carolina state printers.

⁶⁶ Jeffrey L. Pasley, "*The Tyranny of Printers*": *Newspaper Politics in the Early American Republic* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001), 27, 47, 224-225.

⁶⁷ William Gilmore Simms, *The Letters of William Gilmore Simms: Volume IV, 1858-1866* ed Mary C Simms Oliphant and T.C. Duncan Eaves (Columbia, University of South Carolina Press, 1955), 277 n284; Moore, *South Carolina Newspapers* 202.

After the war, Julian Selby, proprietor of *The Daily Phoenix*, was the state printer from 1866-67. A self-made man from a middling household, Selby started as an apprentice and accumulated actual printing experience by spending his entire working life around the offices of the *South Carolinian*.⁶⁸ The most important factor in choosing him as state printer was probably that he was one of the few people that had a functioning printing press and business after the war, but even though Selby had some editing experience, he represented an early departure from the prewar model of newspaper editors with little printing know-how and a more affluent background.

By 1868, other would-be printers had access to printing presses in Columbia, and Joseph Waldo Denny handled state printing from the special session of 1868 until 1871. Denny harkened back to the Pelham mold. Hailing from near Boston, Denny was a captain in the 25th Massachusetts volunteers during the Civil War.⁶⁹ After the war, he headed south and, despite little printing experience, became associated with Republican newspapers in South Carolina like the *Charleston Republican* and the *South Carolina Republican*. When the Republicans took office in 1868, they awarded the public printing contract to Denny to support newspapers sympathetic to the government's interests. The leaders of the Republican party (referred to as "the circle of friends" by subsequent state printers Jones and Woodruff) grew tired of Denny's "close manner of conducting business," and his failure to properly divide the profits from public printing. These issues prompted the state legislature to alter how public printing was done. The new resolution passed in 1871 required the house and senate clerks to jointly make a contract for public

⁶⁸ Selby, *Anecdotal Reminiscences*, 101.

⁶⁹ He would later write their regimental history in 1879.

printing. Albert O. Jones and Josephus Woodruff, the house and senate clerks, accordingly created the Republican Printing Company and awarded it the contract.⁷⁰

Neither Woodruff or Jones had much printing experience. Woodruff spent some time as a reporter and stenographer for the *Charleston Courier*. His main claim to fame was his coverage of the General Assembly when it called for the secession convention in 1860. Though Woodruff's time as a reporter likely familiarized him with printing operations, he did not have any formal editorial or printing experience.⁷¹ Little is known about Albert Osceola Jones, but it is doubtful that he had much editorial or printing expertise either. Born in Washington, DC in the 1840's, Jones was a mulatto who became the clerk of the South Carolina House of Representatives at least as early as 1868. The 1880 census lists a mulatto by that same name and approximate age as a farmer in Beaufort, South Carolina indicating that he may not have had any specific skills to fall back on once the Republican government was voted out.⁷² Woodruff's diary indicated that the both he and Jones had little contact with those doing the actual printing. The chief foreman Josiah Patton oversaw the labor while Woodruff would order the necessary materials, relay what jobs needed to be done, and pay the hands.⁷³ This all meant that people with real printing experience oversaw state printing without any connections to the editors or prominent local businessmen who had traditionally overseen state printing.

The Republican Printing Company was a new creation for the Columbia printing industry. It was a company divorced from newspapers and with the primary task of

⁷⁰ Woody, *Republican Newspapers*, p 34; Woodruff, *Behind the Scenes*, 7-9, 47-48, 51.

⁷¹ Elizabeth Fry Page, "The Romance of Southern Journalism," in *Bob Taylor's Magazine* (May 1910), 147.

⁷² *Daily Phoenix*, July 10, 1868; U.S. Census Bureau, 1870, 1880.

⁷³ Woodruff, *Behind the Scenes*, 5-6, 37, 44.

carrying out state printing. Republican money could be seen going to the printers themselves rather than Northern editors like James Thompson or L. Cass Carpenter. Job printers occasionally existed independently from newspapers in Columbia, like William Sloane's job office, but their business did not have political ramifications. The Republican Printing Company represented a concrete shift in the printing industry in Columbia brought about by the Republican party that was to have lasting impact. The responsibility of state printing shifted to the hands of people with no editorial experience or literary expertise. Because of this change, state printing (if not newspaper editing) became the domain of the average laborer into the twentieth-century. No longer would a state printer's portrait hang in the South Carolina state house, as John Jacob Faust's does (state printer from 1804-1819), because the new state printers were not usually destined for any other career path or of any higher social standing than other citizens of Columbia. People like Wills M. Rodgers, who was a union member and may have worked at the Republican Printing Company, would not be long remembered in the same way as previous state printers like Charles P. Pelham despite playing a pivotal role in the state printing process.

The election of 1876 ousted the Republicans from the state government, which prompted the dissolution of the Republican Printing Company and introduced the need for a new state printer. The Republican Printing Company's chief foreman, Josiah Patton, and multi-time local union president Charles Calvo Jr. formed their own printing company (creatively titled Calvo & Patton Printing Company) and were chosen as replacement state printers. While Calvo and Patton both worked at the *Daily Register*, they were not on the editorial staff (headed by Pelham) and came from humble

backgrounds. Calvo & Patton Printing Company may have been associated with the *Daily Register*, but, as with the Republican Printing Company, they were a company that was entirely dedicated to fulfilling the state printing contract. Even though the *Register* and Calvo & Patton were associated, printers in the 1879 Columbia city directory only listed one of the two as their place of employment. Calvo & Patton held the office until 1880 when James Woodrow, editor of the *Southern Presbyterian*, took over the position. Calvo and Patton and Woodrow then alternated public printing responsibilities every few years until 1898 when The R. L. Bryan Printing Company, an entity not associated with the newspaper business in any way, took over. The R. L. Bryan Company had existed in some form since 1844 when Richard L. Bryan opened a newsstand and stationery shop in Columbia. When he retired in 1882, Bryan's son and nephew took over the business and within two years added a printing department. R. L. Bryan Company was the state printer of South Carolina from 1898 well into the twentieth-century.⁷⁴

James Woodrow may have been an exception, but the main trend to observe is a separation of state printers from the local newspapers and their editors. Government patronage ceased to be a means for newspapers to get revenue. In this way, Reconstruction forces made a permanent change to the print industry in Columbia. While Democrats clearly tried to erase the remains of Republican government, they ultimately embraced a fixture of the Republican regime.

⁷⁴ Robert A. Pierce, "R.L. Bryan Company," in *South Carolina Encyclopedia* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, Institute for Southern Studies, 2016); See Appendix B.

Conclusion

In conclusion, if the project of Reconstruction was to have enduring success in the South a significant number of native white Southerners had to come to support the Republican party. The fact that few did should not hide the thousands of people who were promising candidates to join. The printers of Columbia, South Carolina had financial incentives to support the Republicans as well as a long history of labor activism. They were a group of upwardly mobile people and included several immigrants. Their ultimate rejection of the Republican party reveals the intense bonds formed by family and among fellow tradesmen which directed the printers away from provided explicit Republican support. Despite rejection of the Republicans, the Republican way of conducting state printing was to have a lasting impact for the printers. Dewey Schorb, the son of a German immigrant and a promising potential Republican, eventually came to be a foreman in the new R. L. Bryan Printing Company. Interaction did happen between the printers and Republicans; it just was not as the Republicans imagined it would be.

Bibliography

Newspapers:

Daily Phoenix
Daily Register
Daily Union
Daily Union-Herald
The State

Secondary Sources:

- Abbott, Richard H. 2004. *For Free Press and Equal Rights: Republican Newspapers in the Reconstruction South*. Edited by John W. Quist. Athens: The University of Georgia Press.
- Baggett, James Alex. 2003. *The Scalawags: Southern Dissenters in the Civil War and Reconstruction*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Baker, Cathleen Ann. 2004. *The Press that Cotton Built: Printing in Mobile, Alabama, 1850-1865*. PhD Dissertation, Mobile: University of Alabama.
- Baker, Cathleen Ann. 2004. "The Press that Cotton Built: Printing in Mobile, Alabama, 1850-1865." PhD diss, University of Alabama.
- Clawson, Mary Ann. 1985. "Fraternal Orders and Class Formation in the Nineteenth-Century United States." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 24 (4): 672-695.
- Ellem, Warren A. 1972. "Who Were the Mississippi Scalawags?" *The Journal of Southern History* 38 (2): 217-240.
- Foner, Eric. 1970. *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 1988. *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863-1877*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Ginsberg, Benjamin. 2010. *Moses of South Carolina: A Jewish Scalawag during Radical Reconstruction*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hume, Richard L, and Jerry B Gough. 2008. *Blacks, Carpetbaggers, and Scalawags: The Constitutional Conventions of Redical Reconstruction*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

- Kaufman, Jason, and David Weintraub. 2004. "Social-Capital Formation and the American Fraternal Association: New Empirical Evidence." *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 35 (1): 1-36.
- Montgomery, David. 1967. *Beyond Equality: Labor and the Radical Republicans 1862-1872*. New York: Knopf.
- Moore, John H. 1988. *South Carolina Newspapers*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Moore, John Hammond. 1993. *Columbia and Richland County: A South Carolina Community, 1790-1990*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Nathans, Elizabeth Sudley. 1968. *Losing the Peace: Georgia Republicans and Reconstruction, 1865-1871*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.
- Page, Elizabeth Fry. 1910. "The Romance of Southern Journalism." *Bob Taylor's Magazine* 140-148.
- Pasley, Jeffrey L. 2001. *"The Tryanny of Printers": Newspaper Politics in the Early American Republic*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Pierce, Robert A. 2016. "R.L. Bryan Company." In *South Carolina Encyclopedia*. Columbia: University of South Carolina, Institute for Southern Studies.
- Richardson, Heather Cox. 2001. *The Death of Reconstruction: Race, Labor, and Politics in the Post-Civil War North, 1865-1901*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rubin III, Hyman. 2006. *South Carolina Scalawags*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- Selby, Julian A. 1905. *Memorabilia and Anecdotal Reminiscences of Columbia, S.C., and Incidents Connected Therewith*. Columbia: The R. L. Bryan Company.
- Simms, William Gilmore. 1955. *The Letters of William Gilmore Simms: Volume IV, 1858-1866*. Edited by Mary C Simms Oliphant and T C Duncan Eaves. Columbia: University of South Carolina.
- South Carolina General Assembly. 1873. *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of South-Carolina: Special Session, Commencing Tuesday, October 21, 1873*. Columbia: Republican Printing Company.
- Summers, Mark Wahlgren. 1994. *The Press Gang: Newspapers and Politics, 1865-1878*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Tracy, George A. 1913. *History of the Typographical Union: Its Beginnings, Progress and Development, Its Beneficial and Educational Features Together with a Chapter on the Early Organizations of Printers*. Indianapolis: International Typographical Union.

- Wetta, Frank J. 2012. *The Louisiana Scalawags: Politics, Race, and Terrorism during the Civil War and Reconstruction*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University.
- Wiggins, Sarah Woolfolk. 1977. *The Scalawag in Alabama Politics, 1865-1881*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Woodruff, Josephus. 1936. *Behind the Scenes in the Reconstruction Legislature of South Carolina: Diary of Josephus Woodruff*. Edited by Robert H Woody. Baton Rouge: Franklin Press.
- Woody, Robert H. 1936. *Republican Newspapers of South Carolina*. Charlottesville: The Historic Publishing Co., Inc.
- Zuczek, Richard. 1996. *State of Rebellion: Reconstruction in South Carolina*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.

Appendix A: List of Printers, Pressmen, and Compositors

Name	Years Listed	Known Place of Employment	Union Member	Place of Origin	Family Relations/Notes
Agnew, Robert R. jr	1875				Boarded
Anderson, William E	1870		Yes	North Carolina	Known Republican (see <i>Daily Phoenix</i> , Oct 13, 1872)
Barnett, John B	1879	Calvo & Patton			Boarded
Bassett, Oran	1875				Boarded
Blatts, John	1868				Boarded
Bostick, Frank	1870				
Browne, John T	1860, 1879	Christian Neighbor			Boarded
Browne, Henry A.	1875, 1879	Christian Neighbor			Son of Sidi H. Browne, editor of the <i>Christian Neighbor</i>
Burkett, St Clair C	1879	Daily Phoenix			
Busbey, John H.	1875, 1879	Calvo & Patton			Boarded
Calvo, Charles A. sr	1870, 1875	Republican Printing Co.		Charleston, SC	Father of Charles Calvo Jr. and Eugene Calvo
Calvo Charles A Jr	1868, 1870, 1875	Daily Register, Calvo & Patton	Yes		Boarded in 1868; Member of the Knights of Pythias and the Improved Order of Red Men; Son of Charles Calvo Sr.

Calvo, Eugene E	1875, 1879	Daily Register, R.L. Bryan Printing Co.	Yes		Member of Woodmen of the World; Son of Charles Calvo Sr.
Capers, Frank V.	1875, 1879	Daily Register			
Cox, William	1875				Boarded
Davis, Washington W	1860, 1868, 1870, 1879	Southern Presbyterian	Yes		Boarded in 1860
Deane, William W	1860, 1868, 1870, 1875, 1879	Christian Neighbor, Southern Presbyterian	Yes		
Diseker, James (John?) H	1870, 1875, 1879	Daily Union-Herald, Calvo & Patton	Yes		
Dorsey, Charles	1875, 1879				Son of bookbinder John Dorsey
Elkins, John A	1860, 1868, 1875	Christian Neighbor	Yes		Boarded in 1875 at South Carolina College; Member of the Knights of Pythias; Pallbearer at funerals of Charles A. Calvo Sr. and Edwin Forde; His son, Rev John W. Elkins conducted Miles B. McSweeney's funeral
Emlyn, Horatio N.	1860, 1868, 1870, 1879	Daily Phoenix, Daily Register	Yes	Charleston, SC	Boarded in 1860 and 1868; Member of the Knights of Pythias and the

					Improved Order of Red Men; Married Mary Agnes Forde to be brother-in-law with Edwin and Charles Forde; Co-leader of Mechanics and Farmers Building Loan Association of Richland County with William Duffie
Farrow, William W	1870, 1875	Daily Union-Herald	Yes		
Field, George	1860				Boarded
Forde, Edwin	1868, 1870, 1875, 1879	Daily Register, Calvo & Patton	Yes	Father from Ireland	Brother-in-law with Horatio Emlyn; Brother of Charles Forde
Forde, Charles M.	1875, 1879	Daily Register		Father from Ireland	Brother-in-law with Horatio Emlyn; Brother of Edwin Forde
Forde, Richard	1879	Baptist Courier			
Franklin, John	1870				African-American
Gleaves, William Myers	1875, 1879	Daily Register			
Gray, David	1875				African-American
Hall, John	1860				Boarded
Hall, William	1870, 1875				
Henderson, J M	1860				Boarded
Hendricks, John	1868		Yes		Boarded
Hogan, J.H.	1879	Calvo & Patton			Boarded
Howell, Chas. B.	1875, 1879	Daily Register			

Howell, Oeland F	1860, 1875, 1879	Daily Register	Yes		Boarded in 1860; Member of the Improved Order of Red Men
Hunt, William H.	1879	Calvo & Patton			
Jackson, William H.	1875				
Jowitt, John J.	1879	Daily Register			Boarded
Kinman, James D	1860				
Landrum, P.W.	1860				
Law, E.R.	1879				Boarded
Lee, John	1879				African- American
Loomis, Charles E.	1860				Boarded; Brother-in-law of Robert Miller
Ludette, Fred J.	1879	Calvo & Patton			Boarded
Lynch, Walter S.	1860				Boarded
Marks, Frederick H.	1860, 1868, 1870, 1875, 1879	Daily Phoenix, Daily Register			Brother of Edward Marks; Father of Richardson Stuart Marks; Father-in-law of Josiah Patton
Marks, Edward B.	1875, 1879	Daily Phoenix, Calvo & Patton			Brother of Frederick H. Marks; Uncle of Richardson Stuart Marks
Marks, Richardson Stuart	1875, 1879	Daily Phoenix, Daily Register			Son of Frederick H. Marks; Nephew of Edward B. Marks
Martin, William T.	1870,1 875			Virginia	
McAvoy, William. F.	1875				

McCaw, William H.	1870			North Carolina	
McCollough Joseph	1860				Boarded
McCown, William C.	1879				Boarded
McDaniel, James Calvin	1875			Alexandria, VA	Father of William Briggs McDaniel
McDaniel, William Briggs	1875	Daily Phoenix, Daily Register	Yes	Alexandria, VA	Member of the Knights of Pythias; Son of James Calvin McDaniel
McJunkin, Charles M.	1875, 1879	Republican Printing Company, Editor of Working Christian	Yes	Georgia	Member of the Knights of Pythias
McKnight, Robert A.	1875, 1879	Southern Presbyterian	Yes	Camden, SC	
McMahon, Richard	1875				Boarded
McSweeney Miles B.	1875		Yes	Father from Ireland	Boarded; Member of the Knights of Pythias; Became governor of SC in 1899; Funeral conducted by Rev. John W. Elkins, son of John A. Elkins
Meade, William E.	1875				
Miller, Robert F.	1868, 1870, 1879	Baptist Courier	Yes		Boarded; Married Sarah Elizabeth Loomis to be brother-in-law with Charles Loomis
Miller, William B.	1875		Yes		Member of the Knights of Pythias

Mood, Thomas L.	1860, 1868, 1875, 1879	Daily Register			
Morgan, Isaac, C	1860, 1875	Temperance Advocate			Boarded in 1875; Father of Albon C. Morgan
Morgan, Albon C.	1868		Yes		Son of Isaac C. Morgan
Moore, William A.	1875, 1879	Baptist Courier	Yes		Boarded
Moore, H.C.	1879	Southern Presbyterian			
Moroso, J. T.	1875				Boarded
Nelson, Edwin A.	1875, 1879	Calvo & Patton			Member of the Knights of Pythias
Osborne, John F.	1870, 1875, 1879	Daily Register		North Carolina	
Patterson, James	1860, 1875				Boarded in 1860
Patterson, Samuel	1860				Boarded
Patterson, John	1870			Pennsylvania	
Patton, Josiah A	1860, 1868, 1875, 1879	Republican Printing Company, Daily Register, Calvo & Patton		Albany, New York	Married Frances Marks to be Frederick H. Marks's son-in- law and Richardson Stuart Marks's brother-in-law
Rabb, James G.	1875				Boarded
Roberts, James	1860				Boarded
Rodgers, Wills M.	1875, 1879	Calvo & Patton	Yes		Boarded
Royster, William B.	1870, 1875			North Carolina	
Schorb, Dewey F.	1875, 1879	Southern Presbyterian,	Yes	Germany	Son of John George Schorb

		R.L. Bryan Printing Co			
Schorb, John George	1875, 1879	Southern Presbyterian	Yes		Father of Dewey Schorb; Funeral conducted by James Woodrow
Scoffin, John	1875				
Scott, John J.	1879	Calvo & Patton			
Scott, Robert W.	1870, 1875	Daily Phoenix, William Sloane Job Office	Yes	Scotland	Nephew of William Sloane
Seabrook, Thomas W.	1875				
Selby, Julian A.	1860, 1868, 1875, 1879	Daily Phoenix			Editor of the Daily Phoenix; Father of Julian P. Selby
Selby, Julian P.	1875, 1879	Daily Phoenix			Son of Julian A. Selby
Shivernell, Henry	1860				
Sloane, William	1875, 1879	William Sloane Job Office		Scotland	Uncle of Robert W. Scott
Smith, Dresden Aaron	1870, 1875	Daily Phoenix	Yes		
Smith, Harry H.	1875				Boarded
Smith, R O	1860				Boarded
Terry, John A.	1868		Yes		
Thompson, Isaac	1870				African- American
Tower, Eli	1860, 1879	Calvo & Patton			Boarded
Tutt, Charles Carroll	1870, 1875, 1879	Daily Phoenix, Daily Register, Calvo & Patton	Yes		
Tutt, William H	1868, 1875, 1879	Calvo & Patton	Yes		

Wells, James F.	1870				
Wells, James T	1860, 1868, 1875, 1879	Daily Phoenix	Yes		Boarded in 1860 and 1868; Member of the Knights of Pythias
Wilkinson, A. C.	1875				Boarded
Williams, John	1870, 1875, 1879				Boarded; African- American
Williams, Nathan R	1879	Daily Phoenix			
Wing, Albert	1870, 1875				African- American; Laborer in 1875
Withington, E O	1860				Boarded
Woodruff, W.T.	1875				Boarded

Sources:

Ancestry.com.

U.S. Census Bureau, 1870.

Columbia (Richland County, S.C.) Directory for 1860. Julian A. Selby, 1860.

Columbia (Richland County, S.C.) Directory for 1868. R.L. Polk & Co, 1868.

Columbia (Richland County, S.C.) Directory for 1875-76. Beasley & Emerson Publishers, 1875.

Columbia (Richland County, S.C.) Directory for 1879 - 80. Charles Emerson & Co., 1879-1880.

John Hammond Moore, *South Carolina Newspapers*, 195-218.

Daily Phoenix 7/30/1873, 2/8/1874, 7/8/1874, 7/10/1874, 7/7/1875

Appendix B: List of Stationers, Bookbinders, and Other People Connected to the Print Industry

Name	Years Listed	Occupation	Family Relations/Notes
Browne, Sidi H. Rev.	1868, 1875, 1879	Editor of <i>Christian Neighbor</i> and Minister	Father of printer Henry A. Browne
Bryan, Richard L	1868, 1875, 1879	Bookseller and Stationer	
Bunch, Samuel	1870	Bookbinder	
Carpenter, Cassius M.	1875	Business Manager of <i>Daily Union</i>	
Carpenter, L. Cass	1875	Proprietor of <i>Daily Union</i>	
Dorsey, John	1860, 1870, 1879	Bookbinder	Father of printer Charles Dorsey
Duffie, William J.	1868, 1870, 1875, 1879	Stationer and Bookseller	Co-leader of Mechanics and Farmers Building Loan Association of Richland County with Horatio N. Emlyn
Glass, Peter B.	1860	Bookseller	
Hoyt, James A	1879	Editor at the <i>Daily Register</i> and Proprietor of <i>Baptist Courier</i>	
North, Rial	1860	Bookseller	
Scovel, Nelson R.	1875	Book-keeper and Newspaper Correspondent	
Stokes Enoch R.	1860, 1868, 1870, 1875, 1879	Bookbinder	
Stokes, R. M.	1860	Publisher	

Thompson, James G.	1875	Editor of <i>Daily Union-Herald</i>	
Townsend, Rev. S.	1860	Bookseller	
Wood, Thomas	1870	Bookbinder	
Woodrow, James	1868, 1875	Editor of <i>Southern Presbyterian</i>	Conducted John George Schorb's funeral

Sources:

Ancestry.com.

U.S. Census Bureau, 1870.

Columbia (Richland County, S.C.) Directory for 1860. Julian A. Selby, 1860.

Columbia (Richland County, S.C.) Directory for 1868. R.L. Polk & Co, 1868.

Columbia (Richland County, S.C.) Directory for 1875-76. Beasley & Emerson Publishers, 1875.

Columbia (Richland County, S.C.) Directory for 1879 - 80. Charles Emerson & Co., 1879-1880.

John Hammond Moore, *South Carolina Newspapers*, 195-218.

Appendix C: List of Union Officers by Election Period

Year⁷⁵	Union Officer and Position
January 1867	James T. Wells (Secretary and Treasurer)
June 1867	James T. Wells (Secretary and Treasurer)
January 1868	James T. Wells (Secretary and Treasurer)
June 1868	James T. Wells (Secretary and Treasurer)
January 1869	John A. Terry (President), William E. Anderson (Secretary and Treasurer)
June 1869	William E. Anderson (Secretary)
January 1870	Charles A. Calvo Jr (President), Charles M. McJunkin (Vice President), William H. Tutt (Secretary and Treasurer), Albon C. Morgan (Corresponding Secretary), W.W. Davis (Janitor)
June 1870	William W. Farrow (Secretary and Treasurer)
January 1871	William W. Farrow (Secretary and Treasurer)
June 1871	William W. Farrow (Secretary and Treasurer)
January 1872	Charles M. McJunkin (President), J.H. Diseker (Vice President), Charles A. Calvo Jr (Secretary and Treasurer), John G. Schorb (Corresponding Secretary), and Oeland F. Howell (Janitor)
June 1872	Oeland F. Howell (President), William W. Deane (Vice President), Horatio N. Emlyn (Secretary and Treasurer), Charles Carroll Tutt (Corresponding Secretary), Miles B McSweeney (Janitor)
January 1873	Horatio N. Emlyn (Secretary and Treasurer)
June 1873	H.M. Meetze (President), Horatio N. Emlyn (Secretary and Treasurer)
January 1874	H.M. Meetze (President), Robert A. McKnight (Vice President), Horatio N. Emlyn (Secretary and Treasurer), William B. Miller, (Corresponding Secretary), Wills M. Rodgers (Janitor)

⁷⁵ Union elections were held in December and June. The results were typically announced in the paper the following day. If there were not, the only officer to identify was the secretary and treasurer who signed their name on public announcements.

June 1874	Charles A. Calvo Jr (President), Miles B. McSweeney (Vice President), Oeland F. Howell (Secretary and Treasurer), Dresden A Smith (Corresponding Secretary), John G. Schorb (Janitor)
January 1875	Oeland F. Howell (Secretary and Treasurer)
1875	Miles B. McSweeney (President), Charles Carroll Tutt (Vice President), Oeland F Howell (Secretary and Treasurer), William Briggs McDaniel (Corresponding Secretary), William W. Deane (Janitor)

Sources:

Daily Phoenix, 3/14/1867, 7/3/1867, 2/29/1868, 7/25/1868, 2/27/1869, 5/22/1869, 1/29/1870, 11/26/1870, 1/28/1871, 7/29/1871, 6/29/1872, 2/22/1873, 9/25/1873, 9/27/1873, 12/27/1873, 6/27/1874, 2/27/1875, 6/26/1875

Daily Union, 1/1/1872

Note elections were held twice a year in December and June

Appendix D: South Carolina State Printing Appropriations by Year

Year	State Appropriation	Source
1855	\$12,750	<i>The Statutes at Large of South Carolina Volume XII, p 346</i>
1856	\$12,750	<i>The Statutes at Large of South Carolina Volume XII, p 417</i>
1857	\$15,750	<i>The Statutes at Large of South Carolina Volume XII, p 511</i>
1858	\$15,750	<i>The Statutes at Large of South Carolina Volume XII, p 584</i>
1859	\$15,750	<i>The Statutes at Large of South Carolina Volume XII, p 638</i>
1860	\$15,750	<i>The Statutes at Large of South Carolina Volume XII, p 720</i>
1861	\$6,500	<i>The Statutes at Large of South Carolina Volume XIII, p 4</i>
1862	\$19,500	<i>The Statutes at Large of South Carolina Volume XIII, p 81</i>
1863	\$27,000	<i>The Statutes at Large of South Carolina Volume XIII, p 157</i>
1864	\$67,500	<i>The Statutes at Large of South Carolina Volume XIII, p 200</i>
1865	\$20,000	<i>The Statutes at Large of South Carolina Volume XIII, p 241</i>
1866	\$12,000	<i>The Statutes at Large of South Carolina Volume XIII, p 371</i>

1868 ⁷⁶	\$12,000	<i>Acts and Joint Resolutions of General Assembly of the State of South Carolina Passed at the Regular Session 1868-1869, p 238</i>
1869-1870	\$125,000	<i>The Statutes at Large of South Carolina Volume XIV, p 384</i>
1871	\$30,000	<i>The Statutes at Large of South Carolina Volume XIV, p 594</i>
1872	\$250,000	<i>Acts and Joint Resolutions of General Assembly of the State of South Carolina Passed at the Regular Session 1871-1872, p 463</i>
1873	\$225,589.63 ⁷⁷	<i>Acts and Joint Resolutions of General Assembly of the State of South Carolina Passed at the Special Session of 1873 and the Regular Session 1872-1873, p 482-483</i>
1873 Extra Session	\$50,000	<i>Acts and Joint Resolutions of General Assembly of the State of South Carolina Passed at the Special Session of 1873 and the Regular Session 1872-1873, p 492</i>
1874	\$25,000	<i>Acts and Joint Resolutions of General Assembly of the State of South Carolina Passed at the Special Session of 1873 and the Regular Session 1872-1873, p 614</i>
1875	\$50,000	<i>Acts and Joint Resolutions of General Assembly of the State of South Carolina</i>

⁷⁶ No record was found for 1867.

⁷⁷ 75,000 for report on immigration from 72-73 GA; 25,000 for printing supreme court decisions; 25,000 for tax documents for 73-74; 100,589.63 indebtedness for RPC redeemable at state treasury

		<i>Passed at the Regular Session 1874-1875, p 888</i>
1876	\$50,000	<i>Acts and Joint Resolutions of General Assembly of the State of South Carolina Passed at the Regular Session 1875-1876, p 101</i>
1877	\$10,000	<i>Acts and Joint Resolutions of General Assembly of the State of South Carolina Passed at the Regular Session 1877, p 257</i>
1878	\$20,000	<i>Acts and Joint Resolutions of General Assembly of the State of South Carolina Passed at the Regular Session 1877-1878, p 545</i>
1879	\$11,500	<i>Acts and Joint Resolutions of General Assembly of the State of South Carolina Passed at the Regular Session of 1878, p 763</i>
1880	\$8,000	<i>Acts and Joint Resolutions of General Assembly of the State of South Carolina Passed at the Regular Session of 1879 and the Extra Session of 1880, p 134</i>

Appendix E: List of South Carolina State Printers by Year

Years as State Printer	Name
1804-1819	Daniel and Jacob J. Faust
1820-1828	Daniel Faust
1828-1830	David W. Simms
1830-1838	A.S. Johnston
1839-1845	A.H. Pemberton
1846-1848	Adam G. Summer
1849-1852	I.C. Morgan
1852-1854	Robert W. Gibbes
1855-1857	Edward H. Britton
1857-1860	Robert W. Gibbes
1860-1864	Charles P. Pelham
1864-1865	Felix G. De Fontaine
1865-1866	Julian P. Selby
1868-1871	J. Waldo Denny
1871	Carolina Printing Company
1872-1876	Republican Printing Company
1877-1880	Calvo & Patton Printing Company
1880-1882	James Woodrow
1882-1887	Charles Calvo Jr.
1888-1892	James Woodrow
1892-1898	Charles Calvo Jr.
1898-1919	R. L. Bryan Printing Company

Sources:

*Acts and Resolutions of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina
1791-1919*

Listings of Columbia publications, University of South Carolina Library Catalog.