Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter know, including display on the World Wide Web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

______________________________ ______________________________

Patrick C. Jamieson April 20, 2011

‘The Delicacy of the Subject’: Creating a Proslavery Argument at Antebellum Emory

by

Patrick C. Jamieson

Leslie M. Harris
Adviser

Department of History

____
Leslie M. Harris
Adviser

____
Susan Y. Ashmore
Committee Member

____
Joseph H. Crespino
Committee Member

____
Brett V. Gadsden
Committee Member

April 20, 2011

‘The Delicacy of the Subject’: Creating a Proslavery Argument at Antebellum Emory

by

Patrick C. Jamieson

Leslie M. Harris
Adviser

An abstract of
a thesis submitted to the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Department of History

2011

Abstract

This thesis explores the ideological defense of slavery at Emory College between 1834 and 1861. Emory's intellectual investment in slavery and southern politics is apparent through what professors lectured, wrote, and privately thought on race, slavery, and eventually, secession. Emory impressed upon its students a proslavery ideology which evolved with and paralleled proslavery thought across the South. I trace such thought both in the curriculum and in the public and private discourse—diaries, letters, student essays, newspaper articles, and other published materials—of students and professors. By approaching the college through these sources, I provide a unique understanding of how slavery, states' rights, race, and secession played a role in students' education. I update the institutional history of Emory and identify a new method of inquiry for exploration of the interactions between slavery and higher learning. More generally, this thesis contributes to the historiography of antebellum college education and student culture in the United States.

‘The Delicacy of the Subject’: Creating a Proslavery Argument at Antebellum Emory

by

Patrick C. Jamieson

Leslie M. Harris
Adviser

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Department of History

2011

Acknowledgements

I am deeply indebted to a number of people who have assisted me on this project and indeed shaped my undergraduate career at Emory. Leslie Harris has overseen this project from day one and has been an extraordinarily thoughtful and patient mentor. I am incredibly grateful for her steadfast support, the many hours she spent revising and offering feedback on this project, and her friendship. She is a truly exceptional faculty member at Emory and I am fortunate to have had the pleasure of working with her.

Nearly four years ago, Susan Ashmore introduced me to the world of American history, and I am incredibly thankful for her many contributions to my intellectual development. She has been a wonderful mentor and great friend to me. I appreciate all of the time and energy she put in to helping me on this project and her warm encouragement throughout the process. Without her, I would have never pursued the study of history.

Joseph Crespino was a great mentor to me at Emory—he encouraged me to think outside the box and pursue new interests and consistently helped me improve my writing. I am also indebted to Brett Gadsden for teaching me so much about race and political culture in twentieth century America and his eagerness to discuss this project and the work historians do.

At Emory, several others played important roles in developing and shaping this story. Andy Urban, during his time as a post-doctoral fellow for the Transforming Community Project helped me envision this project and guided my research and writing during the past summer. Gary Hauk, the resident historian of Emory University, helped me navigate the complex world that is Emory's institutional history, invited me on several occasions to present my work, and provided me invaluable feedback throughout the research and writing processes. Pearl Young graciously shared her time and knowledge of the antebellum South with me on numerous occasions—helping me build a bibliography and navigate the overwhelming amount of primary materials in the archives. At the University of North Carolina, Alfred Brophy introduced me to the proslavery argument in antebellum southern colleges and helped me think about this project in a legal context as well.

Numerous others offered input or expertise over the past year on this project. James Roark spent many hours talking with me about the Old South and proslavery historiography. Mark Auslander shared with me his vast knowledge of antebellum Emory and helped me locate numerous sources. Judith Evans-Grubbs helped me link the classical world to the antebellum South. Brooks Holifield and Russell Richey shared with me their expertise on nineteenth century Methodists. At the Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Liz Chase and Kathy Shoemaker and the entire staff were so patient in helping me find the many primary sources that make up this project. Jyotsna Vanapalli invited me to participate in several dialogue groups and allowed me the opportunity to present my work during Founders Week. My colleagues at the Writing Center offered valuable feedback on many occasions. And in the history department, I owe so much to Becky Herring for always encouraging me and keeping me organized.

The February 2011 "Slavery and the University: Histories and Legacies" Conference was a phenomenal opportunity to present my work and learn from others on the important place the university occupies in American history. James Fuller, in addition to serving on a panel with me on proslavery thought, shared his insights into Basil Manly and the University of Alabama. James Campbell and Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham both offered invaluable feedback and encouragement.

I began this project through a grant from the Transforming Community Project (TCP) and I am very grateful for the support I received during the program. Leah Roesch and Luke Whitmore helped me navigate the challenges of intense research and Leslie Harris, Andy Urban, and Melissa Sexton oversaw my work at the TCP. A fellowship at the Bill and Carol Fox Center for Humanistic Inquiry in the spring of 2011 provided a wonderful environment to complete my research and writing and to present my work. I would especially like to thank Keith Anthony, Colette Barlow, Martine Brownley, and Amy Erbil and all of the fellows for their support and encouragement while at the Center.

My greatest debts are to my parents, Ann and Tom Jamieson, who have supported and encouraged me throughout my life and continue to inspire me every day. They are the most wonderful parents anyone could ask for and to them, this thesis is dedicated.

Table of Contents

Preface……………………………………………………………………………………..…1

Introduction: Founding a College in the Proslavery South..…………………………….…….4

Chapter One: The Clash Between North and South………………………………………....17

Chapter Two: An Education Fit for Southern Gentlemen……………………………………40

Chapter Three: Creating a Southern Worldview at Emory College……………..………......55

Conclusion: Dealing with Slavery in the Present……………………………………………..80

Bibliography...83

Preface

This thesis tells the story of a place forty miles due east of where I sit today—Oxford, Georgia, the birthplace of Emory University. This history reveals that the world of antebellum Emory was inextricably linked to the institution of slavery. This is a difficult and often painful story, but it is one that should be told. Emory developed in a world made by cotton, and that cotton was grown by slave labor. Within this world, the very order of society was governed by notions of racial hierarchy. The history of Emory is in numerous ways a history of race and slavery. At its core, this thesis is an exploration of Emory's institutional history. But it is also a lens into the peculiar world of the antebellum South. Thus, this project posits a foundational relationship between slavery, the university, and United States history.

I began this project with one basic question—how did Emory's curriculum treat slavery in the antebellum period? I emerged from the archives with myriad answers that ultimately allowed me to ask a larger question—what was the university's ideological connection to slavery? What was Emory's *intellectual investment* in the peculiar institution itself? The primary impetus for this change was my discovery of numerous arguments, written by Emory professors, in favor of slavery. I began to see Emory as an institution at the forefront of the intellectual defense of slavery—an important center in the region for the invention and propagation of proslavery ideology. The result of my inquiry is a broad assessment of the intellectual and religious culture of Emory and the Old South with respect to the slavery question.

Of the historical subjects that make up this thesis, many have prominent names on and around Emory's campus today. Academic buildings, residence halls, streets, and monuments are named for people such as Ignatius Few, Augustus B. Longstreet, Alexander Means, and Atticus Haygood. While these people are fixtures of Emory's institutional history, their involvement and intellectual investment in slavery is largely unknown within the common narrative. This thesis tells the larger story of those at Emory during the antebellum period and gives special meaning to the place we are today. It allows us to better understand later struggles for integration and equality on this campus in the twentieth century by highlighting the long-lasting and powerful effects slavery had following the Civil War. Furthermore, it allows us to laud the positive changes in the one hundred and seventy-five years of this university while continuing to confront and uncover difficult stories and work towards a better community today.

I am fortunate to have had the opportunity to participate in a groundbreaking conference—*Slavery and the University: Histories and Legacies*—held at Emory University in February 2011. Many aspects of this thesis have been influenced by the work of other scholars who participated in the conference. I am struck by one comment in particular from this conference that has helped me think about the historical significance of this research. Evelyn Brooks Higginbotham, during the final plenary session, noted that this conference represented the creation of a new field of slavery studies—an approach that is both scholarly and activity-based. This field will surely change the way we understand slavery and American history, and I hope this work fits in with this emerging field.

This thesis is organized thematically more so than chronologically. It employs a threefold understanding of the proslavery argument at Emory by looking at the connection between Methodism and the school; the relationship between the curriculum and proslavery thought; and lastly, the effect a proslavery education had on the students of antebellum Emory.

The first chapter of this thesis, "The Clash Between North and South: Augustus Longstreet and the 'Methodist Civil War,'" explores the 1844 schism of the Methodist Church and its connection to Emory through the lens of Augustus Baldwin Longstreet. Longstreet, Emory's second President, served as a delegate at the 1844 conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church and was instrumental in causing the split of the Church at the conference. Longstreet emerged as one of the most vocal and important defenders of slavery following the conference, and his proslavery tracts had a prominent effect on Emory in the 1840s. In two important works, published in 1845 and 1848 respectively, Longstreet articulated a defense of slavery that rested on notions of scriptural legitimacy, the positive good of slavery, and the importance of slaveholder paternalism. While his works were influential in Oxford, his voice carried far outside the boundaries of Emory College. Longstreet addressed abolitionists in the North and his proslavery works were published in multiple editions throughout the South. This chapter will put Longstreet's writings in conversation with other southern intellectuals and evaluate the significance of the 1844 schism on the future of Emory College.

Chapter Two, "An Education Fit for Southern Gentlemen," primarily analyzes the curriculum of antebellum Emory with respect to proslavery ideology. It begins by introducing the relationship between Greek and Roman classics and curriculum—arguing that an education based in the classics was an important step for students to join the ranks of the southern gentry. Through an exploration of antebellum moral philosophy courses, this chapter also posits that a fundamental and important relationship existed at Emory between teaching and proslavery ideology. Using the writings of William Sasnett, a moral philosophy professor in the late 1850s; and the diary of George L. P. Wren, a student at Emory from 1855-1859, this chapter offers conclusive proof of proslavery lectures and textbooks at Emory on the eve of sectional conflict. Throughout, this chapter also contains the most extensive discussion on the evolution of slaveholder paternalism and how various scholars at antebellum Emory developed their teaching and scholarly material around this concept.

Chapter Three, "Creating a Southern Worldview at Emory College," focuses on the students of antebellum Emory and answers the question of how proslavery rhetoric and teaching influenced a student's worldview. It begins by defining the typical student at antebellum Emory, and then looks to several prominent graduates—Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus Lamar, Joseph Addison Turner, George Gilman Smith, and Atticus Haygood—to understand the enormous impact of one's college education. This chapter also examines the social culture of antebellum Emory, focusing on the College's literary societies and the honor culture of the Old South. An overarching concept of this chapter is personal and historical memory—specifically, how students remember their college years and the institution of slavery in the years following the Civil War. This chapter argues that some students, Haygood in particular, desired to view the Old South as beneficial for slaveholders and the enslaved even after such conflict was settled by the War.

A few notes on historical particulars: When possible, I have preserved the integrity of any original quotations by leaving out *spelling in context* [*sic*]. I have only used [*sic*] when I felt it necessary to understand the original meaning of the quotation or to clarify a particularly important word. Many of the primary sources I have used are hand-written, and some difficult to interpret. When a word is unclear or illegible, I have chosen a replacement that I felt preserves the original intent of the author. Lastly, with any research project of this magnitude, it is inevitable that I have made errors. I take full responsibility for any and all of them.

This thesis stands on the shoulders of an emerging body of scholarship that explores the rich history of race at this university and I am incredibly grateful to those who came before me and unearthed much of the history this thesis relies on. At the same time, it is my hope that many others will continue this work and further contribute to our understanding of the legacy of slavery at Emory. This thesis began as a research project for the Transforming Community Project, and I believe I have a broader responsibility than simply satisfying the requirements of a typical academic paper. I hope that this thesis can serve as a forum for sharing this history with a wide variety of people in the Emory community, and encourage dialogues about the issues we face today. I believe that we can use history to better our community—and I hope in Emory's case, to *transform* our community.

P.C.J.
Atlanta, GA
March 2011

Introduction
Founding a College in the Proslavery South

The destines of Emory College, if its own parents are true to its interests, are far-reaching in an onward advance of honor and usefulness.
-Ignatius A. Few, December 13, 1838[1]

The early nineteenth century in rural Georgia can be understood as a time of awakening, repentance, and rebirth. The region was alive with the fervor of the Second Great Awakening and thousands had found salvation and renewed spirituality through conversion to evangelical faiths. The popularity of evangelical churches, traditionally understood as Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian, also brought the creation of numerous evangelical colleges, such as Furman University in 1827, Mercer University in 1829, and Wake Forest University in 1834. It was a period best known as the "denominational era" of higher education in America.[2] In the South, higher education in the antebellum period was also uniquely tied to the questions and debates over slavery. A student's experience at these evangelical colleges was in many ways grounded in the identity of not only one's religion but also one's region.

The historical and religious context behind the rise of the evangelicals in the early nineteenth century remains of central importance to understanding the atmosphere of the evangelical college. Evangelicalism, historian Christine Heyrman has noted, "came late to the American South, as an exotic import rather than an indigenous development."[3] Evangelical denominations in the eighteenth century were fringe groups that embraced radical theology and engaged in antislavery discourse. They existed well outside the social order of the Old South

---

[1] "Catalogue of the Officers & Students, in Emory College, GA, and the Report of the Board of Trustees to the Georgia conference," Oxford, GA, 1839, Emory University Archives, Emory University, Atlanta, GA (hereinafter EU-A).
[2] Donald George Tewksbury, "The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War, with Particular Reference to the Religious Influences Bearing Upon the College Movement," (Ph.D. diss., New York: Columbia University, 1932), 66.
[3] Christine Heyrman, *Southern Cross: The Beginnings of the Bible Belt*, (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997), 9.

and were perceived as a "threat" to the hierarchies that existed in one's daily life. These denominations transformed themselves, however, from virulent opposition of slavery to ultimately accepting and embracing the southern order within a matter of decades. The crux of this transition lies in the faiths' desires to encourage more conversions and to become a facet of mainstream southern society. In short, evangelicalism transformed itself to meet the demands of a wide spectrum of southern society: from the poor yeomanry to elite planters. In 1776, evangelicals made up less than ten percent of the southern population. By 1835, they made up almost forty percent, with over eight hundred thousand followers.[4]

As the outdoor revivals and camp meetings that characterized the period of the Second Great Awakening began to wane in the 1830s, evangelicals had already begun to establish denominational colleges. By the time of the Civil War, the Presbyterians had founded forty-nine colleges, the Methodists thirty-four, and the Baptists twenty-five. In the South in 1820 there existed only one church college. By 1860, there were over thirty-eight evangelical colleges.[5] As educational historian Donald Tewksbury tells us, "[evangelical] colleges came in many cases to be regarded as the agents of a type of denominational imperialism, and as a means of sectarian aggrandizement and aggression."[6] The motivation for creating these schools centered on a desire to preserve evangelical faith and further popularize it.[7] "The evangelical college conferred upon its sponsors not merely respectability but power," Ralph Reed has noted. "It protected and

---

[4] See Heyrman, *Southern Cross*, 264-265. Heyrman estimates that in 1776, 9% of white southerners and 0% of black southerners aged 16 and over, held membership in the Methodist, Baptist, or Presbyterian Church. By 1835, 25.6% of white southerners and 11.4% of black southerners aged 16 and over, held membership in this same group of churches.

[5] Tewksbury, "The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War, with Particular Reference to the Religious Influences Bearing Upon the College Movement," 76; Mark Swails, "Literary Societies as Institutions of Honor at Evangelical Colleges in Antebellum Georgia" (M.A. Thesis, Atlanta, GA: Emory University, 2007), 6.

[6] Tewksbury, "The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War, with Particular Reference to the Religious Influences Bearing Upon the College Movement," 76.

[7] Ralph Eugene Reed, "Fortresses of Faith: Design and Experience at Southern Evangelical Colleges, 1830-1900" (Ph.D. diss., Atlanta, GA: Emory University, 1991), 6.

socialized evangelical youth at the same time it prepared them for effective service in the larger society."[8] Students' time at evangelical colleges was a formative experience in shaping their futures.

Emory was born in the midst of the movement to start more evangelical colleges in 1834. The institution began as the Georgia Conference Manual Labor School, modeled after church-led manual labor schools throughout the South. Its founders envisioned a student's time divided evenly between academic courses and practical labor and farming. Manual labor schools were designed to attract the interests of the slaveholding classes. With rapid increases in wealth and slaves, the schools functioned to ensure that the sons of slaveholders would not grow up "in indolence and become worthless."[9] The Georgia Conference Manual Labor School was a novel, but short-lived affair, however. "The undisciplined students and inexperienced professors," Gary Hauk has noted, "had neither the time nor the will nor the prowess to undertake both the work of scholarship and the full-time running of what was, in its day, a very large farm."[10] Despite interest in the new school, it was burdened by mounting debts. Its founders saw new opportunity and petitioned the Georgia Legislature to charter a new college. This new college would focus solely on academic preparation and abandon the manual labor component, hopefully allowing it to be more profitable. On December 10, 1836, the Legislature granted a charter to Emory College and two years later, Emory would officially open.

The school's founders were important pillars of their community. They decided to name the school after recently deceased Methodist Bishop John Emory, a slaveholder himself whose vision of American education inspired the small group of Methodist preachers. This name is not

---

[8] Ibid.
[9] Richard Wright, "Ambivalent Bastions of Slavery: The 'Peculiar Institution' on College Campuses in Antebellum Georgia," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* LXXX, no. 3 (Fall 1996), 471.
[10] Gary S. Hauk, *A Legacy of Heart and Mind: Emory Since 1836* (Atlanta, GA: Bookhouse Group, 1999): 4-7 (quote on 4).

without significance. The founder's choice to name the College in honor of John Emory, Mark Auslander tells us, "was embedded in the fact that for its white founders, John Emory was emphatically one of their own. He had recently published a powerful tract against abolitionism, came from a prominent Maryland slave-owning family, and was himself a slave owner."[11]

With the founding of Emory, the Georgia Methodists also founded the town of Oxford. Envisioned as an ideal Methodist community of hard-working people, the town only sold lots to pious families on the condition that "no intoxicating liquor be sold, nor any game of hazard allowed." At the center of this town would be its gem—Emory College. Oxford's founders banned liquor stores, billiard halls, and ten-pin alleys. Emory and the town of Oxford were, as one historian put it, a "thoroughly Christian community, a bold experiment in the socialization of evangelical values."[12] In 1838, Ignatius Few, the first president of Emory College, called Emory a "benevolent enterprise…designed to promote the glory of God, the extension and establishment of the Religion of the Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the happiness of men."[13] Few, writing to his trustees and the Georgia Methodist conference, was confident that the "benevolent enterprise"—a school so committed to the religious ideals of its founders and the local community—would grow and prosper in the years to follow.

Without a doubt, slavery played an integral role in the founding of Emory College. Enslaved people built many of the early structures on campus. Emory's founders were powerful slaveholders and their fortunes were built on slave labor. And Newton County, the home of Emory, boasted a number of slave owners—in 1830 there were 513 slave owners and by 1850,

---

[11] Mark Auslander, "Dreams Deferred: African Americans in the History of Old Emory," in Gary S. Hauk and Sally Wolff-King, eds., *Where Courageous Inquiry Leads: The Emerging Life of Emory University* (Atlanta, GA: Bookhouse Group, 2010), 14.
[12] Reed, "Fortresses of Faith," 14.
[13] "Catalogue of the Officers & Students, in Emory College, GA, and the Report of the Board of Trustees to the Georgia Conference," Oxford, GA, 1839, EU-A.

647.[14] Many of the students who attended Emory came from slaveholding families. While the College never officially owned slaves, it did at times rent slaves from nearby owners. Records indicate that on February 9, 1837, the Board of Trustees approved the payment of fifty dollars "for the hire of a negro woman by the name of Sib for 1836 and to give notes for the hire of the negroes ordered to be hired for the present year and the following rates, for Sim: $150, for Sib and her children: $75."[15] Thus, it is without question that enslaved African Americans played an important role in the early days of Emory College. Their physical presence on and around campus helped establish an atmosphere that ultimately propagated a dynamic proslavery argument. At a time when the institution of slavery was increasingly coming under attack, Emory's founders began legitimating and defending it.

***

The origins of proslavery thought in America stretch back to the origins of slavery in colonial America. A little over a decade after the founding of Jamestown in 1607, colonists began to bring African slaves to labor on their land in the New World, largely as indentured servants. This practice would soon end as the colonies began to experience social unrest on the part of white indentured servants and found new ways to import larger quantities of African slaves. Slavery was not a system unique to the colonies at this time, as the European world had already been immersed in the slave trade for over a century, and slavery had existed in classical societies for over two millennia. "As products of European culture," historian Larry Tise notes, "early Americans were well acquainted with human bondage and with forms of thought that

[14] Mark Auslander, "Slavery and Its Legacies at Emory University: Reflections on History" (Presentation, Emory University, November 15, 2010).
[15] For quote see Auslander, "Dreams Deferred: African Americans in the History of Old Emory," in Hauk and Wolff-King, *Where Courageous Inquiry Leads: The Emerging Life of Emory University*, 14-15. Adjusted for inflation, $150 in 2009 dollars is approximately $2,808 and $75 is approximately $1,404.

urged its perpetuation."[16] While these new settlers developed a society with slave labor by the late seventeenth century, they did not focus much of their time defending slavery. As Tise has noted of seventeenth and eighteenth-century colonial societies, little was written or published defending slavery, however, occasional discussions did occur. By the early eighteenth century, despite any widespread opposition to slavery, "there was enough proslavery literature to indicate that colonial Americans and other English subjects could easily defend slavery when necessary."[17]

With an insatiable desire for inexpensive labor to cultivate their crops to send back to the Old World, colonists had transformed many parts of the New World from a society with slaves to a slave society. By 1750, 144, 872 slaves lived in Virginia and Maryland alone, accounting for sixty one percent of all slaves in British North America.[18] Georgia, however, was not a slave society. Founded in 1732 by James Oglethorpe, Georgia initially began as a territory that did not explicitly endorse slavery. "Although the Georgia charter did not contain a specific prohibition of slavery," Michael Thurmond has noted, "supporting documents submitted by the Trustees provided detailed pragmatic arguments justifying their opposition to the institution."[19] Such a vision did not last long—by 1750, as slave traffickers were bringing Africans to the Port of Savannah and auctioning them to the highest bidder, Trustees of the colony repealed the earlier prohibition against slavery.[20]

On the eve of the American Revolution, slavery had become a dominant feature of colonial America, particularly in the South and the Mid-Atlantic regions, and thanks to the port

---

[16] Larry E Tise, *Proslavery: A History of the Defense of Slavery in America, 1701-1840* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1987), 14.
[17] Ibid., 15.
[18] Darlene Clark Hine, William C. Hine, and Stanley Harrold, *The African-American Odyssey* (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2010), 61.
[19] Michael L. Thurmond, *Freedom: Georgia's Antislavery Heritage, 1733-1865* (Atlanta, GA: Longstreet Press, 2002), 10.
[20] For more context, see Ibid., 32-33.

of Savannah, in Georgia, too. In 1770, forty percent of the population in the lower South and Chesapeake regions was black, compared with 4.5 percent of the population in the middle colonies and New England.[21] The ideology surrounding the American Revolution greatly changed the amount of proslavery arguments. Ideas of liberty and equality embodied in the Declaration of Independence appeared to be a contradiction to slavery. "By freeing the colonies from British rule," Paul Finkelman has noted, "the Revolution set the stage for formidable attacks on slavery and in turn necessitated a strong defense of slavery."[22] Southerners also spoke more of slavery as a "necessary evil" during this period. "As partakers of the Revolutionary heritage," Larry Tise argues, southern leaders generally condemned slavery to those outside their region as an evil that could be removed. Southerners did not offer any plans for removal but did see slavery as a necessary evil.[23]

As they began drafting the Constitution, the founding fathers were inevitably faced with the question of how to treat slavery in the nation's founding document. Southern delegates to the Constitutional Convention like Charles Pinckney of South Carolina had become vocal defenders of slavery. Pinckney lobbied other delegates for Constitutional protections for slavery in order to secure what he saw as a vital economic interest to the South. "In short, considering all circumstances," he wrote following the drafting of the Constitution, "we have made the best terms for the security of this species of property it was in our power to make."[24] Furthermore, representing Georgia, Abraham Baldwin (a delegate who would later become the first president of Franklin College), argued that states, and not the federal government, should have the sole

---

[21] Hine et al., *The African-American Odyssey*, 68.
[22] Paul Finkelman, *Defending Slavery: Proslavery Thought in the Old South* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003), 15.
[23] Tise, *Proslavery*, 37. Just because southerners often characterized slavery as a "necessary evil," this does not mean that the "positive good" theory did not exist at the time. As Tise has noted, arguments that slavery provided positive good for masters and slaves existed as long as proslavery arguments existed.
[24] Finkelman, *Defending Slavery*, 25.

authority to regulate the slave trade. As Michael Thurmond notes, "Baldwin stated that the people of Georgia fully supported the institution of slavery and would not accept any limitation or prohibition of the slave trade."[25] The divide between North and South was not as clear in 1787 as it would become in 1861, however several southern states asserted that if slavery was not protected, they would not join the new union. Several northern states had already taken steps towards gradual emancipation before 1787, and antislavery thought slowly began to take shape largely through religious movements.[26] Thus, the result of the Constitutional Convention would ultimately be a compromise that, albeit vaguely, allowed for the perpetuation of the peculiar institution. The founders, never once using the word slave, gave "free persons" rights while limiting the freedom of all others—considering them only "three-fifths" of a person.

Proslavery thought developed alongside a slave economy that would face new challenges with the abolition of the slave trade in the United States in 1808. Contrary to what was a standard belief in proslavery historiography until more recently, proslavery arguments flourished in the North and South in the decades following the ratification of the Constitution.[27] Ironically, some proslavery arguments emerged as a way to promote American nationalism. With the closing of the international slave trade, some northerners, Larry Tise notes, "in the face of British imperialism," associated slavery with American Republicanism. Proslavery ideology "served as a weapon for refuting foreign detractors of American character." Additionally, the development

---

[25] Thurmond, *Freedom*, 76.

[26] See "Introduction" in Leslie M. Harris, *In the Shadow of Slavery: African Americans in New York City, 16261-1863* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003). Even though some northern states legally phased out slavery before and immediately following the Revolution, the effects were gradual. Slavery in New York, for instance, did not end until 1827, and New Jersey did not officially outlaw slavery until the passage of the Thirteenth Amendment in 1865.

[27] Earlier historians have asserted that between the years of 1808-1832, there was little proslavery discourse produced. This period is what historian Alice Dana Adams refers to as the "neglected period," and historians have since argued that there was a flourishing of proslavery literature both North and South. On these historiographical shifts, see: Chapter 3 in Tise, *Proslavery*, 41-74; "The Proslavery Argument in History," in Drew Gilpin Faust, *Southern Stories: Slaveholders in Peace and War* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1992), 72-87.

and continued operation of antislavery societies primarily in the North alerted slaveowners of the precarious and increasingly fragile position they occupied.

William Lloyd Garrison did not single handily change the tone of proslavery writings with the publication of his antislavery newspaper, *The Liberator*, beginning in 1831, but his impact was widely felt. His antislavery newspaper arrived after a decade of increased antislavery activity aimed at the South. Garrison, using the language of the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal" called for the immediate enfranchisement and emancipation of slaves in his first issue.[28] As abolitionist rhetoric became increasingly potent, southerners began to develop a more dynamic, complex, and vocal argument to defend slavery. They turned to all facets of society—law, literature, religion, science, economics, and politics—to propagate a positive defense of slavery.

Proslavery ideology transcended a mere political cause. Slavery, as Drew Faust has written, "became a vehicle for the discussion of fundamental social issues—the meaning of natural law, the conflicting desires for freedom and order, the relationship between tradition and progress, the respective roles of liberty and equality, dependence and autonomy."[29] Southerners also equated their right to own slaves with freedom and progress. "The slaveholders presented themselves to themselves and to the world as the most reliable carriers of the cause of progress in Western civilization," Eugene Genovese has noted, "and they presented their social system as the surest and safest model for a worldwide Christendom that sought to continue its forward march."[30] What began primarily in academic and intellectual circles quickly became mainstream in all of society. Proslavery thought grew more complex and more ubiquitous by the 1830s. The

[28] William Lloyd Garrison, "To the Public," *The Liberator*, January 1, 1831.
[29] Faust, *Southern Stories*, 73.
[30] Eugene D. Genovese, *The Slaveholders' Dilemma: Freedom and Progress in Southern Conservative Thought, 1820-1860* (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1992), 11.

largest body of proslavery literature rested on religious defenses of slavery, primarily from Protestant, often evangelical, southern denominations as the Second Great Awakening took hold.[31] Turning to both the Old and New Testaments, southern clergy often noted that the Bible supported slavery and urged masters to treat their slaves according to Christian principles.[32]

By this period, paternalism was the core ideological position taken by most proslavery arguments and emerged as a way for southerners to secure slavery from both external and internal threats.[33] A product of the reformist zeal that swept the nation following the Second Great Awakening, paternalism emerged as a way for southerners to combat abolitionist attacks on the peculiar institution and to make slavery appear more humane. On both fronts, paternalism emerged as a convincing ideology. As historian Lacy Ford writes, the "paternalist insurgency challenged existing notions of the master-slave relationship, including norms of slave management, discipline, and instruction, without challenging the morality of slavery itself." Thus, it had the power to convince skeptical whites that paternalism could "lead to a more orderly and productive mode of daily life in the slave economy while also saving souls."[34] Paternalism greatly outlived the Civil War, and in fact prospered; becoming the basis for the white supremacist ideology that would come to dominate post-bellum life and influence ideas of the inferiority of African Americans and the need for segregation. As historian Susan Ashmore has noted, paternalism helps us understand why it took many white southerners over a generation

---

[31] Finkelman, *Defending Slavery*, 26.
[32] See Faust, *Southern Stories*, 75. Faust acknowledges that the change in proslavery writings in the 1830s is more of a change in style and tone than of substance. Southerners acknowledged that evils existed in slavery, but focused instead on the "relative merits of social systems." See also, David Donald, "The Proslavery Argument Reconsidered," *Journal of Southern History* 37, no. 1 (February 1, 1971), 6. "It is evident from even a sampling of the proslavery writings in the last two decades before the war that southerners were not writing for a northern audience," Donald notes.
[33] Lacy K. Ford, *Deliver Us From Evil: The Slavery Question in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 141.
[34] Ibid.

to accept the political and civil rights of African Americans.[35] Even in the early twentieth century, racial discourse was rooted in paternalist ideology cultivated a century prior. "In the context of Progressivism and imperialism," historian George Frederickson has noted of the early twentieth century "an ideal approximating a benevolent internal colonialism came to dominate thinking about the race question."[36] Despite the fact African Americans had more political freedom than in the years of slavery, a dominating current of white supremacy influenced by antebellum proslavery attitudes controlled their everyday lives and severely restricted their liberty.

***

The antebellum college campus became an important center for the development and propagation of proslavery thought, and in particular, paternalist thought. Southern educators had a responsibility to the slaveholding classes to educate the young men of the South in a way that agreed with the existence of slavery. And outside of colleges, southern educators influenced a larger realm of proslavery thought through their writings and speeches. Antebellum southern colleges did not simply seek to indoctrinate their students with a worldview compatible with proslavery ideology; they sought to influence all of southern society.

Emory College was no exception. Emory's professors lectured, wrote, and privately thought about race, slavery, and eventually secession, which helps to clarify the College's intellectual investment in slavery and southern politics. These professors impressed upon their students a proslavery ideology that evolved with and influenced proslavery thought across the South. Augustus Baldwin Longstreet, Emory's second president serving from 1840-1848,

---

[35] Susan Youngblood Ashmore, "Histories and Legacies of Race and Slavery at Emory University," (Panel Discussion, "Life of the Mind Lecture Series," Emory University, January 26, 2011).
[36] George M. Fredrickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1987), 325.

became one of the most prominent defenders of slavery by the mid-1840s after his involvement in the schism of the Methodist Church. He published two important works in 1845 and 1848 on the scriptural legitimacy of involuntary servitude and gave numerous sermons and lectures on the subject. Longstreet's voice carried far outside the boundaries of Oxford—his works specifically addressed abolitionist groups in Massachusetts and were published in national journals.

As slavery's place in the growing nation took on greater significance in the 1850s, Emory continued to serve as a center for new ideological fodder. William J. Sasnett, a moral and political philosopher, lectured his students on the necessity and overall good of slavery as well as the natural inferiority of African Americans. The content of Sasnett's lectures appeared on the national stage through several publications, including a book on the progress of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Emory's students were not simply a passive audience to the proslavery rhetoric of their professors. As future southern leaders, clergyman, and plantation owners they actively debated and wrote about the virtues of slaveholding and southern society. Students' experiences at Emory were fundamental in shaping them to become leaders of southern society.

The story of Emory's entwinement with the peculiar institution does not end with the culmination of the Civil War. Ideologies that students and professors shaped and imagined in the antebellum years took on new forms during and after Reconstruction, but they maintained the same principles. The institution of slavery and life in the Old South would come to be romanticized by southerners through literary expression and political discourse. Those who were at Emory College in the antebellum years and who remained important leaders in the College following the War often idealized the Old South in ways that were ostensibly racist. Their nostalgia would take on a variety of forms, but the fact remains that many who grew up

surrounded by antebellum slavery could not (or did not want to) shed the belief that there was benign good in the institution of slavery and that African Americans were inherently inferior to their white neighbors.

Chapter One
The Clash Between North and South: Augustus Longstreet and the "Methodist Civil War"

In early May 1844, a group of Methodist preachers traveled from their hometown of Oxford, Georgia, to New York City to attend the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Among this group were Bishop James Osgood Andrew, the first President of Emory's Board of Trustees, and Augustus Baldwin Longstreet, the current president of Emory College. One hundred and fifty one delegates from all across the country came to the Greene Street Methodist Church in lower Manhattan that morning and assembled early to begin their meeting. "The appearance of this assembly is quite imposing, and commands respect," one delegate noted upon arrival.[1]

On Friday, May 3, James Andrew took his seat at the front of church, having been elected President of the conference the day prior, and called the room to order. Andrew announced he would accept presentation of memorials and petitions to the conference. A delegate from Providence, Rhode Island, promptly submitted a motion to be read concerning Methodist bishops' ownership of slaves. Immediately, a delegate from the South stood up to interrupt the secretary of the conference, stating that he considered it "bad precedent" to read such long motions to the entire body and requested the motion be tabled. At this point, there was much excitement in the room as several others argued for and against the motion being read. A disagreement broke out among delegates that Andrew could not immediately settle. Southerners in the crowd argued that the conference was no place for such a resolution, but they were quickly defeated.[2]

---

[1] Luther Lee and E. Smith, *The Debates of the General Conference of the M. E. Church, May 1844* (New York: O. Scott for the Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America, 1845), 3.
[2] Ibid.

As Andrew and other southern delegates had already suspected, the petition called for the creation of a new committee on the Church's relationship to slavery. It took, as *The New York Herald* reported the next day, a "strong and determined stand against slavery"—declaring that the peculiar institution was "subverting the welfare of this country."[3] The Rhode Island delegate's request began a month-long debate that engulfed the conference. At the center of this controversy was Bishop Andrew—known to delegates from the North not just as a Bishop but also as a slaveholder. Andrew's position as a leader in the Methodist Church was the central question that ultimately caused the "Methodist Civil War" and the schism of the Church.

The clash between the northern and southern Methodists in 1844 marks one of the most remarkable and important events in American history—foreshadowing sectional conflict more than a decade later and affecting Emory and Oxford in profound ways. Following the conference, Augustus Longstreet, Emory's president and close confidant of Bishop Andrew, emerged as an important defender of slavery. Longstreet felt a duty to defend Andrew and to legitimize the peculiar institution itself. Despite the fact that Andrew was the catalyst for the conflict in 1844, Longstreet emerged as particularly important because of his actions during and after the conference.

During the eight years Longstreet served as president of Emory College (1840-1848), he authored several important proslavery treatises on the scriptural legitimacy of involuntary servitude and gave numerous sermons and lectures on the subject. In short, Longstreet's voice during this time helps us understand the complex relationship between slavery and the university, and highlights Emory's special role within the larger context of southern colleges. While Longstreet's works certainly influenced the Emory community, his voice carried far beyond the boundaries of Oxford. Longstreet specifically addressed abolitionist groups in Massachusetts

---

[3] "Methodist Episcopal Conference," *The New York Herald* (New York, May 4, 1844).

and published in national journals. He helped what would eventually be the Methodist Episcopal Church, South become a truly "Southern church," and continued to fan the flames of the fire over proslavery and secessionist arguments during his tenure at Emory College, ultimately contributing to the growing sectional divide of the nation.[4]

***

In 1785, William and Hannah Longstreet moved from their native New Jersey to the Georgia frontier in hopes of settling on a large tract of prosperous land. The couple chose to settle in Augusta, a burgeoning city that had briefly served as Georgia's state capital in the late-eighteenth century. William and Hannah were of at least moderate means—Hannah's father had died several years earlier, leaving a sum of money to the couple; and William was a successful inventor—designing a boat that could move upstream, a version of a sewing machine, and an improvement to the cotton gin known as a "breast roller." Five years after their move, in September 1790, Hannah gave birth to a son, Augustus Baldwin Longstreet.[5]

Augustus, perhaps named after the city of his birth, went north to New Haven at the age of nineteen, graduating from Yale by 1813. He then stayed in Connecticut to train in the law at the Tapping Reeve's law school before returning to Georgia in 1815 to pass his bar examinations. He rode the Richmond County Circuit as a lawyer until 1822, when he became a judge in the Superior Court of the Ocmulgee District. Longstreet's post lasted until 1825, when he lost his judgeship due to a change in the control of the state assembly. He returned to private practice; by 1827, he had purchased a plantation near Augusta.

---

[4] Lewis M. Purifoy, "The Southern Methodist Church and the Proslavery Argument," *Journal of Southern History* 32, no. 3 (August 1966), 326.

[5] For biographical context on Augustus Longstreet, see: John Donald Wade, *Augustus Baldwin Longstreet: A Study of the Development of Culture in the South* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1969); David Rachels, *Augustus Baldwin Longstreet's Georgia Scenes Completed: A Scholarly Text* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1998); Kimball King, *Augustus Baldwin Longstreet* (Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1984); Oscar Penn Fitzgerald, *Judge Longstreet: A Life Sketch* (Nashville, TN: Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1891).

In 1827, Longstreet also joined the Methodist Church during an evangelical wave of immense religious enthusiasm that flooded the South. Following his conversion, he entered Georgia's political scene when an opportunity to purchase a newspaper, the *Augusta Chronicle,* came about. Longstreet, inspired by the "strongly unionistic" sentiment of the 1833 elections, converted the newspaper to the *States Rights Sentinel* and began publishing extensively on nullification and the southern cause.[6] Longstreet was equally inspired by South Carolina politician John C. Calhoun, a staunch advocate for states' rights and secession, and based much of his writing on Calhoun's understanding of the Constitution and the state of the Union at the time.[7] Reflecting on his purchase in August 1843, Longstreet wrote that it was his hope to convince the majority of Georgia and "all the candid readers of the United States that the much abused doctrine of Nullification was the true doctrine of our government."[8] His purchase of the *Sentinel* marked his entry into the political circles of Georgia as a leading editorialist and opinion writer.

Longstreet also developed the political views that he would bring to Emory in 1840 through his fiction writing. Prior to his tenure at Emory College, Longstreet was perhaps best known for his short stories of humor and realism, *Georgia Scenes, Characters, Incidents, &c. in the First Half Century of the Republic* (first published in 1835 with subsequent editions). *Georgia Scenes*, as Longstreet intended it, was to "supply a chasm in history which has always been overlooked—the manners, customs, amusements, wit, dialect as they appear in all grades of society to an ear and eye witness of them."[9] The first of these essays was "The Dance," which

---

[6] Wade, *Augustus Baldwin Longstreet; a Study of the Development of Culture in the South*, 132.
[7] Ibid., 134; Ibid., 93. Wade writes that Longstreet gradually turned toward a stricter reading of the Constitution—"driven thither by what he considered the undue encroachments of the Federal power."
[8] Longstreet to "Yale Class of 1813," as quoted in Jimmy Ray Scafidel, "Letters of Augustus Baldwin Longstreet" (Ph.D. diss., Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, 1976), 145.
[9] As quoted in Rachels, *Augustus Baldwin Longstreet's Georgia Scenes Completed*, xlviii.

appeared in the *Milledgeville Southern Recorder* in 1833. Following his purchase of the *States Rights Sentinel*, Longstreet began publishing additional stories that then became part of the overall collection in *Georgia Scenes*. In these stories, Longstreet documented the lives of everyday rural Georgians in the early nineteenth century. Edgar Allen Poe praised the collection in 1836 as "an exquisitely discriminating and penetrating understanding of character in general, and of southern character in particular."[10] Longstreet's representation of southern character is important to understanding the evolution of his views on race and slavery. Literary scholar Jessica Wegmann has argued that it is impossible to look at *Georgia Scenes* as a "conveyor of the 'true' character of antebellum Georgia" without looking to issues of race and slavery.[11] One can see a clearly racist undertone in his portrayal of African American characters that helps set the tone for Longstreet's later works, which contain more overt racism and arguments for the positive good of slavery.

One particular story reveals how acceptable these attitudes were in the nineteenth-century South. "The Dance," subtitled "A Personal Adventure of the Author," features a central character, Billy Porter, described by Longstreet as "a negro fellow of much harmless wit and humour, who was well known throughout the State."[12] The story is exemplary of Longstreet's quiet racism in the 1830s. In the story, Billy entertains the narrator, Baldwin, and his friend, whom he refers to as "the Squire." Baldwin and the Squire are discussing history when they are "interrupted" by the sound of a violin, played by Billy. Baldwin writes that he and the Squire enjoyed Billy's fiddle playing and dancing very much. Having been thoroughly entertained, the Squire recalls it was "impossible to give [Baldwin] his attention for half an hour after Billy

---

[10] Review, *Southern Literary Messenger*, March 1836.
[11] Jessica Wegmann, “"Playing in the Dark" with Longstreet's "Georgia Scenes": Critical Reception and Reader Response to Treatments of Race and Gender,” *The Southern Literary Journal* 30, no. 1 (October 1997): 13-14.
[12] Augustus Baldwin Longstreet, *Georgia Scenes: Characters, Incidents, etc., in the first half-century of the Republic*, Second edition (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1870), 13.

arrived."[13] Longstreet attempts to portray Billy as a "Happy Darky," a carefree, lazy, simple character—similar to the character of Sam in Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*.[14] While Billy is not explicitly a slave, Longstreet clearly portrays him as an inferior person with far less intelligence than any of the white characters. Longstreet's belief in the inferiority of African Americans, present in his writing in the 1830s, will only become more pronounced a decade later in his proslavery pamphlets.

By the end of the 1830s, Longstreet decided to train to be a Methodist minister and officially became a part of the ministry in January 1839. As Longstreet wrote to his wife, he was impassioned by what he described as "the last call of God to preach his gospel," and desired to leave the "comfortable surroundings" of the legal profession to become a "true Christian."[15] In August 1839, after six months as a clergyman in Augusta, the trustees of Emory College asked Longstreet to replace outgoing President Ignatius Few. At the time, as one biographer has noted, Longstreet's name was perhaps better known than the college itself.[16]

Having accepted the trustees' offer, Longstreet came to Oxford in February 1840. During his inaugural address, he called upon Emory's faculty, trustees, and residents of Oxford to help make Emory into a preeminent destination for pious education in a time of intense denominationalism.[17] Longstreet saw the College as a place to foster basic Christian values and

---

[13] Ibid.
[14] Wegmann, "'Playing in the Dark" with Longstreet's 'Georgia Scenes,'" 16.
[15] King, *Augustus Baldwin Longstreet*, 21.
[16] Ibid., 23.
[17] For more on Longstreet's inaugural address, see Henry Morton Bullock, *A History of Emory University* (Nashville, TN: Parthenon Press, 1936), 77; Wade, *Augustus Baldwin Longstreet: A Study of the Development of Culture in the South*, 259. As Donald Wade notes of the time, "It was an era of denominationalism, of happy belief in the possibility that one might at any day, now, find absolute and definitive Truth."

piety. He warned the students of engaging in "youthful follies," telling them that "college is not a place for boys; nor are the Collegians the characters for tricks."[18]

By 1840, Longstreet had already established himself as a staunch advocate for conservative southern values. He was intensely connected to the debate over slavery and the future of the southern states during his time at Emory, and he has been called by historian Albea Godbold a "stalwart defender of slavery."[19] A slaveholder himself, Longstreet viewed slavery as a normal and necessary component of southern life. He grew up amidst slaves, and as an adult owned many slaves on his plantation in Augusta—Longstreet owned at least twenty-one slaves and had seventeen "free colored people" living on his land in Augusta.[20] Longstreet's personal correspondence indicates he might have owned between forty and fifty slaves in the early 1830s. By 1840, when Longstreet had just moved to Oxford, he brought fifteen slaves and two "free colored people" with him to his new home. On his plantation in Augusta, he retained the services of at least six African Americans whom he listed as "free colored people" on the 1840 Census.[21]

---

[18] "Augustus Baldwin Longstreet Inaugural Address to Emory College," 1840, MSS209, Box 1, Folder 1, Manuscript, Archives, & Rare Book Library, Emory University, Atlanta, GA (hereinafter referred to as EU-MARBL).

[19] Albea Godbold, *The Church College of the Old South* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1944), 89.

[20] 1830 U.S. Census, Augusta, Georgia (Richmond County).

[21] Ibid.; 1840 U.S. Census, Oxford, Georgia (Newton County). Because the 1840 Census does not list the names of those living on Longstreet's farm in 1840, it is impossible to ascertain their names to check if they were in fact registered with the local court as free blacks. The census only lists that there were two males and three females between the ages of ten and twenty-three, and one female between the age of twenty-four and thirty-five. While this is at most a speculative claim, it is possible that the older female was the mother of the younger males and females living on the farm. The status of those African Americans living on Longstreet's plantation in Augusta in 1840 is unclear. Laws against free blacks, specifically in Georgia, were quite strict. In 1801, the Georgia Legislature ended the practice of allowing masters to manumit slaves without their approval, and by 1818, the Georgia Legislature repealed a law that allowed masters to free slaves in their will. Further, in 1818, the Legislature banned the immigration of free blacks to Georgia. Southern whites, particularly in a state such as Georgia, went to great lengths to limit the freedom of any free blacks at an increasing rate until the start of the Civil War. On free blacks in the antebellum South, see Ira Berlin, *Slaves Without Masters: The Free Negro in the Antebellum South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981); Michael P. Johnson and James L. Roark, *Black Masters: A Free Family of Color in the Old South* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1986); Ford, *Deliver Us From Evil*, specifically 194-200.

Longstreet, both before and after the Civil War, later reflected on his slave ownership in a manner that obscured the true facts—he lied about the amount of slaves he owned and tried to distance himself from the peculiar institution. His writings after the Civil War hint at his desire to preserve a certain memory of slavery. This fact is quite perplexing, however. Longstreet only tries to distance himself from slavery on the grounds of his slaveownership. He does not imply that he had any moral qualms over owning slaves, merely financial troubles. An 1842 letter Longstreet wrote to his brother-in-law, Albert Park Torrence, helps shed some light on Longstreet's understanding of himself as a slaveowner. Torrence wrote to Longstreet asking him to buy eight slaves to help ease his growing debts. Longstreet, however, was "extremely reluctant to be again bothered with that kind of property" but was willing to "take them" if he could do so "without too great a loss." Longstreet's reluctance stemmed not from a moral or ethical question over owning slaves, but rather a financial one. Longstreet's debt problem, or Torrence's for that matter, was a common problem for slaveowners in the antebellum period. As historian Walter Johnson has noted in his study of the antebellum slave trade, "The entire economy of the antebellum South was constructed upon the idea that the bodies of enslaved people had a measurable monetary value, whether they were actually sold or not. Slaves were frequently used as collateral to borrow money, and were transferred in order to pay debts. Thus, many planters, like Longstreet, were constantly balancing their ownership of chattel property with growing debt obligations.[22]

Longstreet was concerned with speculation and warned Torrence of the possible dangers of getting into too much debt. He then told Torrence of his own sale of twenty-nine slaves eight years earlier in 1834. Even if Longstreet did sell twenty-nine slaves in 1834, as he claimed to

[22] Walter Johnson, *Soul By Soul: Life Inside the Antebellum Slave Market* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999), 25-26 (quote on 26).

have done when writing to Torrence, he was still a slaveowner by 1840, bringing at least fifteen slaves—including four slaves under the age of ten—with him to his new home in Oxford.[23] Even by 1860, as he moved to Columbia, South Carolina, to serve as president of South Carolina College, he owned at least seven slaves between the ages of nine and sixty.[24]

During Reconstruction, as the nation was trying to heal from the wounds slavery caused, Longstreet did not want to identify with being a large slaveholder. His correspondence indicates that he wanted to refashion himself in a way that made him less connected and more innocent. He told his cousin, Louisa, in 1870 that he only owned slaves for a short period of time, characterizing himself as a reluctant slaveowner. On how he came into possession of his slaves, he told his cousin they were inherited by his wife, Eliza: "These negroes had been bequeathed to [Eliza] and her brother in early childhood by their grandfather, who had selected them to correspond in age with the age of the two children, that they all might grow up together. Her brother soon died, and they all fell to her," Longstreet wrote.[25] Longstreet's use of the passive phrase "fell to her" is surely a way to distance himself from slave ownership.

In a similar vein to his letter to Torrence, Longstreet also noted to Louisa that he quickly fell into debt upon becoming a slave master: "My practice increased, to be sure, but my expenses increased in duplicate ration, and my troubles in an innumerable ratio." Seeing that his "crops barely paid the expenses of making them," Longstreet decided to sell his slaves and found a purchaser—one he described as "a companion of my boyhood, a pious man, and of course a good master."[26] How Longstreet chose to remember his slaveholder status is indicative of the

---

[23] 1840 U.S. Census, Oxford, Georgia (Newton County). In Oxford, Longstreet was listed as owning fifteen slaves on the 1840 Census. Of those slaves, one male and three females were under the ages of ten, two males and three females were between the ages of ten and twenty-three, two males were between the ages of twenty-four and thirty-five, and two males and two females were between the ages of thirty-six and fifty-four.
[24] 1860 U.S. Census, Slave Schedules, Columbia, South Carolina (Richland County).
[25] Longstreet to Louisa, March 6, 1870, as published in Scafidel, "Letters of Augustus Baldwin Longstreet," 658.
[26] Ibid., 658-659.

time in which he wrote. Perhaps seeing the dissolution of slavery and wanting to reposition himself politically, Longstreet distanced himself from slavery in the antebellum years by downplaying his own role as a slaveowner. And after the Civil War, Longstreet's writing implies that he wished to wash his hands clean of any wrongdoing as it might be perceived by others, implying that his proslavery stance in the public arena had weakened considerably in the aftermath of the War and Reconstruction.

***

Four years into Longstreet's tenure as President, he participated in one of the most formative events in Emory's history—the General Conference of the Methodist Church in 1844. Prior to the conference, Longstreet had focused his attention primarily on publishing fiction; his stories were a softer way of presenting racist arguments in favor of slavery. Following the conference, Longstreet became one of the staunchest defenders of the peculiar institution, arguing extensively for it by employing both a scriptural and moral defense in numerous published pamphlets and speeches as well as espousing a strong defense in his personal discourse. His shift from fiction to political writing was far from accidental—it was a direct result of his experiences in 1844. Most importantly, Longstreet's new-found interest in proslavery literature elevated the status of Emory College as an institution committed to defending the peculiar institution.[27]

Slavery was a topic on the mind of almost every delegate coming to New York in 1844. In fact, the controversies had been brewing since the beginning of the nineteenth century, if not earlier. The Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States officially formed in 1784 as an

---

[27] See Bullock, *A History of Emory University*, 87. The only mention of Longstreet's proslavery writings in Bullock's institutional history of Emory is as follows: "There [Oxford] lived the principals of the test case on slavery which had split Methodism, and thence from Longstreet's hand came a series of published letters, pamphlets, and books—telling thrusts in defense of the South."

antislavery church but had its roots in the early eighteenth century and the First Great Awakening. At that time, Methodists were not only antislavery, but they also welcomed African Americans to their congregations. "Methodists' participation in the religious revivalism of the [First] Great Awakening," historian Leslie Harris has noted, "led them to preach the religious equality of all people, regardless of their status on earth."[28] By the 1780s, as the church officially formed, early bishops such as Francis Asbury and Thomas Coke both vehemently denounced slavery, following the lead of their founder, John Wesley, who believed slavery was one of the greatest evils in existence.[29]

By 1800, however, the Church began to compromise its positions on the peculiar institution. Methodists retreated from an explicit antislavery doctrine—the Church was no longer actively working to exclude slaves from membership in the Church and only prohibited them from becoming ministers. At the same time, Methodists in the South increasingly preached to and attempted to convert slaves. Methodists in the North preached to interracial audiences. "To assuage planter fears and yet preach to the slaves," historian Christopher Owen has noted in his study on Methodism in Georgia, "Georgia Methodists argued [in the 1830s] that conversion would create contented, hardworking slaves."[30] These Methodists were simply espousing the benefits of paternalism—emphasizing it to be a reform movement for masters and slaves. For the next three decades, the Methodist Church left the topic of slavery largely out of general discourse. Methodists were on thin ice in ignoring the slavery question; there existed a delicate balance between the northern and southern factions in the Church that could shift at any point.

[28] Harris, *In the Shadow of Slavery*, 51.
[29] See Christopher H. Owen, *The Sacred Flame of Love: Methodism and Society in Nineteenth Century Georgia* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1998), 33. As Owen has noted, southern evangelicalism did not come about to defend the institution of slavery or "to bolster southern political positions."
[30] Ibid., 39-42. Owen finds that the Georgia conference in particular converted a number of slaves and was quite successful in "slave missions."

"Methodists had relegated the slavery issue to the periphery of moral and institutional concern," historian Donald Matthews tells us. "Church leaders wished neither to condemn nor explicitly to condone Negro servitude, partially because of previous experiences with antislavery preaching and partially because of their dedication to the American Colonization Society (a movement emphasizing "colonization" and emigration) and the missions to slaves."[31]

At the 1832 Methodist General conference held in Baltimore, the slavery question became an issue when the Church had to elect a new bishop to serve in the South. This was not even a year after Nat Turner's notorious rebellion, which resulted in over one hundred deaths and several southern states passing stricter laws towards slaves. Northern Methodists, partially influenced by Abolitionist discourse in the North and Nat Turner's 1831 rebellion, were particularly wary of further involvement with slavery and argued that the new bishop must not be a slaveowner. Thus, while several candidates more qualified entered the election for the new position, a majority of northern and southern delegates elected James Osgood Andrew as a bishop because he did not own slaves.[32] "It is not my merit that has made me a Bishop, but my poverty," Andrew told Lovick Pierce, a fellow Georgian. The "poverty" Andrew referred to, was of course, his having no slaves.[33] The fact that Andrew acknowledged this indicates the possibility that he believed the sole impediment standing between himself and owning slaves was a lack of wealth and desired to eventually become a slaveowner. A southern delegate, William Winans, at the time confessed in his diary of the circumstances of Andrew's election:

---

[31] Donald G. Mathews, *Slavery and Methodism: A Chapter in American Morality, 1780-1845* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965), 114.

[32] See George Gilman Smith, *The Life and Letters of James Osgood Andrew: Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church South: With Glances at his Contemporaries and at Events in Church History* (Nashville, TN: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1882), 230. See Chapter three of this thesis for more on George Gilman Smith and post-Civil War memory. Interestingly, as Smith notes, "The southern delegates were almost as numerous in 1832 as the northern, and, with a few votes from the West, could have elected any man that the South put forward." Thus, Andrew's election was a compromise on the part of southerners, most likely to secure the peace on the slavery question.

[33] See Mathews, *Slavery and Methodism*, 117.

"Why was he chosen? Because he belonged to the South and because he had no slaves….[A]s a southern man I must detest the principle on which this election was conducted….I fear for the consequences in time to come."[34] Winans' belief suggests not only that southerners were growing increasingly tired of compromise but also that southerners felt their interests could not be represented without a sympathetic slaveholding bishop in office; hence Winans' opposition to Andrew's election.

At the 1836 conference, the slavery question again came to the forefront of debate over the election of three new bishops. Northerners, holding to the compromise reached at the 1832 conference, asserted that no candidate could be connected to slavery, and refused to vote for any nominee who held slaves. Southern delegates responded by suggesting that slaveholding was in fact a "necessary qualification," arguing that at least one southern Bishop should be a slaveholder.[35] The Southern delegates argued this position possibly because they desired a proslavery bishop to preach in the North. Given that bishops were assigned all over the country, southerners saw this as an opportunity to station a proslavery advocate in antislavery territory. Ultimately, southerners lost, and the conference did not elect a slaveholding bishop in 1836. Southerners were incensed by the compromise: "Many southern delegates—men who wielded considerable influence because of their position—resented what they believed was a 'proscription' of slaveholders, and, by implication, the South," Donald Matthews tells us.[36]

A compromise reached at the conference, however, suppressed further agitation. Delegates, in a unanimous vote, agreed they "wholly disclaim any right, wish, or intention to

---

[34] William Winans Diary, May 22, 1832, as quoted in Ibid. Whether all southerners accepted Andrew's election as a compromise is somewhat unclear. Mathews notes that much of the debates were concealed in secret caucuses at the 1832 conference, so little primary sources exist.
[35] "The True Grounds upon which the Southern Portion of the M. E. Church Must Rest, if the Contemplated Separation from their present Connection Should be Effected," *Christian Advocate and Journal*, June 26, 1844.
[36] Mathews, *Slavery and Methodism*, 177.

interfere in the civil and political relation between master and slave as it exists in the slave-holding states in this Union."[37] This compromise got broken in 1837, however, when Ignatius Few, then president of Emory College, urged the Georgia conference to pass a resolution denying that slavery in the United States was a "moral evil." As Christopher Owen has noted of the resolution, it "cut through years of ad hoc compromises and directly repudiated [Methodist] antislavery principles."[38] By the 1840 General Conference, Donald Mathews describes three parties within the Methodist Church: southerners, abolitionists, and conservatives. Conservatives (northern anti-abolitionists) desired to keep the Church unified and worked to prevent discussion on the slavery question.[39] At the 1840 Conference, perhaps in an effort to quell further arguments, delegates voted not to alter the basic rules the Church had established in 1784. Thus, no new formal text would be added on the slavery question and the debate would once again be put off to the following meeting.

Given the delicate balance between the northern and southern branches of the Methodist Church, many anticipated conflict before their arrival in New York in May 1844. Many northern Methodists were prepared to put the slavery question on the table and settle it for the last time, while southerners continued to resist any such action to limit slavery. The issue that would prompt the debate was the existence of a slaveowning Bishop—James O. Andrew. How Andrew came to possess up to sixteen slaves is a matter of much historical debate, but most likely his slaves came from his third marriage.[40] Nevertheless, the mere fact that Andrew owned slaves by 1844 brought about serious conflict at the conference.

---

[37] *Journals of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, Volume 1, 447.
[38] Owen, *The Sacred Flame of Love*, 52.
[39] Mathews, *Slavery and Methodism*, 192-193.
[40] For a comprehensive look at this question and others surrounding Andrew's ownership of his slaves, see Mark Auslander, *The Accidental Slaveowner: Revisiting a Myth of Race and Finding an American Family* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, forthcoming). An incorrect interpretation of Andrew's slaveholding is even present in Emory's own institutional history, authored by Henry Morton Bullock. See Bullock, *A History of Emory University*,

By May 21, 1844, the conference delegates asked a subcommittee to "ascertain the nature of Andrew's relation to slavery," which was followed by a letter from Andrew explaining his proslavery position, which he had reached earlier in a meeting with Longstreet. Northerners and southerners met separately to discuss Andrew's situation in informal meetings. The following day, a member of the Baltimore conference took the bold step of calling for Andrew's resignation.[41] The debate carried on for several days, reaching such a state of intensity that "a half dozen [men were] rising and addressing the President at the same moment," delegate Thomas Stringfeld remembered.[42] While Andrew was willing to resign from his position, Longstreet and other members of the Georgia delegation pressured him to stay. "To have stepped down, they believed, would have been to stigmatize southern Wesleyans for slaveholding and to have jeopardized the existence of Methodism in their region," Christopher Owen writes.[43] After efforts to reconcile such conflicting positions, the southerners, realizing they were in the minority, began to look for ways to secede from the church. They decided to break away from the national church a month after the conference began. Following the 1844 split, southern Methodists, now in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, had to argue the moral question of whether slavery was right and justify it as not being a sin.[44] This ideology influenced the defensive proslavery rhetoric coming from those affiliated with the new southern church.

On June 26, 1844, the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, a northern Methodist weekly, published a lengthy 4,000 word editorial on "the true grounds upon which the southern portion of

---

86-87. Bullock writes that Andrew only owned two slaves, and that they "came into his possession by inheritance, and not through his desire to own slaves."

[41] Despite the fact that Maryland was in fact a southern, slaveholding state, two members from the Baltimore conference were antislavery.

[42] As quoted in Mathews, *Slavery and Methodism*, 262.

[43] Owen, *The Sacred Flame of Love*, 55.

[44] Purifoy, "The Southern Methodist Church and the Proslavery Argument," 325-326.

the [Methodist] Church must rest."[45] The *Advocate* told its readers it hoped to ascertain why the southern members left the Church, asking "What *new* grievance or injury has been inflicted by the Church action upon our brethren in the South?" They quickly answered "None—absolutely none!"—noting that "the southern portion of the Church have no just ground for the disruption proposed." Thus, northern church members wanted to show that the separation was completely the fault of the southern members. Citing a long list of grievances against southerners, the paper ultimately wrote that the question of separation was "to be settled by the [S]outh."[46]

The article infuriated Longstreet, who responded to the senior editor of the *Advocate* in a letter on October 24, 1844. "I am actually amazed at the tactics which you display in your new character of champion of the North against the South," Longstreet wrote. "Your [editorial] is a delicate appeal to the public against southern ingratitude, and…a labored article to show, that the southern delegates must attach all the responsibilities of the division of the church, and of all the evils that may flow from such an event."[47] Longstreet argued throughout the letter that the history of compromise on the subject of slavery has been beneficial to all, and that the southern members were following the established "rules." "Slavery may be an evil and not a sin," he wrote; "it may be odious to some and necessary to others, it may be a sin under some circumstances and no sin under others. And hence the necessity of reconciling all opinions upon this subject by fixed rules."[48] Longstreet signed his letter "A Southern Delegate," and attached an article—a further rebuttal to the June 26 editorial—that he requested be published in the *Christian Advocate.* Longstreet desired order and hoped to silence the debate on the slavery

---

[45] "The True Grounds upon which the Southern Portion of the M. E. Church Must Rest, if the Contemplated Separation from their present Connection Should be Effected," *Christian Advocate and Journal*, June 26, 1844.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Longstreet to the Senior Editor of the *Christian Advocate and Journal*, October 25, 1844, as published in Scafidel, "Letters of Augustus Baldwin Longstreet," 161.
[48] Ibid., 167.

question within the Church by proposing what happened in New York was simply an infraction of the established "rules."

The northern editors did not publish Longstreet's letter or article, causing Longstreet to publish it himself in pamphlet form in 1845. Titling the pamphlet *Letters on the Epistle of Paul to Philemon, or the Connection of Apostolical Christianity with Slavery*, Longstreet intended to prove the scriptural legitimacy of slavery. He first offered a broad statement aimed directly at his northern colleagues. In it, he asked them (perhaps rhetorically) to provide him any example of the Bible not supporting slavery:

> Do *you conjointly, or any one of you, separately, present to the Methodists of the South, an unanswerable argument*, BASED UPON THE SCRIPTURES, *in support of your position, that it is a sin for a Christian, a Christian Minister, or a Christian Bishop to hold slaves.* When I say *an unanswerable argument,* I mean one that meets the several texts of Scripture which have been so often quoted as clearly sanctioning slavery. Only convince us, that God forbids the relationship of Master and Slave—nay, only give us a satisfactory answer to the arguments which we adduce from Scripture to show that he sanctions it—and all the wounds of our Church will be healed in an instant.[49]

Longstreet's "letters" rest on Paul's "Letter to Philemon" contained in the New Testament of the Bible. Many proslavery advocates used this passage to state that the Bible endorsed slavery by way of Paul's desire for Onesimus, a slave, to be returned to his owner, Philemon.[50] Longstreet noted that Paul's letter "seems to me of itself decisive of every ground of difference between us." The letter establishes that "there is no sin in holding slaves"; "a Slaveholder may be a very pious man in the sight of God, and worthy of the love, fellowship, and confidence of the best of men";

---

[49] For quote, see Augustus B. Longstreet, *Letters on the Epistle of Paul to Philemon, or the Connection of Apostolical Christianity with Slavery* (Charleston, S.C.: Printed by B. Benkins, 1845). The editors of the *Southern Christian Advocate* (a publication of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South) also reprinted Longstreet's article in 1845.

[50] See "Slavery and the Bible," *De Bow's Review 9* (September, 1850), 286. Such a defense was not uncommon in other proslavery literature. Take, for example, an 1850 article titled "Slavery and the Bible" published in *De Bow's Review*. After discussing Paul's letter to Philemon, the article states "We find, then, that both the Old and New Testaments speak of slavery—that they do not condemn the relation, but, on the contrary, expressly allow it or create it; and they give commands and exhortations, which are based upon its legality and propriety. It cannot, then, be wrong."

and "that slaveholding is no disqualification for the ministry."[51] Longstreet returned to 1844 in his conclusion to his final letter, asking, "If Paul and his colleagues thus esteemed Philemon, how can you and your colleagues reconcile it to your consciences to treat Bishop Andrew as you have treated him and as you are still treating him?"[52] While Longstreet wrote this work specifically in response to the northern Methodists, it was widely published throughout the South and certainly caught the attention of many northern abolitionists.[53]

The southern Methodist press published Longstreet's most prominent proslavery pamphlet in 1847, three years after Longstreet's letters to the *New York Advocate*. Again, in response to the 1844 schism, and titled "A Voice from the South," the pamphlet contained a series of letters from Georgia (authored by Longstreet) to Massachusetts. Longstreet chose to write to Massachusetts using the voice of Georgia and not his own. He considered Massachusetts "the mother of Abolitionism." Longstreet's defense of Georgia (and slavery) was multifaceted, but throughout we can see his desire to remain innocent from the cruelties of slavery. He first blamed Massachusetts for "fastening Slavery" upon Georgia and the South. This fact, he noted, "certainly justifies [Georgia] in looking for courtesy from those who fastened the institution upon her, and in demanding silence from them, until they will point out some practicable mode of getting rid of it."[54] Longstreet's notion that slavery was "fastened" upon Georgia—placing the blame elsewhere, was not unlike Thomas Jefferson's own defense of slavery in an early draft of the Declaration of Independence. Jefferson accused King George III

---

[51] Longstreet, *Letters on the Epistle of Paul to Philemon, on the Connection of Apostolical Christianity with Slavery*, as published in Scafidel, "Letters of Augustus Baldwin Longstreet," 177.
[52] Ibid., 179.
[53] See Owen, *The Sacred Flame of Love*, 63. On the impact of Longstreet's writing, see also Larry E. Tise, *Proslavery: A History of the Defense of Slavery in America, 1701-1840* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2004), 127. Owen further notes, "As part of a rancorous dispute between Wesleyans, *Letters on the Epistle of Paul to Philemon* was addressed to northern and southern audiences."
[54] Augustus Baldwin Longstreet, *A Voice from the South: Comprising Letters from Georgia to Massachusetts, and to the Southern States* (Baltimore, Western Continent Press, 1847).

of bringing slavery to the New World, writing, " He [King George] has waged cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people who never offended him, captivating and carrying them into slavery in another hemisphere, or to incur miserable death in their transportation thither."[55]

Longstreet exercised caution when placing blame on the North. He aimed to show that slavery was not the original intention of people in Georgia, or even southerners, but instead an institution they had to cope with. Georgia, in fact, forbid slavery for several decades after its founding, and Longstreet clung to this point. "When I first settled in this country," he wrote in the voice of Georgia, "I proclaimed to the world that I intended to have nothing to do with Slavery; and I adhered steadfastly to my resolution, until it was overpowered by the complaints of my children." He denied any involvement in the slave trade, writing, "You [the North] and mother Brit, having 'put the price of human flesh in your pockets,' went off glorying in your profits—leaving me to manage this flesh as I could." How southerners would "manage" this "human flesh" was a way for Longstreet to distinguish the South from the North in terms of paternalism. Slaves, Longstreet noted, were "victims of Yankee avarice"; a mere vestige of economic vitality. Southerners had a "superior" way of managing them.[56]

Longstreet's explanation of how southerners "coped with" slavery—the "superior" way in which he believed they managed their slaves—is at its core an argument rooted in paternalist ideology. Longstreet aimed to show not just that the slave trade was an abomination and that southerners took no part in it, but what southerners subsequently did for slaves—slaveholder benevolence and Christianization—was morally good. "That my children, in purchasing slaves from yours," he wrote, "delivered them from the most cruel bondage that man ever groaned

[55] Paul Leicester Ford, *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, Volume II (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1893), 52.
[56] Ibid.

under [referring to the slave trade], is most true—that there was pity and compassion on the side of the purchasers, and none on the side of the vendors is equally true; but for these things I give them no credit, because selfishness and not humanity urged them to traffic."[57] Longstreet's idea that slave trafficking was based entirely on "selfishness" or a desire to make money contrasted sharply with southern paternalism. During the time Longstreet wrote, proslavery supporters increasingly tried to demonstrate the "humanity" in southern slavery and decry and distance themselves from what they saw as the horrors of the Atlantic slave trade. While profitability was still a goal, proslavery writers often left it in the background, choosing instead to highlight the immense benefits of paternalism for slaves and slaveholders alike. As Lacy Ford has noted of this concept, "paternalism required the paternalist to show some larger scope of humanitarian concern not simply in the daily treatment and provisioning of slaves or even in the nurture of slave families and religion, but also in the acceptance of a broader social responsibility for making slave society work humanely as well as profitably."[58] By arguing for the "humane" benefits of slavery, Longstreet espoused the very concepts at the foundation of paternalistic ideology.

Longstreet also used "A Voice from the South" to argue that enslavement benefited people of African descent more than emancipation would. Answering a hypothetical question Longstreet posed to abolitionists on the benefits of emancipation or colonization, he wrote, "I set these two hundred and eighty-one thousand human beings free[59]—I proclaim liberty to these old and decrepid [*sic*], these young and helpless. Among them are many sick, lame, blind, deaf and dumb. I set them adrift upon the world, houseless, breadless, penniless. Before the God who

[57] Ibid.
[58] Ford, *Deliver Us From Evil*, 147.
[59] Referring to all of the slaves in Georgia, which at the time numbered around 300,000.

made you, Sister Mass, do you think this would be right?"[60] Longstreet believed the consequences of emancipation would be dire for all slaves. "A month's time would bury nineteen-twentieths of them," he wrote.[61] Under paternalism, masters had certain obligations—fair treatment of slaves, providing slaves with adequate food and housing, and of course, converting them to Christianity. These benefits would all be lost, Longstreet believed, if blacks were emancipated. Furthermore, Longstreet found that blacks simply could not live on their own—they depended on their masters for survival. Paternalism required masters to recognize slaves as human beings, but as human beings utterly dependent on white masters and the institution of slavery itself.

What impact Longstreet had on students at Emory College at the time is more difficult to ascertain. One Emory student, Robert Archelaus Hardaway, a sophomore in 1845, who boarded in Longstreet's home and often "ate at Judge Longstreet's table," recalled later that Longstreet convinced many students at Emory to become Democrats. By the end of Hardaway's tenure, he wrote, "most of the students were Calhoun Democrats."[62] Such political affiliation would have important consequences in a little over a decade when questions of secession were linked to one's party. John C. Calhoun, a prominent Democratic politician from South Carolina, was a staunch supporter of the doctrine of nullification and later secession on the basis of protecting South Carolinians' rights to own slaves. Longstreet did not induce all students to become staunch Democrats, however. Emory student George Munson wrote in 1848, "We have no news at interest except that politics is raging at its highest point and it is yet doubtful how our state will go in the Election, but this is a subject which aught never to trouble or interest students."

---

[60] Longstreet, *A Voice from the South*.
[61] Ibid.
[62] "Robert Archelaus Hardaway Recollections," collection 3006, Louis Round Wilson Special Collections Library, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (hereinafter UNC-SHC).

Continuing, Munson wrote, "It would seem that President Longstreet has been successful in persuading students to avoid politics."[63] Given that Munson wrote about Longstreet three years after Hardaway attended Emory, Longstreet could have changed his ways. Perhaps, given the nature of the 1848 Presidential election and the lack of a viable southern Democrat, Longstreet was not as interested and did not try to persuade Munson or his peers[64].

On June 14, 1844, the *Charleston Mercury* lamented, "If the clergy whose business is peace and good will cannot tolerate each other of the same sect, what will become of the politicians whose vocation is strife and dissention?"[65] Published in the city where the Civil War would begin seventeen years later, the *Mercury* acknowledged the fraying bonds within southern society that would cause a bloody conflict over many of the same questions raised in New York in 1844. Augustus Longstreet and the clash between North and South in the Methodist Church set the tone for the future years of antebellum Emory. The split of the church transformed Oxford into the intellectual capital of Southeastern Methodism.[66] The proslavery defense Longstreet articulated—a scriptural and moral defense of slavery that often times utilized paternalistic ideology—would be the foundation of proslavery rhetoric at Emory before, during, and even after the Civil War. Undoubtedly, Longstreet's voice had a prominent effect on the social and political culture of Emory at the time he was writing and speaking. During Longstreet's tenure, some of the most important leaders of the South would emerge from Emory, many of whom cited Longstreet as one of their most important mentors. Longstreet's vision of the South and his understanding of slavery influenced the personal and professional discourse of

---

[63] George B. Munson to his parents, October 10, 1848, Record Group 800, Series 47, Box 1, Folder 19, EU-A.
[64] In the 1848 Presidential Election, Zachary Taylor, a Whig from Louisiana, competed against Lewis Cass, a Democrat from Michigan. Martin Van Buren also ran as a Free Soil candidate, however, he did not win any electoral votes. Taylor won the election, including the electoral votes from Georgia. If Longstreet was a staunch Democrat, he would have been hard-pressed to support Taylor, even though Taylor did not oppose slavery.
[65] *Charleston Mercury*, June 14, 1844 in Mathews, *Slavery and Methodism*, 282.
[66] Bullock, *A History of Emory University*, 87.

a number of students and other faculty at the time. Longstreet and the 1844 conference—a fundamental connection between slavery and the university—left a powerful legacy at Emory that would remain for decades.

Chapter Two
An Education Fit for Southern Gentlemen

"The first and greatest problem for Southern educators," Eugene Genovese notes, "was to counteract the growing transatlantic revulsion against slavery as a moral as well as social evil."[1] Southern schools in the nineteenth century were still largely committed to providing a "classical education." While their northern counterparts placed less emphasis on Greek and Roman classics and moved towards more "practical" subjects necessary for an increasingly capitalist, free-labor based economy, southern schools continued to follow an eighteenth-century model of education. Dixie's colleges, especially, retained the classical disciplines because classical societies provided justification for slavery and the ethic of southern honor.[2] Ancient Greece, in many ways, was emblematic of the South, and offered a convenient reasoning and defense of a slave society. By the 1840s and 1850s, distinct regional differences emerged in college curricula over slavery and abolition, with southern colleges keeping the eighteenth-century model and northern colleges moving towards a more scientific, modern curriculum.[3]

Emory remained committed to the classical model of education throughout the antebellum period, with little variation in its course offerings from 1838 to 1861. In 1838, with just five faculty members and twenty students, the school boasted courses in ancient languages and literature, moral and mental philosophy, mathematics, and the natural sciences, including chemistry, mineralogy, and geology.[4] By 1845, Emory's course offerings expanded to include *Greek Tragedies*, *Greek Testament*, *Xenophon's Memorabilia*, *Homer or Herodotus,* and *Virgil's*

---

[1] Eugene Genovese, *The Southern Front: History and Politics in the Cultural War* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1995), 92.
[2] Robert F. Pace, *Halls of Honor: College Men in the Old South* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2004), 20.
[3] Caroline Winterer, *The Culture of Classicism: Ancient Greece and Rome in American Intellectual Life, 1780-1910* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002), 74-75.
[4] "Catalogue of the Officers & Students, in Emory College, GA, and the Report of the Board of Trustees to the Georgia conference," Oxford, GA, 1839, EU-A.

Georgics. The College required both "composition" (writing essays) and "declamation" (oral recitation, in front of a group) in all courses.[5] During their senior year of study, students were also required "to deliver original orations in the College Chapel, several times during the year, in addition to the usual exercises at commencement."[6]

Admissions standards, in addition to a requirement that candidates be at least fourteen years of age, were also based on knowledge of the classics. "Candidates for admission into the Freshman class," the 1845 *Catalogue* read, "will be examined on the Grammars of the Latin and Greek Languages; Caesar's Gallic War; Virgil Bucolics [*sic*], and Six Books of the Aeneid; Cicero's Six Orations; Greek Reader; Two of the Gospels in Greek; Arithmetic; Algebra, through Simple Equations."[7] These rigorous admissions standards ensured students would be prepared for an even more intense study of the classics. The College's guide advised parents "to provide competent instructors for their sons, and to allow sufficient time for thorough preparation."[8]

A classical education was an important step for students to join the ranks of the southern gentry. "Throughout the antebellum period a fairly deep knowledge of Greek and Latin literature was essential, as was the skill to express oneself in one or both languages," Wayne Durrill has noted. Such knowledge "qualified students for membership in a very select group and provided them with the skills and ideas vital to the exercise of political power in the broadest

---

[5] "A Catalogue of the Officers and Students of Emory College, 1845, Oxford, Newton Co., GA.," EU-A. See Wayne K. Durrill, "The Power of Ancient Words: Classical Teaching and Social Change at South Carolina College, 1804-1860," *Journal of Southern History* 65, no. 3 (August 1999), 472. Such a curriculum was not uncommon. At South Carolina College in 1801, freshmen were required to read four gospels of the New Testament written in Greek, Zenopohon's *Cyropaedia*, Virgil's *Aeneid*, a selection of Cicero's political orations, and a review of John Mair's *Introduction to Latin* and a text on Roman antiquities. Sophomores continued by reading such texts as Homer's *Iliad* and juniors read Cicero's *De Oratore*.

[6] "Catalogue of the Officers, Students & Alumni of Emory College, Oxford, Georgia" (Macon, GA: Printed by Benjamin F. Griffin, 1853), EU-A.

[7] Ibid. See also "Regulations, Statutes, Etc. of Emory College, Oxford, Georgia" (Augusta, GA: Printed by W. S. Jones, Newspaper, Book and Job Printer,1851), EU-A.

[8] "Catalogue of the Officers, Students & Alumni of Emory College, Oxford, Georgia," EU-A.

sense."[9] Such texts also offered more pragmatic benefits. Cicero's *De Oratore,* for example, taught students logic and many of the skills necessary for the formal debates they participated in as members of Emory's literary societies. In the college environment, southern students were constantly forced to defend their honor by their professors and peers. Mark Swails contends that college literary societies, the primary extracurricular activity of more than half of Emory students in the antebellum period, actually functioned as honor societies where students had to constantly defend their honor.[10] The classroom became a place for students to prove their masculinity and worth in a society that had clearly defined values and boundaries. "Professors shamed students in classes with their teaching style, treated them as children with their many rules and constant scrutiny, and severely challenged [students'] honor with their punishment methods," Swails argues.[11]

The instruction of religious principles was central to the curriculum of the antebellum evangelical college. "Theology determined pedagogy at Southern church colleges," Ralph Reed notes.[12] Every course could be linked to religious teachings. Physics courses taught students about the sovereignty of God as creator of the universe. Ancient history courses advanced the view that Rome's decline was due to the moral depravity of its rulers. Curriculum reinforced religion almost universally.

Moral philosophy and its related classes, more than any other subject at the antebellum college, were deeply tied to the propagation of a distinct proslavery ideology. The courses, as part of the larger academic and theological discipline of moral science, were a fundamental part

---

[9] Durrill, "The Power of Ancient Words," 471.
[10] See "Introduction," in Swails, "Literary Societies as Institutions of Honor at Evangelical Colleges in Antebellum Georgia." For more on the relationship between Southern honor culture and literary societies at Emory, see Chapter 3 of Ibid.
[11] Ibid., 1.
[12] Reed, "Fortresses of Faith," 206.

of a student's education in the antebellum southern college. The study of moral philosophy was particularly important in shaping students' attitudes on slavery. This course was the capstone of a student's four-year career in the antebellum college. Almost all colleges had a required course on the subject, and the college's president usually taught the course. These courses combined lessons of ethics and classical and modern philosophy with religious teachings and political ideologies. Moral philosophy, as religious historian E. Brooks Holifield notes, "occupied an exalted position in the intellectual life of the Old South."[13] It "transmitted the culture's values to each new generation of students, trying to make inherited moral expectations seem plausible and persuasive."[14] These courses were crucial in the intellectual development of the young southern gentleman. They prepared a student with the ideas and thought they would need to succeed in the Old South.[15] A college education greatly elevated the status of a southern male, and in turn, gave these students the opportunity to become members of the southern gentry. At Emory, moral philosophy courses also bridged the gap between southern intellectual thought and Methodist teachings.[16]

The study of political economy was also a part of this discipline. As historian James Fuller notes, political economy courses "attempted to bring economics and politics together in a comprehensive way."[17] These courses were also closely tied to moral philosophy courses. Francis Wayland, Brown University president and author of the most prominent text for the

---

[13] E. Brooks Holifield, *The Gentlemen Theologians: American Theology in Southern Culture, 1795-1860* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1978), 127.
[14] Ibid., 128.
[15] See A. James Fuller, *Chaplain to the Confederacy: Basil Manly and Baptist life in the Old South* (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2000), 255. Fuller, in his study on Basil Manly and the University of Alabama, writes that the fact college presidents usually taught the course allowed them to "assure themselves that each graduate had fully understood the position that they were to hold as leaders of American society."
[16] See Reed, "Fortresses of Faith," 216. As Ralph Reed finds, "moral philosophy transmitted evangelical culture in religious terms, teaching that ethics were intuitive, universal, and God-ordained."
[17] Fuller, *Chaplain to the Confederacy*, 255.

subject, wrote in 1837 that the principles of both disciplines "are so closely analogous" that "almost every question in the one, may be argued on grounds of belonging to the other."[18]

By 1830, abolitionists increasingly attacked the morality of slavery, forcing southerners to confront these issues in response. While southerners had previously defended slavery primarily on the grounds of policy and economics, they now moved to highlight its morality in new ways. As Larry Tise notes, such shift did not lead to the creation of new arguments in favor of slavery, but rather the addition of a new component. "Every writer who favored its perpetuation, found it necessary to discuss the manner in which slavery could be viewed as a moral (at least not immoral) institution."[19] The most popular way to accomplish this was to base arguments on Christian scripture.

Several moral philosophy texts dominated higher education in the nineteenth century. Anglican Theologian William Paley authored the most notable work of the period, *Principles of Moral and Political Philosophy*, first published in 1785. Paley possessed what Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene Genovese call a "generally optimistic view of human nature," where "men arrived at a sound morality through reason."[20] The text was popular at many southern colleges, including Emory, where professors assigned it beginning in 1847, if not earlier. Paley's text does condemn slavery, however. Commenting on the common defense many proslavery advocates offered that slavery was not prohibited in the Bible, Paley notes "it is unjust to infer from this silence, that Christ deemed all the then existing institutions right, or that he forbade the worse to be bettered." He also called for gradual emancipation, and while this was not a strictly abolitionist idea per se, he noted that gradual emancipation would be the only way to truly

---

[18] Francis Wayland, *The Elements of Political Economy* (New York: Leavitt, Lord & Company, 1837), vi.
[19] Tise, *Proslavery*, 116.
[20] Elizabeth Fox-Genovese and Eugene Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class: History and Faith in the Southern Slaveholders' Worldview* (Cambridge,: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 568.

"correct the wickedness and folly" of the institution of slavery.[21] Paley's argument was agreeable for southerners insofar as he advocated the power of states over the federal government in settling questions of property ownership; a position southerners could use to defend their ownership of slaves.[22]

Francis Wayland's *The Elements of Moral Science* (1835) was another popular text for moral philosophy courses. Official records do not indicate whether this text was used at Emory, but they do indicate that another work by the author, a text for political economy courses, was used until 1861. The book was compatible with most southern professor's beliefs on legitimate authority in society, but incompatible with their views on slavery.[23] Wayland, a Northern Baptist, presented an anti-slavery sentiment in the text. In his 1835 edition, he wrote in a section titled "The Violation of Personal Liberty by the Individual," that domestic slavery is, "the most common form of this violation."[24] "Slavery…violates the personal liberty of man as a physical, intellectual, and moral being," Wayland wrote. He addressed proslavery arguments by acknowledging that slavery is not explicitly referred to in the New Testament and wrote that if it is not forbidden, the Gospel "must be opposed to the *practice* of slavery; and therefore, were the principles of the Gospel fully adopted, slavery could not exist."[25]

Wayland's *The Elements of Political Economy* (1837) remained popular at Emory. The College used the text beginning in 1853, if not earlier, and continued to use it even after the Civil War. Wayland primarily based his economic philosophy on the writings of Adam Smith and

---

[21] William Paley, *Paley's Moral and Political Philosophy (As Condensed by A. J. Valpy)* (Philadelphia: U. Hunt & Son, 1845), 111.
[22] See Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 151. Additionally, gradual emancipation was a way for moderate southerners to accommodate some abolitionist thought, usually coupled with plans for colonization. Such plans were most always in the distant future, though. On gradual emancipation, see Ford, *Deliver Us From Evil*, 375-376.
[23] Fox-Genovese and Genovese, *The Mind of the Master Class*, 570.
[24] Francis Wayland, *The Elements of Moral Science* (New York: Cooke and Co., 1835), 220.
[25] Ibid., 225.

Jean-Baptise Say. As historian James Fuller notes, for Wayland, the "science of wealth" was very much linked to proving the truth of Christian beliefs. "The invisible hand of capitalism, was the hand of God."[26] While Wayland grounded himself in the classical tradition, he insisted on a connection between economics and Christian natural theology. Fuller's study notes that Wayland's book was a standard text in American universities during the antebellum years. Basil Manly, a prominent Baptist Minister and President of the University of Alabama from 1837-1855, relied extensively on Wayland's *Political Economy* text in his classes. Manly, who would come to be known as one of the most prominent proslavery writers of the antebellum South, "closely followed Wayland's text" and encouraged his students to master its contents.[27]

In *The Elements of Political Economy,* Wayland described the slave trade as one that "caused the impoverishment of another nation."[28] The result of the trade, he wrote, "has been the almost ultimate depopulation of the slave coast." While he refrained from a comment on the morality of slavery, he advanced other arguments connected to the economic defense of slavery. Wayland commented extensively on capitalism and the nature of free labor. "The accumulation of capital is more for the advantage of the laborer than of the capitalist," he wrote. "The greater the ratio of capital to labor, the greater will be the share of the product that falls to the laborer." Wayland concluded that the laboring classes, more so than the wealthy classes, were more interested in increasing the capital of the country.[29]

The use of Paley's and Wayland's texts at Emory in the 1850s raises a number of questions, most notably, why the school seemingly endorsed a book that did not defend the most

---

[26] Fuller, *Chaplain to the Confederacy*, 256.
[27] Ibid. For a more in-depth discussion on Wayland's *Political Economy* text, see William J. Barber, "Political Economy from the Top Down: Brown University," in William J. Barber, ed., *Economists and Higher Learning in the Nineteenth Century* (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1993), 72-94.
[28] Wayland, *The Elements of Political Economy*, 186.
[29] Ibid., 131.

important institution of the region's social order. As Ralph Reed notes, "the pedagogical debate over slavery [in the 1850s] had become hopelessly intertwined with sectional politics….Southern church college officials who had welcomed Northern scholars and books now excluded them with a defensiveness that betrayed their own feelings of cultural inferiority."[30] The answer to this question most likely lies in the fact that there remained few if not any other options until 1859. Paley's textbook, in particular, is important to understanding a professor's and the College's views on slavery during the late antebellum period.

By 1860, records indicate that Paley's text was no longer used in moral philosophy courses at Emory, but Francis Wayland's textbook continued to be taught in political economy courses. In moral philosophy courses, the College switched to Methodist preacher and educator R. H. Rivers' *Elements of Moral Philosophy* (1859). The book was divided into two sections: *theoretical ethics,* where the author criticized and argued against Francis Wayland's definition of moral law, and *practical ethics*, complete with an entire chapter devoted to the defense of slavery.

Rivers' book, and its subsequent revisions, were clearly written for a southern audience. As he wrote in the 1859 first edition, "for many years, the institutions of learning in the South have been without a suitable text-book on Moral Philosophy." At this late date, Rivers' text shows us how deep the sectional crisis had gotten. The *Methodist Quarterly Review*, a Southern Methodist publication, praised *Elements* as possessing a "rare excellence." The publication further commented on Rivers' position on slavery: "So far as we know it, it is the only text-book of Moral Philosophy which takes the Southern side of this question. The South has long needed such a book, and whoever has read [it] will conclude, as we have done, that while this book is

---

[30] Reed, "Fortresses of Faith," 219.

extant we shall not need another."[31] Introducing the subject of slavery, Rivers wrote, "most of the philosophical writings of American authors are exhibitions of fanaticism rather than of sound logic or scriptural truth when they discuss the subject of slavery."[32] Rivers divided his discussion on slavery into sections on everything from the "delicacy of the subject," to an argument that slavery was "a blessing to the slave."[33] Above all else, Rivers argued "slavery is not a sin…[because] it has done more to Christianize the African race than all else combined."[34]

Rivers simply satisfied the demands of southern intellectuals who desired a textbook that embraced their point of view. His argument that slavery "is not a sin" because it Christianized the African race was a common one. Seventeen out of twenty-two prominent proslavery writers between 1831 and 1861 measured in a study by Larry Tise utilized this same argument when commenting on the character of American slavery.[35] Because abolitionists charged that slavery was immoral, thus un-Christian, proslavery writers focused on positive connections between slavery and morality, further building the "lure" of paternalism. "They characterized slavery as a missionary institution, a divine trust, and a practice encouraged by Scripture," Tise notes.[36] Exemplary of this principle is Thornton Stringfellow's argument in the proslavery pamphlet *Cotton is King*, published in 1860. Stringfellow emphasized that God ordained slavery and that Christian masters had an obligation to convert and baptize their slaves. "Masters give unto your

---

[31] Methodist Episcopal Church and South, *The Quarterly Review of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South* (Published by John Early for the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1860), 186. Interestingly, this review was written in Oxford, GA, most likely by an author affiliated with Emory. Unfortunately, the publication does not indicate the reviewer's name.
[32] R. H. Rivers and Thomas O. Summers, *Elements of Moral Philosophy* (Nashville, TN: Southern Methodist Pub. House, 1860), xv.
[33] Ibid., 329; Ibid., 348.
[34] Ibid., 355.
[35] See table 5.5 in Tise, *Proslavery*, 114.
[36] Ibid., 115.

servants that which is just and equal, knowing that you also have a master in heaven," he wrote.[37] The striking similarities between Rivers' college textbook and the writings of proslavery thinkers such as Stringfellow is not surprising as Rivers was most likely influenced by many of their works when drafting his own book.

The war over textbook content in antebellum southern colleges was a war for ideological control over students. What texts were available and the choices professors made in choosing a particular text are no doubt important in understanding the proslavery atmosphere at Emory College. What students read is only one part of the larger puzzle, however. It is also necessary to investigate how students received such works and what influence they had at Emory.

The diary of Emory student George Lovick Pierce Wren offers conclusive proof of classroom lectures defending slavery. Moreover, his diary demonstrates how professors discussed proslavery thought in the context of a classroom setting. Wren recalled in his 1858 diary that Emory professor William Sasnett used his new post as professor of moral philosophy and political economy courses to lecture students on slavery. "Since dinner[,] we have been lectured by Professor Sasnett on Slavery," Wren wrote. "I took a few notes and will now attempt to fill some of them out."[38] While Wren's diary is comprehensive compared to other antebellum student diaries of the time, he spent a considerable amount of time discussing Sasnett's lecture that day. Wren's desire to record the lecture for future reading indicates its personal importance to him and is a recognition of Sasnett's position and power as a pedagogue.

William J. Sasnett was a professor of Ancient language, English Literature, and by 1856, Mental and Moral Philosophy and Political Economy at Emory. Sasnett joined the Emory

---

[37] Thornton Stringfellow, "The Bible Argument: Or, Slavery in the Light of Divine Revelation," in E. N. Elliott, *Cotton is King, and Pro-Slavery Arguments: Comprising the Writings of Hammond, Harper, Christy, Stringfellow, Hodge, Bledsoe, and Cartwright, on This Important Subject* (Augusta, GA: Pritchard, Abbott & Loomis, 1860), 461-521. As reprinted in Finkelman, *Defending Slavery*, 127.

[38] "George Lovick Pierce Wren Diary," entry for March 1858, MSS 249, Box 1, Folder 2, EU-MARBL.

faculty in 1849 and was also a minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South . On Sundays, he often preached long, powerful sermons with Emory professor and eventual president, Alexander Means.[39] Whether his 1858 lecture was a regular part of the class or a special occurrence is unknown. The content of his lecture, however, is quite revealing. Sasnett told his class about the necessity for slavery, and the positive good it provided for blacks and the South. He told the class that slavery was necessary for the welfare of blacks in the South. "People are in necessity of this government," he said. "The government of negroes must be strong, from their inferiority and their natural instinct differing from the white race. They need superior minds to govern them, which we may learn from the state of those who live to themselves and are shut out from the authority of the white race."[40] Thus, for Sasnett, slavery was a necessary form of government. Additionally, Sasnett's writing highlights how engrained and standardized the proslavery argument had become by the 1850s. Sasnett simply reiterated the ideas of other proslavery ideologues, offering nothing new to the argument.

Sasnett's notion that slaves were in need of a "superior mind" to rule and govern them was not uncommon. Blacks' perceived inferiority allowed proslavery writers to advance the argument that they needed protection and guidance through slavery. After all, George Fitzhugh, author of the widely read *Cannibals All!* and perhaps the most famous proslavery writer, outlined an almost identical defense. Fitzhugh wrote in 1854 that "the weak in mind or body require guidance, support, and protection; they must obey and work for those who protect and guide them—they have a natural right to […] masters." Fitzhugh believed strongly that "nature" made slaves and that law and government existed to "regulate, modify, and mitigate […] slavery."[41]

---

[39] "Young John Allen Diary," entry for Sunday, June 3, 1855, MSS 11, Box 19, Folder 1, EU-MARBL.
[40] "Wren Diary," EU-MARBL.
[41] George Fitzhugh, *Sociology for the South: or, The Failure of Free Society* (Richmond, VA: A. Morris, 1854), 178.

This is the same "government" that Sasnett told his students slaves were "in necessity of."[42] Sasnett was most likely well acquainted with the literature of the South's leading proslavery intellectuals—learning from them and reiterating similar viewpoints. Additionally, his arguments were not uncommon from those of other moral philosophers in southern colleges. Professor Robert Henry at South Carolina College told his class of their obligation to keep slavery alive. "It is absolutely necessary to keep blacks in their present condition," he said.[43]

Sasnett subscribed to the idea that slavery was a *positive good*. He was certainly not the first to subscribe to this thesis. Proslavery writers in the North and South had been writing about the peculiar institution's positive good since the late-eighteenth century.[44] A major tenet of the *positive good* argument is that slavery is the best form of labor. Sasnett told students at Emory that slaves "are better paid than any other class of laborer." While slaves were never *paid*, he Sasnett felt that the benefits of paternalism outdid any monetary compensation. When slaves are ill, "they have some one to wait on them and administer their wants, while the poor class of people of the black and white have to labor much harder and with but little pay not even enough generally for sustenance…."[45] Many southerners argued that slavery was a better and more

---

[42] "Wren Diary," EU-MARBL.
[43] Michael Sugrue, "We Desired Our Future Rulers to Be Educated Men: South Carolina College, the Defense of Slavery, and the Development of Secessionist Politics," in Roger L Geiger, ed., *The American College in the Nineteenth Century* (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 2000), 105. This chapter serves as an interesting contrast to Emory for two reasons. First is the less religious culture of South Carolina College. Because of the nature of the evangelical college during this period, moral philosophy courses at Emory most likely contained far more discussion on religion than courses at South Carolina. Second, Sugrue argues that what students learned at South Carolina translated to their later lives—often in the political sphere. Thus, this chapter does a good job of proving the intersection of curriculum and classroom discussions on slavery and how it fits into the larger intellectual life of the Old South.
[44] Much historiographical debate exists over what has come to be known as the "positive good" thesis. William Sumner Jenkins in his *Pro-slavery Thought in the Old South* first popularized the concept as a way of identifying a transition from mild approval of slavery to an all-encompassing defense that proved slavery to be a positive benefit to blacks and American society. Larry Tise argues that Sumner's thesis, which had become so prevalent in proslavery historiography after its publication, is at its core a misrepresentation of proslavery literature. Sumner's thesis shows that the *positive good* thesis began in the 1830s and only existed in the South, while Tise aptly demonstrates that its origins lie in the eighteenth century and the argument can be seen in writings of northerners and southerners. See Chapter 5 in Tise, *Proslavery*, 97-123.
[45] "Wren Diary," EU-MARBL.

humane alternative to the cruel free-labor marketplace that existed in the North. "The economics of slavery, they asserted, allowed for a paternalistic protection of slaves that capitalism did not provide for workers," Paul Finkelman notes. Factory owners did not "care" for their workers, did not protect them from the difficult nineteenth-century life, did not "save" them with Christianity, and did not provide them with ample job security. Slave masters, many in the South argued, did all of this. Thus, Sasnett based his highly paternalistic argument that slavery is a *positive good* on an economic defense of slavery as well.

Sasnett's teachings in the classroom complemented his book, *Progress: Considered with Particular Reference to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*, published in 1855. Sasnett did not intend the book to be a comprehensive defense of the peculiar institution but rather a commentary on the functions of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, in society and suggestions for how it "ought to be developed."[46] Sasnett wrote that society was rapidly expanding, and that "if [the Church] would retain her efficiency," it must "avail herself of every opening offered, must profoundly and intimately identify herself with all the movements of society, and become its controlling, guiding element."[47] Proslavery ideology, however, occupied an important position in the book. He considered the institution of slavery "both abstractly and concretely…defensible on the ground of both philosophy and Scripture."[48] The book subscribes to a highly paternalistic view of slavery, arguing that masters must take care of their slaves just as parents do their children, in very similar language and ideology to his classroom lectures.

In *Progress*, Sasnett was more concerned with advancing the religious components of the *positive good* argument. He argued that masters must provide slaves with "all requisite facilities

---

[46] William Jacob Sasnett, *Progress: Considered with Particular Reference to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South* (Nashville, TN: E. Stevenson & F.A. Owen, 1855), 11.
[47] Ibid.
[48] Ibid., 211.

for their own personal salvation."[49] He also equated the relationship between masters and slaves with that of parents and their children. "They are in our hands," he wrote, "dependent as well for their eternal hopes as for their physical comfort upon us. It is with us to determine whether they shall live in heathenish degradation and perish in their sins, or whether, with such religious privileges as we enjoy, they shall rise from their moral debasement and live forever."[50]

Slaves' final salvation was Sasnett's ultimate goal: "These people, in their original home, would, perhaps, have been incapable of appropriation by the ordinary instrumentalities of missionary labor; but among us, in a state of slavery, with all the advantages and access and amelioration which it allows, the gospel has facilities to render itself effectual in their ultimate triumphant evangelization…."[51] Sasnett even believed that after salvation, slaves could return to Africa to Christianize other Africans. His desire to Christianize slaves was realized to some extent. While not the central focus of this study, evangelical denominations had succeeded in Christianizing a large number of slaves. Historian John Blassingame has noted that "an overwhelming majority of the slaves throughout the antebellum period attended church with their masters."[52] Sasnett's treatment of slavery in *Progress* is remarkably similar to Rivers' text and his classroom lectures as noted by Wren. They all contain similar arguments for slaveholder paternalism, the positive good of the institution, and slaveholders' responsibilities to Christianize and care for their slaves. The arguments also responded to abolitionists by attacking free labor and factory owners in the North.

The academic environment at antebellum Emory truly shaped its students to become members of the southern gentry—it was an education fit for southern gentlemen. Through the

---

[49] Ibid.
[50] Ibid.
[51] Ibid., 212.
[52] John W. Blassingame, *The Slave Community: Plantation Life in the Antebellum South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), 93.

study of the classics, students learned the historical and political legitimacy of Greek and Roman slavery, and in turn, slavery as it existed in the antebellum South. Moral philosophy courses further taught students the positive good of slavery through both classroom lectures and assigned readings. The similarities between arguments for slavery in moral philosophy courses and the proslavery writers of leading southern intellectuals only further highlight the extraordinary power of slaveholder paternalism and the hegemonic attitudes of the master class. Additionally, they help highlight why secession would become so accepted by many southerners in 1860. Given the relationship between proslavery ideology and the curriculum, the importance of the university in shaping the intellectual culture of the Old South becomes more central. The legacy of a proslavery curriculum at Emory is reflected best in its students.

Chapter Three
Creating a Southern Worldview at Emory College

Blest in his lowly and his happy lot,
The negro here possessed a cheerful cot,
Which gave him shelter for his humble head,
While daily toil supplied him bounteous bread;
Here was the garden with its scented thyme,
And all the flowers that bless the Southern climes
-Joseph Addison Turner, "The Old Plantation," 1858[1]

Emory's students were not simply a passive audience to the proslavery rhetoric of their professors. As future southern leaders, clergymen, and plantation owners, they actively debated and wrote on the virtues of slaveholding and southern society. Some were sure that slavery was right while others—albeit a small minority—remained skeptical. Emory's antebellum students went on to great endeavors following graduation—fighting for the southern cause in the Civil War, rising to political careers during and after Reconstruction, and becoming important members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. Students' experiences at Emory were fundamental in shaping them to become leaders of southern society.

Students' education and socialization at Emory shaped their worldviews and futures with particular respect to proslavery ideology. While students at Emory College did not exclusively come from wealthy families of the antebellum South, a college education greatly elevated the status of a southern male, and in turn, gave these students the opportunity to become members of the southern elite—the master class. Thus, students desired to become a part of the slaveholding class. Their lives and worldviews were no doubt shaped by the powerful influence of the

[1] Joseph Addison Turner, "The Old Plantation: a Poem" (Atlanta, GA: Emory University Library Publications, 1945).

Methodist Church. The fact that Emory was an evangelical college meant that its students were deeply religious and often converts to the faith after a spiritual awakening.

Throughout its antebellum years, Emory only had a small number of students and faculty. By 1861, on the eve of the Civil War, Emory College had graduated 333 students. Fifty-seven were "Ministers of the Gospel," ninety-six were "engaged in the practice of teaching," and twenty-three had died. All of these students were white and male, and most were from Georgia. In 1861 at Emory, there were twenty-six seniors, twenty-nine juniors, fifty-six sophomores, and twenty-eight freshman. Only fourteen of these students were not from Georgia and all were southern.[2] While the number of students steadily grew at Emory from its first year in 1838 to 1861—there were only twenty students at the College in 1839—the school remained relatively small. Students were also quite young. The average age for matriculation at Emory was 17.9 years between 1836 and 1840, and between 1851 and 1855, the average age of a graduate from Emory was 20.7, with no students older than 25. Between 1858 and 1860, the average age had risen only slightly to 18.2.[3]

The students at Emory College did not exclusively come from the wealthy families of antebellum Georgia. In fact, because Emory was a church college, students came from families of both elite planters and local ministers. As Eugene Genovese has noted, slave states sent a higher proportion of their white youth to college than free states, and "an important minority" of southern students did not come from well-to-do families.[4] While a proportion of students undoubtedly were from slaveholding families, there existed a notable proportion of students who were not. In a survey of the occupations of parents and guardians of students at evangelical

---

[2] "Catalogue of the Officers & Students, of Emory College, Oxford, Georgia," (Atlanta, GA: Franklin Printing House, 1861), EU-A.
[3] Reed, "Fortresses of Faith," 131.
[4] Genovese, *The Southern Front*, 92.

colleges throughout the South in 1850, Ralph Reed found that 67% were farmers, 9.9% were attorneys or physicians, 9.3% were clergy or educators, 6.2% were skilled laborers, 5% were merchants, and only 1.9% were unskilled laborers. Of this survey, 90% owned slaves, with an average of twenty four slaves.[5]

Because Emory was an evangelical college, its student population differed slightly from that of a state college. In addition to tuition being less expensive—$135 at Emory compared to $152 to $171 at Franklin College (later the University of Georgia) in 1838—church colleges generally attracted students of more "middling circumstance[s]."[6] While South Carolina College, among the most prestigious colleges in the antebellum South, attracted almost exclusively the sons of prominent planters and politicians, Emory attracted many of those students but also the sons of Methodist ministers—who would have been considered middle class. Some students did come from prominent slaveholding families at Emory, however. Lewis Graves, a graduate of the class of 1845 and the son of wealthy Newton County planter and entrepreneur Iverson L. Graves, came from a household that in 1840 had thirty-two slaves, twelve of whom were under the age of ten.[7]

Regardless of one's status prior to coming to college, it is clear that a college education elevated the standing of a southern male. An education offered young students "a *liberal* education, in the original, literal, sense of the term: the curriculum of the college fitted a man to be a master rather than a slave," writes historian Michael Sugrue.[8] Students came to Emory not unlike the way students came to South Carolina College, with aspirations for a prosperous life.

---

[5] Reed, "Fortresses of Faith," 130.
[6] Gary S. Hauk, *A Legacy of Heart and Mind: Emory Since 1836* , 7; Roger L Geieger, "Introduction," in Roger L Geiger, ed., *The American College in the Nineteenth Century* (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2000), 7.
[7] 1840 U.S. Census, District 420, Georgia (Newton County).
[8] Michael Sugrue, "We Desired Our Future Rulers to Be Educated Men: South Carolina College, the Defense of Slavery, and the Development of Secessionist Politics," in Geiger, *The American College in the Nineteenth Century*, 94.

With only a minority of students becoming ministers following their graduation, many Emory students went on to careers in law, politics, business, or agriculture. Students would often move up to positions within southern society whereby they could afford to purchase slaves. William W. Flewellen, a graduate of the class of 1845, for instance, had already purchased a forty-three year old female slave less than five years after graduating.[9] John W. Hudson, class of 1846, who moved to Putnam County, Georgia, after graduating, owned thirty-seven slaves in 1860.[10] Robert W. Lovett, of the class of 1843, owned eight slaves by 1850.[11] Gustavus John Orr, a graduate of the class of 1844, returned to Emory to become a professor of Mathematics by the early 1850s. He purchased at least four slaves by 1850 who lived at his home in Oxford. His personal records indicate he owned at least nine slaves in 1860 on the eve of the Civil War.[12]

Students at antebellum Emory, like students at all evangelical colleges, were subject to a number of strict regulations that spelled out proper conduct in every facet of college life. The faculty and trustees of the College laid out specific guidelines for students, instructing them that "profane swearing, Sabbath-breaking, indecent language, falsehood, fraud, and dishonesty of every kind, utterly disqualifies a young man for an honorable standing in College, and the more so from their corrupting influence upon the young and inexperienced, who are removed from the restraints and counsels of parental authority and affection."[13] Additionally, students had to obtain permission from the faculty prior to leaving the campus after nine o'clock at night and were explicitly prohibited from attending any "ball, theatre, horse race, cock-fight, or … any

[9] 1850 U.S. Census, Slave Schedules, District 8, Georgia (Muscogee County).
[10] 1860 U.S. Census, Slave Schedules, District 311, Georgia (Putnam County).
[11] 1850 U.S. Census, Slave Schedules, District 74, Georgia (Screven County).
[12] 1850 U.S. Census, Slave Schedules, Subdivision 65, Georgia (Newton County); Auslander, "Dreams Deferred," in Hauk and Wolff-King, *Where Courageous Inquiry Leads: The Emerging Life of Emory University*, 14-15.
[13] "Regulations, Statutes, Etc. of Emory College, Oxford, Georgia" (Augusta, GA: Printed by W. S. Jones, Newspaper, Book and Job Printer,1851), EU-A.

amusement forbidden by the faculty."[14] Faculty members strongly enforced these rules, too. Emory student M. B. Summerlin, writing home to his father only a week after his arrival at Emory and before school even began, noted "they [the faculty] are very strict here."[15] A student's day was exhausting—they awoke early to attend worship services and then classes. Following lunch they were to study into the evening. After dinner, students wrote letters or met in their literary societies and before bed, students often read the Bible by candlelight.[16] A day was not complete, as George L. P. Wren described in his diary, without "reading a chapter in the Bible."[17] Some students, of course, did find the time for diversions. "We would frequently assemble in one room and engage in any in-door amusement we could invent," Emory student Joseph Addison Turner recalled. Turner wrote about two students who often played the fiddle and the flute together, noting "we had much pleasure in listening to the music made by these gentlemen in conjunction."[18] Despite Turner's remembrance of some amusement, contemporary observers have often characterized the antebellum college as stringent and tiresome.

Honor was a central component of a student's life at Emory in the antebellum period. "Southerners adhered to a moral code that may be summarized as honor," historian Bertram Wyatt-Brown wrote in his seminal work on southern honor culture. The southern honor culture, according to Wyatt-Brown, was "inseparable from hierarchy and entitlement, defense of family blood and community needs."[19] Southern honor pervaded numerous parts of society for white

---

[14] Ibid.
[15] As quoted in Swails, "Literary Societies as Institutions of Honor at Evangelical Colleges in Antebellum Georgia," 40.
[16] Reed, "Fortresses of Faith," 105.
[17] "Wren Diary," EU-MARBL.
[18] Diary entry for January 10, 1850 in Joseph A. Turner "Notes on Autobiography," Microfilm 215, Emory University Libraries. No publication information is available for Turner's notes on the microfilm copy and it is unclear where the original notes are located. See also, Thomas H. English, ed. *Autobiography of "The Countryman, 1866* (Atlanta, GA: Emory University Library, 1943).
[19] Bertram Wyatt-Brown, *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 3-4.

males, and the antebellum college was an important place to develop one's sense of honor. Students were at college, in part, to learn the rules and expectations southern society had for them. While honor was practiced in most facets of a student's life at Emory, nowhere was it more critical to display one's honor than in the halls of Emory's literary societies.[20]

Literary societies were a mainstay of almost all antebellum colleges. Usually existing as two opposing organizations, these societies were perhaps one of the few outlets for students to entertain themselves outside of their rigorous academic and devout religious lives. These societies also offered more pragmatic benefits as well. Students developed their critical thinking and oration skills—helping them overcome common fears of public speaking. Emory student Joseph Addison Turner later remembered his time in the Phi Gamma literary society as productive and essential: "I gained my reputation for talent more by the speeches I made in the Phi Gamma Society than by any proficiency in my text-books," he noted.[21] Students were intensely loyal to their respective societies. As historian Robert Pace has written, "students often felt more loyalty to their literary society than to the college as a whole."[22] Societies were run entirely by students, and students "were free to exercise their own initiative in these organizations."[23] The societies organized debates, usually held on most Saturdays, on a variety of topics. They also hosted famous speakers and served as the intellectual and social epicenter of the college. As the debate societies were perhaps the most important aspect of extracurricular life for many college students, the topics of debates reveal issues students felt were important and relevant outside of their classroom education.

---

[20] "Introduction," in Swails, "Literary Societies as Institutions of Honor at Evangelical Colleges in Antebellum Georgia," 1-5.
[21] Diary entry for January 10, 1850 in Turner, "Notes on Autobiography.
[22] Pace, *Halls of Honor*, 73.
[23] Godbold, *The Church College of the Old South*, 85.

Two literary societies existed at Emory throughout most of the antebellum period—the Phi Gamma Society and the Few Society. Historian Richard Rose has calculated that in 1850, there were forty-two members of the Phi Gamma Society—thus, 36% of the Emory student body was part of the society. There were 585 total members initiated into the Phi Gamma society between 1838 and 1861. Given that the rival society, the Few Society, had an equal number of members, then an overwhelming majority of students in the College would have been members of one of the two societies during their time at Emory.[24] The Phi Gamma society was founded first, in 1838, followed by the Few Society the next year. The buildings of the literary societies at Emory were quite elaborate. "The interiors of both Phi Gamma and Few were indeed rather elegant, if not ostentatious," Atticus Haygood's biographer wrote of Haygood's time at Emory.[25] Each society had an extensive collection of books, outnumbering the College's own library at the time.

What is perhaps most intriguing about the literary societies' membership at Emory is their interest in debating issues related to slavery and how their debate topics reflected issues in the surrounding culture. Topics either connected to slavery or states' rights were debated a total of forty-three times between the two societies out of a total of 832 recorded debates in the antebellum period, or about five percent of the debates according to the records available.[26] Of those, twenty-four debates were directly on the subject of slavery, while nineteen were on the subject of states' rights. Within those debates on slavery, ten centered on the morality of slavery and eight focused on whether the slave trade should be reopened or abolished. Topics on slavery varied, from the scriptural legitimacy of the peculiar institution, to the morality of owning slaves.

---

[24] See Swails, "Literary Societies as Institutions of Honor at Evangelical Colleges in Antebellum Georgia," 19-20.
[25] Harold W. Mann, *Atticus Greene Haygood* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1965), 19.
[26] See Appendix in Swails, "Literary Societies as Institutions of Honor at Evangelical Colleges in Antbellum Georgia." Other popular topics included women's suffrage, temperance, constitutional questions, and other current political topics.

The question of whether slavery should be abolished appeared often as well—and at an increasing frequency on the eve of the Civil War. The way the debate questions were worded underscores the paternalist influence on the literary societies—especially such questions as "Is it right for us to bring Africans over to America to become Slaves?" Or, "Is Slavery justified by natural rights and the principles of human equality?" Students debated whether slavery should be abolished in October1859 and asked whether the union should be dissolved in 1860. The societies asked whether the slave trade was "right" and whether slavery "as it exists in the South" was a "moral evil."[27]

Antebellum students debated similar topics at other colleges as well. For example, the Dialectic Society at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC), argued the question: "Should slavery as it now exists in our country be justly considered a reproach?" in 1850, and in 1855: "Is southern slavery justifiable?" Topics of secession and states' rights were also common—in 1859 at UNC, students debated: "Would disunion be profitable to the South?"[28] Ralph Reed has noted of literary societies at all southern evangelical colleges that "students wrestled with the most divisive political topics of the day in their literary societies….Slavery dominated literary society debates after 1840." Thus, "Literary society debates reflected the sectional bias of their participants, and rarely revealed the misgivings of many evangelicals about slavery."[29] Historian Thomas Harding wrote in his study of literary societies that debates on

---

[27] For debate topics, see Appendix in Swails, "Literary Societies as Institutions of Honor at Evangelical Colleges in Antebellum Georgia."
[28] Erika Lindemann, "The Debating Societies," in *True and Candid Compositions: The Lives and Writings of Antebellum Students at the University of North Carolina*, online exhibition, *Documenting the American South* <http://docsouth.unc.edu/true/chapter/chp05-02/chp05-02.html> (accessed March 18, 2011).
[29] Reed, "Fortresses of Faith," 136; Ibid., 138.

secession and slavery "waxed and waned at intervals, but became a subject of intense interest in 1860 and 1861."[30] Not surprisingly, this fact applies to both societies at Emory.

***

Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus Lamar, Joseph Addison Turner, Attitucs Greene Haygood, and George Gilman Smith are fitting examples of antebellum students at Emory to explore the impact of the school's proslavery curriculum. Important elements of this curriculum that they learned at Emory often appear in their post-Civil War writings and careers. These students are exceptional of Emory College graduates, however. They achieved great success following their time at Emory and do not necessarily represent the normal career paths of Emory students at the time. However, the effects their Emory education on their later lives is more emblematic of other graduates. These students' writings in later life reveal the important contribution Emory had in their intellectual and social formation. Their understanding of southern slavery was cultivated or furthered while at Emory, and their post-Civil War writings reveal a desire to discuss only what they felt to be the "positive" aspects of slavery—namely, slaveholder paternalism. Each of these four men wrote extensively in their later careers and struggled with understanding the post-Civil War South. While Emory most likely had a profound impact on these students lives, it was not the sole reason they harbored such strong and hegemonic attitudes towards slavery. Emory was a place for students to refine their attitudes on slavery, and a place where there was little room for dissent from proslavery positions. Emory and southern society thus mutually reinforced a proslavery culture.

Lucius Quintus Cincinnatus Lamar, for many years, was thought of as Emory's most distinguished graduate of the nineteenth century. Lamar, who attended Emory between the years

---

[30] Thomas Spencer Harding, *College Literary Societies: Their Contribution to Higher Education in the United States, 1815-1876* (New York: Pageant Press International, 1971), 156.

of 1841 to 1845, went on to serve as a member of Congress, a Senator, Supreme Court Justice, and Secretary of the Interior under Grover Cleveland. The year he graduated from college he married Virginia Longstreet, the daughter of Augusts Baldwin Longstreet in 1845, moved to Missisiipii from his native Georgia in 1849, and while a member of the House of Representatives on the eve of the Civil War, he strongly supported his state's (Mississippi) secession from the Union. At one point, Emory's own law school was even named in his honor. Numerous historians have greatly romanticized Lamar's political career. John F. Kennedy even remembered Lamar quite fondly in his Pulitzer-Prize winning collection of political biographies, *Profiles in Courage*.

The College's influence on Lamar's early life is quite apparent. As Lamar recalled in his 1870 commencement address at Emory: "There is another old man [Augustus Longstreet] who sat at the very fountain head of my mind, and with loving hand directed the channel into which it was required to flow, and who, when I arrived at manhood, gave me my betrothed bride, who has ever since held the choicest place in my affections and made my life one constant song of joy."[31] The influence the faculty had in shaping Lamar's views while he was at Emory is quite apparent. Lamar's years at Emory were a time of intense debate over the question of slavery; he was undoubtedly exposed to the ideas of Longstreet and others on the position of the Methodist Church and the slavery question. As his biographer later recalled, "Lamar's life at Emory doubtless contributed largely to produce in him those sentiments and opinions anent [*sic*]the question of slavery and its relation to the political frame of the Federal Government which made him shortly afterwards a conspicuous and aggressive leader in southern politics."[32] Going to college during the 1844 split of the Methodist Church, and throughout his undergraduate

---

[31] Ibid.
[32] Edward Mayes, *Lucius Q.C. Lamar: His Life, Times, and Speeches, 1825-1893* (Nashville, TN: Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1896), 34.

education, he was fully immersed in proslavery culture. Having spent much time at Longstreet's residence, Lamar undoubtedly conversed with Longstreet about the 1844 schism and Longstreet's fiery letters to Methodist news editors in the North in support of James Osgood Andrew and the institution of slavery itself.

Joseph Addison Turner was born in 1826 in Putnam County, Georgia. After his short one-year tenure at Emory as a student in 1845, he would go on to publish a prominent Confederate weekly from his Georgia plantation during the war and author several nostalgic poems lamenting the positive good that came out of slaveholder paternalism in 1858. Of all his accomplishments, Turner is chiefly remembered for hiring a young Joel Chandler Harris in 1862 as an apprentice—launching Harris' literary career and serving as the chief influence on Harris' life. Turner came to Emory as a sophomore due to six years of preparatory school at the Phoenix Academy in Eatonton, Georgia. A biographer reported that he borrowed "significant funds" to attend the college and was incredibly ambitious at the time.[33] While at Emory, Turner, along with several other students, boarded at Augustus Longstreet's home. During their time at Longstreet's, Turner recalled he and his fellow students often referred to the quarters as "Foib's Quarter"—a name they euphemistically derived from the names given to "the cabins where negroes are quartered."[34] Turner spent one term at Emory College, never returning after his winter break. "Tiring of the restraints of college life," Turner wrote later in his autobiography, he left Emory to pursue a teaching career at Phoenix Academy the following year.[35] While his time in Oxford was short, it was important in his social and intellectual development. Turner

[33] Paul M. Cousins, "Student Life at Old Emory in 1845: Diary of Joseph A. Turner Tells of Judge Longstreet," *Emory Alumnus*, November 1930, 9.
[34] Diary entry for January 10, 1850 in Turner, "Notes on Autobiography." The term "Foib," according to Turner, was a nickname various students gave to Longstreet.
[35] Ibid.

came to Oxford with ideas about the good of slavery and its role within southern society, and his education reinforced those views.

In his limited writings on Emory contained within his diary at two separate points and later in his autobiography, Joseph Turner primarily focused on his academic pursuits and daily life.[36] Turner's writings on the position of slaves in southern society, both at the time he was at Emory and when he wrote much later, deserve attention. "There are the negroes too with whom I have spent many a glad day hooking the minnow and chasing the haru [*sic*]," Turner wrote privately in September 1845 while in Oxford. Presumably writing about those African Americans he encountered while growing up in nearby Putnam County, Georgia, Turner launched into a defense of slavery grounded in the same notions of slaveholder paternalism as understood by Longstreet and others at Emory during the time. His entry was defensive—he wrote addressing the "fanatics" (most likely abolitionists), noting, "we treat our slaves like brothers." Turner's characterization of slaveholders' treatment of their slaves was intended to imply the humane qualities of slave masters.[37] "It was incumbent upon whites, and especially upon Christian whites," Lacy Ford notes, "to recognize the humanity of slaves and treat them accordingly."[38] Such an understanding of paternalism was common in the 1840s, and Turner would use these beliefs as the basis of his longer and more forceful proslavery writings on the eve of the Civil War.

Turner focused one of his diary entries concerned with his time at Oxford largely on the relationship between white and black children during childhood. He wrote about the "pure enjoyment" and "true friendship" that "exist[s] between the white and black children who have

---

[36] Turner only writes one entry while he was a student at Emory in 1845. In another entry (1850), Turner reflects on his time at Emory. Later, he uses his diary to construct an autobiography, which he publishes sometime after the Civil War (its date remains unclear).
[37] Diary entry for September 10, 1845 in Turner, "Notes on Autobiography
[38] Ford, *Deliver Us From Evil*, 147. See the Introduction of this thesis for more context on paternalism.

been reared up together." He further noted, "They [presumably abolitionists] know nothing of the feelings which pervade the negro's bosom for the white child with whom he has been reared and with whom he has so much associated. They know nothing of the kindly glow of mutual sympathy and sorrow between the son and the slave when the latter leaves the paternal roof."[39] Turner's nostalgic tone, rooted in his belief that the relationship between black and white children fostered basic good in southern society, is a hallmark of his later literary writings. He wrote of this relationship fondly, most likely from personal experience. Turner's memory, however, exists within the confines of slaveholder paternalism.

Why Turner focused on this subject in 1845 is more difficult to discern. Turner was somewhat homesick upon his arrival at Emory earlier in September 1845. "Really it is no pleasant matter to leave home, parents, brothers, sisters, friends, and the scenes to which we have been accustomed from childhood," he wrote. Perhaps Turner, recalling the "scenes" he had "been accustomed from childhood" thought of those slaves he group up among. He might have thought back to life on the southern plantation from his interactions with "Ernest," an African American man Turner encountered daily while living at Longstreet's home.[40] Thus, Turner's entry is very personal—operating on a very emotional and wistful level.

Atticus Haygood came to Emory a decade after Turner in 1855 and graduated in 1859. He later became President of Emory from 1875-1884, and was known by many as a prominent spokesman for the "New South" alongside Henry Grady. While at Emory, Haygood deeply immersed himself in proslavery literature. He kept a detailed listing of all of the books he read

[39] Diary entry for September 10, 1845 in Turner, "Notes on Autobiography

[40] Turner writes of Ernest when describing the daily rituals of eating dinner at Longstreet's home. He recalls hearing from across the street, "Ernest, ring that bell"—a bell that called students to dinner. Interestingly, Turner refers to Ernest as "a negro of the said cognomen being bellman." Turner's use of the word "cognomen," a word used in Ancient Rome to describe one's last name, should not be overlooked. Turner is implying that Ernest is a part of Longstreet's "family" and given the nature of Longstreet's relationships with African Americans, was most likely a slave belonging to Longstreet. Thus, Turner's recognition of Ernest as part of Longstreet's family is well in line with slaveholder paternalism which calls for recognizing slaves as part of the master's family. See Ibid.

while at Emory—both books assigned for class and his personal reading and organized his readings by subject. In what historians commonly refer to as a "Commonplace Book," Haygood noted a number of works specifically on proslavery ideology. Haygood read works by leading proslavery thinkers in E. N. Elliot's famous *Cotton is King, and Pro-Slavery Arguments*, an edited volume containing works by Albert Taylor Bledsoe, Thornton Stringfellow, James Henry Hammond, David Christy, and others. He also read an article written by moral philosopher R. H. Rivers, and other pieces on the biblical defense of slavery.[41] Many of these works contained lengthy treatises on the positive good of slavery, the need for slaveholder paternalism, and the fallacies of northern abolitionism.

George Gilman Smith was a student at Emory in 1855 for only eight months, not unlike Turner. Smith was born in 1836 in Georgia and experienced a spiritual awakening in his youth prior to attending Emory. Reflecting on his time at Emory, he wrote "I was a boy[,] but now I was a praying, God fearing, Bible reading one….My college life short as it was would be itself a long chapter. I had my ups and downs religiously, but I did not willfully and deliberately intermit any of my duties nor yield [to] my temptations." Smith unfortunately had to drop out of the College shortly after his arrival due to financial troubles with his father who "unwisely…built him a home…had no money, and was in debt for every shingle in it."[42] Smith attended Emory at an important time, however, remembering in his autobiography that his peers and professors were quite notable. While Smith seemed destined for failure in 1855 due to his poor academic performance and his family's financial difficulties, he went on to become a prominent Methodist minister and historian of Methodism and Georgia in the nineteenth century.

---

[41] "Notebook for 1857," Atticus Greene Haygood Papers, MSS 138, BV 12, EU-MARBL.
[42] "George Gilman Smith Reflections," George Gilman Smith Papers, MSS 228, Box 5, EU-MARBL.

The issues that caused the bloody sectional conflict of the Civil War fascinated each of these four students. The students' retrospective writings on the Old South following the war—specifically ideas of race, slavery, and states' rights—reveal an understanding of slavery as beneficial for slaveholders and the enslaved. Each of these figures viewed southern society through the clouded lens of the Civil War, and each articulated complicated ideas of race that reveal a deep understanding of the proslavery literature of the antebellum period. They wrote in an era that historian David Blight has described as driven by ideas of *race* and *reunion*. In the years following Radical Reconstruction, Blight cites a "reconciliationist" vision as a method of dealing with those who died on the battlefields of the Civil War. Alongside this current was the development of a more formal white supremacist ideology that paved the way for legalized Jim Crow segregation beginning in the 1880s. Both the force of reconciliation and white supremacy overtook any vision of emancipation—a vision created by African Americans' own complex understanding of their freedom. As Blight notes, "the inexorable drive for reunion both used and trumped race."[43] This historical climate allowed for southerners' romanticized version of history that continued to cast slavery as positive and the Civil War as a result of northern aggression and a misinterpretation of the Constitution.

L.Q.C. Lamar's pre-Civil War political career can be characterized by strong support for states' rights and southerners' right to own slaves. After a term in the Georgia State Legislature, Lamar moved back to Mississippi and was elected a member of Congress in 1856. On the eve of the War, Lamar openly supported John C. Calhoun and Jefferson Davis, just as his father-in-law, Augustus Baldwin Longstreet did. "Others may boast," Lamar said to the House of Representatives in 1858, "of their widely extended patriotism, and their enlarged and

---

[43] David W. Blight, *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002), 2.

comprehensive love of this Union. With me, I confess that the promotion of [s]outhern interests is second in importance only to the preservation of [s]outhern honor."[44] In 1860, with war approaching, Lamar left office to officially join secessionist groups in Mississippi and drafted the official Ordinance of Secession for the state. He committed himself fully to the cause of the Confederacy.

When Mississippians reelected Lamar to Congress following the reunification of the nation, he was determined to be seen as a reconciliationist politician in Washington—a man working to put the Union back together. On April 27, 1874, Lamar gave a eulogy for Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts, a staunch advocate for Radical Reconstruction. As Nicholas Leeman notes of the speech, "Lamar praised Sumner's moralism and magnanimity, came awfully close to hinting that he harbored a certain warmth of feeling toward Reconstruction itself, and grandly suggested that the great man's passing be the occasion for sectional reconciliation."[45] In Washington, the newly elected Congressman desired to be the great national hero of Reconstruction. In John F. Kennedy's *Profiles in Courage*, Kennedy treats Lamar like that hero. He described Lamar in the prewar days as "one of the most rabid 'fire-eaters' ever to come out of the deep South," but was quick to qualify that statement, noting Lamar's amazing transformation. In Kennedy's analysis, Lamar's "full, rich voice touched the hearts of every listener with its simple plea for amity and justice between North and South."[46] It was Lamar's eulogy of Sumner, Kennedy believed, that changed the tone of Reconstruction—it was "a turning point in the relations between North and South."[47]

---

[44] As quoted in John F. Kennedy, *Profiles in Courage* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), 179.
[45] Nicholas Lemann, *Redemption: The Last Battle of the Civil War* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 2006), 70.
[46] Kennedy, *Profiles in Courage*, 173; Ibid., 172.
[47] Ibid., 173.

Kennedy's vision of Lamar was far from accurate, however. While Lamar utilized the language of unity in Washington, in Mississippi he only spoke with the language of division. As Lamar wrote to Edward Clark, a former law partner and close friend, he saw the future of the South quite differently: "It does seem to me that if there ever was a time when the white people of this state, the men in whose veins flows the blood of the ruling races of the world, should rise & with one unanimous voice protest against the domination to be piled upon them the present is that time."[48] Lamar wrote this in 1874, just a few months before he eulogized Charles Sumner—the same eulogy that Kennedy praised so highly. Thus, Lamar's rhetoric was really a front to mask his desires to keep African Americans in as subordinate place—to disenfranchise them while supporting a system of terrorism and violence against them. Lamar, as Lemann has argued, was drawing the color line in the New South. Lamar did not want to give up the vision of southern society he had held dear for so long—one that he no doubt cultivated on his father's plantation in Georgia and brought with him to college in Oxford beginning in 1841. Kennedy described Emory College at the time as a "hotbed of states' rights" with a president [Longstreet] who was "a flaming follower of Calhoun." Longstreet's influence on Lamar was "always strong" as Kennedy noted, and given the truth of Lamar's political actions during Reconstruction, it never left.

Joseph Addison Turner also faced the realities of the impending war with unanimous support for the South. Turner began his literary career in the 1840s, but he had little success. He published various essays, book reviews, and poems to little acclaim and by 1848, he founded a short-lived periodical, *Turner's Monthly*. In 1858, he authored a poem titled "The Old Plantation," where he lamented the impending fall of the Old South in a lengthy discussion of the positive good of paternalism. Not until 1860, with the publication of his plantation journal, *The*

[48] Lemann, *Redemption*, 69-70.

Plantation (four issues; 1860), and later *The Countryman* (1862-1866), did Turner achieve true success, however.[49] Turner was a committed proslavery advocate and used both *The Plantation* and *The Countryman* to voice his beliefs. Since *The Plantation* was a literary journal concerned with southern life and culture, Turner allotted many pages to the defense of slavery.[50] The *Southern Literary Messenger* praised Turner's new publication as a "first-class journal," containing "southern sense" and "southern humor." It noted that the purpose of *The Plantation* was to defend slavery through a "totally unqualified, unreserved, in moral, social, and political point of view," commending the paper for its uncompromising stance.

Interestingly, Turner did not subscribe to the scriptural defense of slavery and instead believed in the natural inferiority of African Americans, citing scientific and philosophical principles. He denied any possible utility in religious defenses and focused on an argument rooted in white supremacy. "If the negro is capable of education, he is capable of freedom," Turner wrote in the November 1862 edition of *The Countryman*. As historian Lawrence Huff has argued, Turner believed "the joint government of the master and the state afforded Negroes as much happiness as they were able to enjoy…." Turner believed that slavery was in fact a "blessing" to blacks, while also beneficial to white southerners.[51] Through the paper, Turner also served as an influential mentor to a young Joel Chandler Harris, the postwar southern author of the *Uncle Remus* folk tales. Harris, like Turner, wrote to elicit nostalgic reactions from his readers on the relationships between masters and slaves in the Old South. The narrator of Harris' *Uncle Remus* stories (1880) is "an old negro who appears venerable enough to have lived during

---

[49] Lawrence Huff, "Joseph Addison Turner: Southern Editor during the Civil War," *Journal of Southern History* 29, no. 4 (November 1963): 471. Turner only published *The Plantation* for four issues and had to suspend publication due to the onset of the War. He began publishing again in 1862 under the new name, *The Countryman*.
[50] Ibid., 470.
[51] Ibid.

the period" who has "nothing but pleasant memories of the discipline of slavery."[52] The appeal of the plantation Harris writes of was certainly influenced by his own childhood, similar to Turner's, of growing up among black children.

The paternalist undertone of Harris' *Uncle Remus* stories juxtaposed alongside Turner's defense of slavery prior to the end of the Civil War shows remarkable similarities. Harris' work was part of a popular literary genre of plantation literature at the time. Harris endorses paternalism through Uncle Remus' recognition of its positive effects. In one story, Uncle Remus, talking with a white man, asserts that he and fellow blacks needed the rules and laws of antebellum society—essentially arguing that African Americans would be better off on the antebellum plantation than in the post-bellum South: "You slap de law outer a nigger a time er two, an' larn 'im dat he's got fer to look atter his own rashuns an' keep out'n udder fokes's chick'n-coops, an' sorter coax 'im inter de idée dat he's got ter feed 'is own chillums, and be blessed ef you ain't got 'im on risin' groun'."[53] Uncle Remus was essentially a "black champion of paternalism," as Michael Price has noted.[54]

Harris and Turner were living in a New South dominated by a desire to romanticize the Old South and preserve white supremacy. In this time, pastoral nostalgia helped ease the pain caused by southerners' uncertainty over the future of their economy and the black race. Atticus Haygood was also living in this society, and his writings, like Harris and Turner, are firmly grounded in a sense of the South developed during slavery. By 1875, Emory's trustees elected Haygood president of Emory College, and he moved back to Oxford, returning just sixteen years after he graduated. While Haygood was certainly immersed in the prevailing proslavery

---

[52] Joel Chandler Harris, *Uncle Remus: His Songs and his Sayings. The folk-lore of the old Plantation* (New York: D. Appleton & Company, 1881), xvii.
[53] Ibid., 232.
[54] Michael Price, "Back to the Briar Patch: Joel Chandler Harris and the Literary Defense of Paternalism," *Georgia Historical Quarterly* LXXXI, no. 3 (Fall 1997): 692.

ideology of the antebellum period, and from his writings seemed to embrace it, he eventually became a prominent spokesman for the New South through his "progressive" writings and close ties to Henry Grady, the editor of the *Atlanta Constitution* at the time. Historian Susan Ashmore, exploring Haygood's complexity, has noted that his life straddled two worlds: "Haygood developed his world view during the days of slavery," Ashmore tells us, "and as the New South grew up around him after 1865, he used the lens of the Old South to make sense of this new place he found."[55] Haygood's time at Emory College on the eve of the Civil War cemented his ideological beliefs on slavery. The books he read, the discussions with classmates and professors, and the version of Methodism that he practiced while at Emory reveal that Haygood understood slavery as a positive good for masters and slaves. In his later writings, Haygood desired to preserve a history of the Old South that obscured the true horrors of the ownership of human beings.

Haygood would go on to write two important works: his "New South" or "Thanksgiving Sermon" and his book, *Our Brother in Black: His Freedom and His Future*, in 1880 and 1881, respectively. In both of these works, Haygood articulated a new vision of the South and offered a solution for what he termed "the Negro problem."[56] His Thanksgiving Sermon reflected on slavery but also exuded confidence about the future of the South. "I for one," he wrote, "thank God that there is no longer slavery in these United States!" He was quick to qualify his statement, however, by noting fondly the good he believed came as a result of the peculiar institution: "I do not forget the better characteristics of African slavery as it existed among us for so long a time under the sanction of national law and under the protection of the Constitution of

---

[55] Susan Youngblood Ashmore, "Thoughts on White Supremacy: Atticus Haygood, White Southern Moderates, and the New South," (Presentation, Emory University, March 20, 2009).
[56] Atticus G. Haygood, "The New South: Thanksgiving Sermon, 1880," (Emory Library: 1950); Atticus G. Haygood, *Our Brother in Black: His Freedom and His Future* (New York: Phillips & Hunt, 1881).

the United States." He stated, "I do not forget that its worst features were often cruelly exaggerated, and that its best were unfairly minified; more than all, I do not forget that, in the providence of God, a work that is without a parallel in history was done on the southern plantations…a work that resulted in Christianizing of a full half million of the African people…."[57] Here, Haygood believed that Christianization, and not labor, was the prominent work done in the Old South. In his sermon, many parallels exist between Haygood's understanding of slaveholder benevolence and his positive belief in whites' Christianization of African slaves.

Despite Haygood's "progressive" attitudes, he was still grounded in the same ideologies that he no doubt cultivated at Emory College in the late 1850s. Historian George Fredrickson called Haygood "the South's leading intellectual exponent of an accomodationist and paternalistic attitude toward the Negro." Indeed, Haygood's nostalgia for the Old South should not go unnoticed. On growing up among slaves, he wrote: "I make no apology for having believed in it [slavery]. I was taught to believe in it; I grew up in the midst of it; I saw its very best aspects in my father's house. His slaves loved me, and I loved them; and we love each other to-day." Despite the fact that Haygood had since "changed [his] opinions" on slavery, he would not "denounce the 'old masters.'"[58] In Haygood's 1889 *Pleas for Progress*, he wrote that "Negroes got all the good of slavery." In his opinion, "the white race in the South suffered its evils without its good"; while slaves "got through slavery what never, in the history of the world so many who were lately savages obtained in so short a time—the habit of labor, the English language, some knowledge of the institutions of a Christian republic, and as to thousands of

[57] Haygood, "The New South: Thanksgiving Sermon, 1880," 11.
[58] Atticus Haygood, *Our Brother in Black: His Freedom and His Future* (New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1889), 43-44.

them, the religion of Jesus Christ."[59] Thus, Haygood strived to demonstrate the positive effects and the righteousness of slaveholder paternalism in an era that George Fredrickson refers to as "new paternalism"—ideology that Henry Grady and Joel Chandler Harris, among others, would cling to in order to advance the "New South" and improve the lives of blacks so long as they did not threaten the white political order.[60]

George Gilman Smith, like Haygood, expressed doubts over slavery while qualifying them in a coded language that still respected slaveholder paternalism and white supremacy. Following his service as a chaplain for the Confederacy in the Civil War, Smith became a Southern Methodist minister, and eventually a historian of Emory and Southern Methodism. Smith authored *The History of Georgia Methodism from 1786 to 1886*, *The Life and Times of George Foster Pierce*, *The Life and Letters of James Osgood Andrew*, *The Story of Georgia and the Georgia People, 1732 to 1860*, *The Boy in Gray: A Story of War*, and several other notable works. His monographs on Andrew and Methodist History are especially important as Smith served as the "gatekeeper" of Southern Methodist History during the nineteenth and into the twentieth century.

Writing his autobiography in the late-nineteenth century, Smith repeatedly justified his political positions prior to the Civil War. He noted that he had been a "Constitutional Unionist" supporting John Bell in the 1860 election and only hesitantly supported secession in 1861—feeling he had no other choice—"When what…I never dreamed…a possibility[,] it became evident that a majority of the States in the North were determined to destroy slavery. I saw no

[59] Atticus Greene Haygood, *Pleas For Progress* (Nashville, TN: Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1889), 132-133.
[60] Frederickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind*, 205

hope of escape from absolute ruin but to withdraw from the Union. I did not expect war but if I had I would have taken the same course," he wrote.[61]

On slavery, Smith believed the institution to be "the most costly and least productive labor in the world." He noted "the advocates of slavery were very haughty and intolerant.…They refused to admit there were any evils to be corrected or anything in it to be condemned."[62] Despite Smith's pro-union beliefs and his reflective writings after slavery, he also respected slaveholder paternalism in many ways—noting the good that came out of such forms of benevolence—"cruel masters were the exception" and "owners were generally kind." Writing of the "obligations of planters," Smith noted that "The planter was bound to support the whole family, little and big, sick and well, old and young." Further, "The planters frequently had to incur large debts in buying food in [spans] of flood or drought," he wrote—but they did so because of the "needs of their negroes." Smith ended his reflection noting that while "negroes even the best treated did not enjoy slavery," they had "better food and better houses and better care as slaves than they [have] as freemen."[63] Smith, like Haygood, was trying to make sense of the new world he was in. His difficulty in understanding and reflecting on slavery tells us a lot about the nature of his time at Emory and the nature of the South after slavery—most notably the fact that Smith, and many others, were searching for ways to explain slavery in a way that emphasized what they saw as the "good" that came out of paternalism. Thus, Smith's statements are truly exemplary of the amazing power of the paternalist argument and the fact that southerners, more than anything else, wanted to be seen as innocent of the cruelties of slavery in the years following the Civil War. Smith essentially altered the reality of slavery in order to assuage any guilt he or others might have had.

---

[61] Owen, *The Sacred Flame of Love*, 92; "George Gilman Smith Reflections," EU-MARBL.
[62] "George Gilman Smith Reflections," EU-MARBL.
[63] George Gilman Smith Reflections," EU-MARBL.

Smith remembered James Andrew as a man who "looked so stern and was so gentle" and wrote of him fondly in his 1882 hagiographic biography of Andrew published by the Southern Methodist Publishing House.[64] Throughout much of his discussion on Andrew's slave ownership and troubles at the 1844 conference, Smith recounted stories of Andrew through the lens of the Civil War. "I have attempted no more than a simple narration of the events of [Andrew's] life," Smith writes in the preface, noting that he has "no disposition to revive old animosities" when referring to the events of 1844. It becomes quite apparent, however, that Smith does much more than simply narrate Andrew's life, and the way in which he writes about him—noting Andrew's reluctance to own slaves and his benevolence as a slaveholder—no doubt highlight the attitudes that Smith would have cultivated during his time at Emory in 1855.[65]

Noting Andrew's humble origins, Smith wrote extensively of Andrew's election as a Bishop in 1832. He aimed to show that delegates did not, in fact, select Andrew because of his non-slaveowner status, but rather because of his superior intellect and record of service. "Perhaps there was no man in the body who had less desire to be a Bishop than James O. Andrew, and perhaps no man who had less expectation of being chosen to the office," Smith wrote in 1882. Smith went further to protect Andrew's legacy, noting that the Bishop never gave a pledge to not be a slaveowner or own slaves. "If any man was so intensely anti-slavery as to cast a vote for [Andrew] merely because he was not a slave-holder," Smith noted, "and was under the impression he was opposed to slave-owning, the blindness was willful."[66] Writing almost forty years after 1844, Smith desired to show Andrew's reluctance to hold the position. He was also responding to allegations from northern Methodist journals made in the immediate aftermath of the 1844 conflict that Andrew was elected simply because that he did not own

---

[64] Ibid., Smith, *The Life and Letters of James Osgood Andrew*.
[65] Ibid., vii.
[66] Mathews, *Slavery and Methodism*, 231.

slaves. However, the preponderance of evidence from this conference tells the story quite differently. Delegates elected Andrew because he did not own any slaves, and Smith, ever the guardian of Andrew's legacy, wanted to obscure this fact from coming to light.

All four of these students represent Emory College in the post-Civil War period in various arenas of southern society. More importantly, however, they harbor an understanding of slavery grounded in the proslavery literature and teaching they encountered in the antebellum period. Each student developed a view of the world he lived in during a time when the plantation South and the institution of slavery were coming under increasing scrutiny from abolitionists and antislavery activists. Slaveholder paternalism never fully left any of these students as they attempted to unpack the complex social and racial realities of the New South. Each student was ostensibly racist throughout his life; they understood the South through the confines of white supremacist ideology. Politically, Lamar pushed forward measures to ensure the dominance of the white ruling class in Mississippi long after he would leave office. Emphasizing the positive good of slavery remained a way to assign inferior status to newly freed African Americans and to subjugate them to the lowest class. W. E. B. Du Bois predicted in 1903 that the greatest problem of the twentieth century would be "the problem of the color line."[67] With the creation of legalized segregation through Jim Crow laws, Du Bois foresaw the complex problems that ultimately took shape out of an ideology cultivated and secured in antebellum slavery.

---

[67] W. E. B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk: Essays and Sketches* (Chicago: A.C. McClurg & Co., 1903), vii.

Conclusion
Dealing with Slavery in the Present

Emory acknowledges its entwinement with the institution of slavery throughout the College's early history. Emory regrets both this undeniable wrong and the University's decades of delay in acknowledging slavery's harmful legacy.
-Resolution, Emory University Board of Trustees, January 13, 2011

With the ending of the Civil War—the bloodiest conflict ever fought on American soil—a war fought over the desire for coerced slave labor—nearly four million enslaved men, women, and children became free. Just a few short months after the fighting stopped, the nation ratified the Thirteenth Amendment, abolishing the cruel and vicious system of labor that legally permitted the ownership of human beings in every state, North and South. African Americans might have left behind the literal shackles that had held them for so long, but they were by no measure fully free. Indeed, with freedom came inequality, and the notions of racial hierarchy that justified the peculiar institution would not be laid to rest with the bodies of those who lost their lives in the Civil War. It would take African Americans well over a century to receive what they were entitled to as citizens through the civil rights struggles of the mid-twentieth century; and even then, their equality was incomplete. This long history of struggle that began with slavery is not just a part or small theme of American history but is in fact a deeply rooted and defining characteristic of American life.

Emory is not immune from the horrific legacy of the institution of slavery and the scourge of racial inequality that developed alongside it. Just as slavery occupies a truly foundational place within American history, we can see how slavery has shaped the university in profound ways. Emory's founders were unanimously slaveholders and their vision for the college was one that was guided by the realities of living in a slaveholding society. The college

utilized slave labor to erect structures that are still on campus today. Slaves were an integral part of students' lives—often working on the campus and residing in the nearby homes and plantations of Oxford. The college's entwinement with slavery, however, does not end with the presence of slaves and slave labor on campus. At a time when slavery itself was increasingly coming under attack by its critics, those at Emory were deeply committed to preserving it. Indeed, Emory's *intellectual investment* in slavery was profound. Faculty members authored proslavery treatises and lectured their students on the inherent good in slavery—defining and later perpetuating slaveholder paternalism. Many students left Emory with a desire to be members of the slaveholding class, and many realized that desire. Slavery did not only define Emory during the antebellum period though. In the years following the Civil War, those at Emory were deeply involved in defining the future fate of African Americans. Many could not help but hold on to the ideals of the Old South and think back to slavery as a system whose benefits outweighed any costs.

Slavery continued to shape Emory in profound ways into the twentieth century. It took a century after the Civil War began for the school to integrate and admit its first African American student. And even then, as Emory took important steps in integrating its campus as the City of Atlanta grappled with desegregation, African Americans struggled to become a part of the Emory community. In recent years, Emory has begun a long process of historical research—excavating a difficult and often controversial past in an effort to understand its community today—thanks to the work of the Transforming Community Project. The process of healing from the wounds slavery caused begins with work like this. On January 13, 2011, the Executive Committee of the Emory Board of Trustees issued a formal statement of regret for the University's "entwinement" with the peculiar institution and the decades of harm it caused.

While we should laud the University's official recognition of slavery's place in its history through the issuance of a formal statement of regret, we should not see this as the end. To see it as the end would be to put aside this history, to stop exploring and asking questions about how this difficult past shapes the present, and to think that all problems have been solved.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Manuscript and Unpublished Sources

Emory University Archives, Emory University

Emory College General Records, 1834-1914
Emory College Course Catalogues, 1836-1868
Regulations and Statues of Emory College, 1851

Manuscript, Archives, and Rare Book Library, Emory University

Atticus Greene Haygood Papers
Augustus Baldwin Longstreet Papers
George Gilman Smith Reflections
George Lovick Pierce Wren Diaries
Graves Family Papers
Orr Family Papers
Young John Allen Papers

Southern Historical Collection, Louis Round Wilson Special Collections Library, University of North Carolina

Robert Archelaus Hardaway Recollections

Newspapers and Periodicals

Charleston Mercury
Christian Advocate and Journal
De Bow's Review
Emory Alumnus
New York Herald
The Liberator
Quarterly Review of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South
Southern Christian Advocate
Southern Literary Journal

Published Books, Essays, and Pamphlets

Bascom, Henry. *Methodism and Slavery: With Other Matters in Controversy Between the North and the South; Being a Review of the Manifesto of the Majority, in Reply to the Protest of the Minority, of the Late General Conference of the Methodist E. Church, in the Case of Bishop Andrew*. Frankfort, KY: Hodges, Todd & Pruett, 1845.

Bruno, John I. *Newton County, Georgia Estate Records*. Conyers, GA: Published by author, 1996.

Carter, Christine J., ed. *The Diary of Dolly Lunt Burge, 1848-1879*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1997.

Dew, Thomas R. *An Essay on Slavery*. Richmond, VA: J.W. Randolph, 1849.

Elliott, E. N. *Cotton is King, and Pro-Slavery Arguments: Comprising the Writings of Hammond, Harper, Christy, Stringfellow, Hodge, Bledsoe, and Cartwright, on This Important Subject.* Augusta, GA: Pritchard, Abbott & Loomis, 1860.

Fitzhugh, George. *Sociology for the South: or, The Failure of Free Society*. Richmond, VA: A. Morris, 1854.

Ford, Paul Leicester. *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*. Volume II. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1893.

Harris, Joel Chandler. *Uncle Remus: His Songs and his Sayings*. The folk-lore of the Old Plantation. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1881.

Haygood, Atticus. *Our Brother in Black: His Freedom and His Future*. New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1889.

———. "The New South: Thanksgiving Sermon, 1880." Atlanta, GA: Emory Library, 1950.

Hundley, Daniel. *Social Relations in Our Southern States*. Bedford, MA: Published by Henry B. Price, 1860.

Lee, Luther and Smith, E. *The Debates of the General Conference of the M. E. Church, May 1844*. New York: O. Scott for the Wesleyan Methodist Connection of America, 1845.

Longstreet, Augustus Baldwin. *A Voice from the South: Comprising Letters from Georgia to Massachusetts, and to the Southern States*. Baltimore, Western Continent Press, 1847.

———. *Georgia Scenes: Characters, Incidents, etc., in the first half-century of the Republic*. Second edition. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1870.

———. *Letters on the Epistle of Paul to Philemon, or the Connection of Apostolical Christianity with Slavery*. Charleston, SC: Printed by B. Benkins, 1845.

Means, Alexander. *An Address Designed to Enforce the Importance of Sanctified Learning and Home Institutions to the South, Delivered Friday, June 30th, 1848, Before the Amosophic and Phi-Gamma Societies*. Charleston, SC: Printed by Burges & James, 1848.

Myers, Edward Howell. *The Disruption of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1844-1846; Comprising a Thirty Years' History of the Relations of the Two Methodisms*. Nashville, TV: A. H. Redford, 1875.

Paley, William. *Paley's Moral and Political Philosophy (As Condensed by A. J. Valpy)*. Philadelphia: U. Hunt & Son, 1845.

Pierce, George Foster, and Lovick Pierce. *Bishop Pierce's Sermons and Addresses: With a Few Special Discourses by Dr. Pierce*. Nashville, TN: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1886.

Rivers, R. H. *Elements of Moral Philosophy*. Nashville, TN: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1859.

Sasnett, William Jacob. *Address Delivered Before the State Temperance Convention of Georgia, at Atlanta, on the 30th of June, 1853*. Atlanta, GA: 1853.

———. *Discussions in Literature and Religion*. Nashville, TN: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1859.

———. *Progress: Considered with Particular Reference to the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*. Nashville, TN: E. Stevenson & F.A. Owen, 1855.

Smith, George Gilman. *The Life and Letters of James Osgood Andrew: Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church South: With Glances at his Contemporaries and at Events in Church History*. Nashville, TN: Southern Methodist Publishing House, 1882.

———. *The History of Georgia Methodism from 1786 to 1866*. Atlanta, GA: Published by A. B. Caldwell, 1913.

Smith, William Andrew. *Lectures on the Philosophy and Practice of Slavery*. Nashville, TN: Stevenson and Evans, 1856.

Wayland, Francis. *The Elements of Moral Science*. New York: Cooke and Co., 1835.

———. *The Elements of Political Economy*. New York: Leavitt, Lord & Co., 1837.

Published Memoirs and Biographies

Coulter, E. Merton. *College Life in the Old South*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1951.

Dempsey, Elam Franklin. *Atticus Green Haygood*. Nashville, TN: Parthenon Press, 1940.

English, Thomas H., ed. *Autobiography of "The Countryman, 1866*. Atlanta, GA: Emory University Library, 1943.

Fitzgerald, Oscar Penn. *Bishop George F. Pierce.* Nashville, TN: Barbee & Smith, 1896.

———. *Judge Longstreet: A life sketch*. Nashville, TN: Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1891.

King, Kimball. *Augustus Baldwin Longstreet*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1984.

Mann, Harold W. *Atticus Greene Haygood*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1965.

Rachels, David. *Augustus Baldwin Longstreet's Georgia Scenes Completed: A Scholarly Text*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1998.

Smith, George. *The Life and Times of George Foster Pierce, D.D., LL. D., Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South with his Sketch of Lovick Pierce, D.D., his Father*. Nashville, TN: Hunter & Welburn, 1888.

Smithson, William T. *In Memoriam. Rev. Bishop James Osgood Andrew, D.D., Rev. Augustus B. Longstreet, D.D., LL. D., Rev. William A. Smith, D.D., Together with Original Essays and Poems*. New York: Compiled and Published by W.T. Smithson, 1871.

Tomes, Robert. *My College Days*. New York: Harper, 1880.

Turner, Joseph Addison. *Autobiography of Joseph A. Turner*. Atlanta, GA: Emory University Library, 1943.

———. "Notes on Autobiography" (Unpublished). Atlanta, GA: Emory University Library, Microfilm 215.

———. "The Old Plantation: a Poem." Atlanta, GA: Emory University Library, 1945.

Wade, John Donald. *Augustus Baldwin Longstreet; a Study of the Development of Culture in the South*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1969.

Secondary Sources

Theses and Dissertations

Hart, Thomas A. "Contributions of Gustavus J. Orr to Education in Georgia: A Thesis in Emory University." M.A. Thesis, Atlanta, GA: Emory University, 1933.

Lide, Anne. “Five Georgia Colleges from 1850 to 1875.” M.A. Thesis, Atlanta, GA: Emory University, 1957.

Owen, Christopher Hendrick. “Sanctity, Slavery, and Segregation: Methodists and Society in Nineteenth Century Georgia.” Ph.D. diss., Atlanta, GA: Emory University, 1991.

Reed, Ralph Eugene. “Fortresses of Faith: Design and Experience at Southern Evangelical Colleges, 1830-1900.” Ph.D. diss., Atlanta, GA: Emory University, 1991.

Riley, Denise A. “The Masters of the Blue Room: An Investigation of the Relationship Between the Environment and the Ideology of the Faculty of the College of William and Mary, 1836-1846.” Ph.D. diss., Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, 1997.

Rose, Richard Mansfield. “For Our Mutual Benefit: Antebellum Georgia College Student Organizations.” Ed.D. diss., Athens, GA: University of Georgia, 1984.

Scafidel, Jimmy Ray. “Letters of Augustus Baldwin Longstreet.” Ph.D. diss., Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina, 1976.

Sugrue, Michael. “South Carolina College: The Education of an Antebellum Elite.” Ph.D. diss., New York: Columbia University, 1992.

Swails, Mark. “Literary Societies as Institutions of Honor at Evangelical Colleges in Antebellum Georgia.” M.A. thesis, Atlanta, GA: Emory University, 2007.

Tewksbury, Donald George. “The Founding of American Colleges and Universities Before the Civil War, with Particular Reference to the Religious Influences Bearing Upon the College Movement.” Ph.D. diss., New York: Columbia University, 1932.

Wright, Richard Nowell. “Planters and Scholars: The Common Bonds of Higher Education in Antebellum Georgia.” M.A. thesis, Athens, GA: University of Georgia, 1996.

Young, Pearl. “Religious Coming of Age among Students at Antebellum Georgia’s Evangelical Colleges.” M.A. thesis, Atlanta, GA: Emory University, 2010.

Presentations

Ashmore, Susan Youngblood. “Histories and Legacies of Race and Slavery at Emory University.” Panel Discussion, “Life of the Mind Lecture Series,” Emory University, January 26, 2011.

———. “Thoughts on White Supremacy: Atticus Haygood, White Southern Moderates, and the New South.” Presentation, Emory University, March 20, 2009.

Auslander, Mark. “Slavery and Its Legacies at Emory University: Reflections on History” Presentation, Emory University, November 15, 2010.

Harris, Leslie M. "Histories and Legacies of Race and Slavery at Emory University." Panel Discussion, "Life of the Mind Lecture Series," Emory University, January 26, 2011.

Articles

Brophy, Alfred L. "The Republics of Liberty and Letters: Progress, Union, and Constitutionalism in Graduation Addresses at the Antebellum University of North Carolina." *North Carolina Law Review* (forthcoming).

Drinkwater, L. Ray. "Honor and Student Misconduct in Southern Antebellum Colleges." *Southern Humanities Review* 27 (Fall 1993): 323-44.

Donald, David. "The Proslavery Argument Reconsidered." *Journal of Southern History* 37, no. 1. (February 1971): 3-18.

Durrill, Wayne K. "The Power of Ancient Words: Classical Teaching and Social Change at South Carolina College, 1804-1860." *Journal of Southern History* 65, no. 3 (August 1999): 469-498.

Harris, Leslie, M. "(Re) Writing the History of Race at Emory." *Academe* 92, no. 4 (August 2006).

Huff, Lawrence. "Joseph Addison Turner: Southern Editor during the Civil War." *Journal of Southern History* 29, no. 4. (November 1963): 469-485.

McLachlan, James. "The American College in the Nineteenth Century: Toward a Reappraisal." *Teachers' College Record* 80, no. 2 (December 1978): 287-306.

Phillips, Ulrich B. "The Central Theme of Southern History." *American Historical Review* 34, no. 1 (October 1928): 30-43.

Price, Michael. "Back to the Briar Patch: Joel Chandler Harris and the Literary Defense of Paternalism." *Georgia Historical Quarterly* LXXXI, no. 3 (Fall 1997): 686-712.

Purifoy, Lewis M. "The Southern Methodist Church and the Proslavery Argument." *Journal of Southern History* 32, no. 3 (August 1966): 325-341.

Southall, Eugene Portlette. "The Attitude of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Toward the Negro from 1844 to 1870." *Journal of Negro History* 16, no. 4 (October 1931): 359-370.

Vaughn, Gerald. "Teaching Moral Philosophy in the South During Slavery and Reconstruction: Edward Wadsworth of Lagrange College and Southern University." *Methodist History* 46, no. 3 (April 2008): 179-188.

Wegmann, '"Playing in the Dark' with Longstreet's 'Georgia Scenes': Critical Reception and Reader Response to Treatments of Race and Gender." *Southern Literary Journal 30*, no. 1 (October 1997): 13-26.

Whitescarver, Keith. "Creating Citizens for the Republic: Education in Georgia, 1776-1810." *Journal of the Early Republic* 13, no. 4 (Winter 1993): 455-479.

Wright, Richard. "Ambivalent Bastions of Slavery: The 'Peculiar Institution' on College Campuses in Antebellum Georgia." *Georgia Historical Quarterly* LXXX, no. 3 (Fall 1996): 467-485.

Books

Auslander, Mark. *The Accidental Slaveowner: Revisiting a Myth of Race and Finding an American Family*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, forthcoming.

Barber, William J., ed. *Economists and Higher Learning in the Nineteenth Century*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1993.

Berlin, Ira. *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998.

———. *Slaves without Masters: The Free Negro in the Antebellum South*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1981.

Blassingame, John W. *The Slave Community: Plantation Life in the Antebellum South*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Blight, David W. *Race and Reunion: The Civil War in American Memory*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2002.

Bullock, Henry Morton. *A History of Emory University*. Nashville, TN: Parthenon Press, 1936.

Cash, W. J. *The Mind of the South*. New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1941.

Clarke, Erskine. *Dwelling Place: A Plantation Epic*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005.

Daly, John Patrick. *When Slavery Was Called Freedom: Evangelicalism, Proslavery, and the Causes of the Civil War*. Louisville, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 2004.

Degler, Carl N. *The Other South: Southern Dissenters in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.

Du Bois, W. E. B. *The Souls of Black Folk: Essays and Sketches*. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co., 1903.

Ericson, David F. *The Debate Over Slavery: Antislavery and Proslavery Liberalism in Antebellum America*. New York: New York University Press, 2000.

Faust, Drew Gilpin. *A Sacred Circle: The Dilemma of Intellectual Life in the Old South, 1840-1860*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1977.
———. *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1982.

———. *Southern Stories: Slaveholders in Peace and War*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1992.

Finkelman, Paul, ed. *Defending Slavery: Proslavery Thought in the Old South*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003.

Ford, Lacy K. *Deliver Us From Evil: The Slavery Question in the Old South*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage, 1995.

Franklin, John Hope. *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of American Negroes*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1947.

Fredrickson, George M. *Racism: A Short History*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2002.

———. *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny, 1817-1914*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1971.

Fox-Genovese, Elizabeth and Eugene D. Genovese. *Slavery in White and Black: Class and Race in the Southern Slaveholders' New World Order*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

———. *The Mind of the Master Class: History and Faith in the Southern Slaveholders' Worldview*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Fuller, A. James. *Chaplain to the Confederacy: Basil Manly and Baptist Life in the Old South*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2000.

Gallagher, Gary W. *The Confederate War*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997.

Gaston, Paul M. *The New South Creed: A Study in Southern Mythmaking*. New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1970.

Geiger, Roger L, ed. *The American College in the Nineteenth Century*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2000.

Genovese, Eugene D. *Roll, Jordan, Roll; the World the Slaves Made*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1974.

———. *The Slaveholders' Dilemma: Freedom and Progress in Southern Conservative Thought, 1820-1860*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 1992.

———. *The Southern Front: History and Politics in the Cultural War*. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 1995.

———. *The World the Slaveholders Made: Two Essays in Interpretation*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1969.

Godbold, Albea. *The Church College of the Old South*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1944.

Harding, Thomas Spencer. *College Literary Societies: Their Contribution to Higher Education in the United States, 1815-1876*. New York: Pageant Press International, 1971.

Harris, Leslie M. *In the Shadow of Slavery: African Americans in New York City, 1626-1863*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003

Harper, William. *The Pro-Slavery Argument, as Maintained by the Most Distinguished Writers of the Southern States*. New York: Negro Universities Press, 1968.

Hauk, Gary S. *A Legacy of Heart and Mind: Emory Since 1836*. Atlanta, GA: Bookhouse Group, 1999.

Hauk, Gary S. and Sally Wolff-King, eds. *Where Courageous Inquiry Leads: The Emerging Life of Emory University*. Atlanta, GA: Bookhouse Group, 2010.

Heyrman, Christine Leigh. *Southern Cross: The Beginnings of the Bible Belt*. New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1997.

Hine, Darlene Clark, William C. Hine, and Stanley Harrold, *The African-American Odyssey*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 2010.

Holifield, E. Brooks. *The Gentlemen Theologians: American Theology in Southern Culture, 1795-1860*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1978.

Horowitz, Helen Lefkowitz. *Campus Life: Undergraduate Cultures from the End of the Eighteenth Century to the Present*. New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1987.

Johnson, Michael P. and James L. Roark, *Black Masters: A Free Family of Color in the Old South*. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1986.

Johnson, Walter. *Soul by Soul: Life Inside the Antebellum Slave Market*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Jordan, Winthrop D. *White Over Black: American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812*. Second. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2010.

Kennedy, John F. *Profiles in Courage*. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Kolchin, Peter. *American Slavery, 1619-1877*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2003.

Lawrence, Harold. *Methodist Preachers in Georgia, 1783-1900*. Tignall, GA: Boyd Pub. Co., 1984.

Lemann, Nicholas. *Redemption: The Last Battle of the Civil War*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2006.

Mathews, Donald G. *Slavery and Methodism: A Chapter in American Morality, 1780-1845*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Matlack, Lucius C. *The Antislavery Struggle and Triumph in the Methodist Episcopal Church*. New York: Negro Universities Press, 1969.

McKitrick, Eric L. *Slavery Defended: The Views of the Old South*. Edgewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

McKivigan, John R., and Mitchell Snay. *Religion and the Antebellum Debate Over Slavery*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1998.

O'Brien, Michael. *Conjectures of Order: Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810-1860*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.

Owen, Christopher H. *The Sacred Flame of Love: Methodism and Society in Nineteenth Century Georgia*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1998.

Pace, Robert F. *Halls of Honor: College Men in the Old South*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 2004.

Ringenberg, William C. *The Christian College: A History of Protestant Higher Education in America*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2006.

Rudolph, Frederick. *Curriculum: A History of the American Undergraduate Course of Study Since 1636*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

———. *The American College and University: A History*. New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1962.

Taylor, Ernest Richard. *Methodism & Politics, 1791-1851*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1935.

Thurmond, Michael L. *Freedom: Georgia's Antislavery Heritage, 1733-1865*. Atlanta, GA: Longstreet Press, 2002.

Tise, Larry E. *Proslavery: A History of the Defense of Slavery in America, 1701-1840*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 2004.

Winterer, Caroline. *The Culture of Classicism: Ancient Greece and Rome in American Intellectual Life, 1780-1910*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2002.

Wyatt-Brown, Bertram. *Southern Honor: Ethics and Behavior in the Old South*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Young, Jeffrey Robert. *Proslavery and Sectional Thought in the Early South, 1740-1829: An Anthology*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press, 2006.