Embodied Placemaking as a Rhetoric of Citizenship on Johns Island, South Carolina

by

Michael Dimmick

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

(English)

at the

University of Wisconsin-Madison

2015

Date of Final Oral Examination: 6/25/2015

This dissertation is approved by the following members of the Final Oral Committee:

Michael Bernard-Donals, Professor, English
Morris Young, Professor, English
Christa Olson, Associate Professor, English
Kate Vieira, Assistant Professor, English
Nancy Buenger, Associate Faculty Associate, School of Library and Information Studies

Abstract

This dissertation, an archival study of the rhetorical practices of an African American, Gullah, community on Johns Island in the Sea Islands of South Carolina, offers a critical reappraisal of embodied placemaking as a rhetoric of citizenship. It does so by examining how Gullah traditions offered ways for marginalized African American islanders to respond to and reimagine their "place" in white spatialities on the island, to rhetorically dwell within the white spaces of the island, and to shape rhetorical practices that brought island communities to presence in the rhetorical space of the nation through the formation of the Citizenship School program. I develop an understanding of embodied placemaking as a mutually constitutive relationship between the material and metaphoric spaces of place, communities, cultural traditions, and the body that broadens our understanding of practices of citizenship.

I have organized the dissertation into two large thematic sections. The first section, comprised of Chapters Two and Three, examines the ways that spatial rhetorics shape notions of citizenship and who has access to participate in island and, more broadly, national publics. I develop this line by studying how the island was 1) imagined as an abstract space, absenting Gullah communities from civic life; and 2) contrast this with a view "on the ground." I read Septima Clark's walking tours of her time on Johns Island, through the lens of metis, a "wiley" and "cunning" embodied rhetoric that reveals and introduces the islanders' absented practices of citizenship to national publics. The second section is comprised of Chapters Four, Five, and Six and turns to examining the embodied placemaking practices of the Gullah islander communities. I trace the rhetorical legacy of embodied placemaking through 1) traditions of storytelling and folk

medicine, the informal institutions of island life; and 2) the development of new rhetorical spaces in independent institutions (a benevolent society, a praise house, and the Citizenship School). Throughout, I argue that space, and, in particular, embodied placemaking, played a central role in developing the citizenship practices that islanders would employ as a rhetoric of citizenship to bring the community to rhetorical presence.

Acknowledgments

To the gracious people at Avery Research Center for African American History and Culture, Wisconsin Historical Society, Highlander Folk School (Highlander research and Education Center), and UNC Chapel Hill's Southern Folklife Collection, thank you for all the help and teaching me something about the pitfalls and promises of archival work.

To my early mentors - Christine Kiebuzinska, Paul Heilker, and Virginia Fowler. Christine, it is safe to say I would not have become the scholar I am today without our conversations, your encouragement and support, and the perspective you helped cultivate. Paul, I can say with absolute certainty that you set me on this path, introduced me to and humanized the field, coached me through so much, allowed for me to experiment with form, and embody a model of service to the academy, to learning and scholarship, and to students. I can only hope that one day I am half the model you have been, and whether you know it or not, still are. Virginia, my classes with you have always operated in the background of much of my work and concerns. Your willingness to let me play with ideas and encouragement to struggle through the challenges I found helped lay the groundwork for so much of what would come. Each of you, in your own way, has, at the risk of being repetitive, taught me much about how to listen to, hear, and see what a student is, can be, and will become.

To my cohort members, Peter Mayshle and David Hudson, all that we can do is indebted in small and big ways to those early foundations. I'm sorry if I am in the mood for grand pronouncements, but I dwell fondly over all that we shared coming up.

To my peers - Becca Tarsa, Kim Moreland, Annika Konrad, Anna Floch Arcello, Beth Godbee, Rush Daniels, Timothy Johnson, Sharon Yam, Rebecca Lorimer, Annie Massa-MacLeod, Chris Syrnyk- I have been fortunate to share time, space, classes, discussions, support, advice, conversations, joys, and frustrations with you all. Let us continue to thank each other. Truly blessed to have come up with all of you around me.

To my dear friends, Mike Gangloff, Patrick Best, Nathan Bowles, Troy Schafer, and Dani Schafer. Each of you in your own way have brought me back to life at some point in time, have brought me joy at others, and have opened vistas I never heard before. More and more to come. I love you all.

To my dear colleagues, Roger Thompson and David Rachels, you taught me quite a bit about camaraderie, academic integrity, and academic community. Roger, your faith, support, and collaboration over the years has been a brilliant model of how academics should turn an attentive ear to their peers. And your house, thanks for letting me use your house too. David, our lengthy summer evenings watching movies, late night dinner runs, and conversing about music, noir, academia, and family has given me some of the finest moments of the last eight summers.

To all the faculty and staff at University of Wisconsin-Madison, if I could collectively extend my thanks I would, but since that seems a bit inappropriate, here goes. My committee members, Morris Young, Michael Bernard-Donals, Christa Olson, Kate Vieira, Nancy Buenger. Morris, I don't even know where to start. Nearly everything I have done over the last seven years is indebted to working with you in one way or another. So many times you've given free reign to so much of my interests, and, other times, probably just as many, tightened them in with an admonitory glance. Thank you

for your patience, understanding and time. Mike, whether it has been in the classroom, sitting across from you at your desk, or getting suitably slammed on the racquetball court, you've helped me mature as a scholar, taught me to reframe questions, and reminded me that it is ok to leave some ideas behind. You have an unerring ear for listening to the most obtuse statements and distilling them into a statement of such crystalline simplicity. To this day I marvel at how you could synthesize some of my more, uhmm, capacious wanderings.

Christa, this is a little hard to explain, but bear with me. Though I have never had a class with you, listening to you speak about your work (and reading it, I should say), noting the advice you offered in commenting on student dissertations, and the brief and pointed, always useful observations you offered in the many times I stopped by your office unannounced has left a new voice in the chorus of academic voices in my head. Kate, I was first impressed some long years ago with your work after hearing you talk about it at a colloquium event, and have since then only grown fonder of the vision you have and bring to literacy studies. Nancy, I want to thank you for all the informal conversations we have had over the years, the chance to work with you through Design Lab, and finally, for lending a new perspective and direction for my work.

Brad Hughes, I have yet to meet someone so dedicated, so attentive, and so concerned with the struggles writers face on a daily basis. Thank you for all the opportunities. Deborah Brandt, for encouraging students to not just be teachers or scholars, but to be stewards of the discipline, thank you. And finally, but by no means least, Robyn Shanahan, you are a master of all that is the department, and I think it is safe

to say that very few would make it through without your labors. Your wit and joy put a humanizing spin on so many facets of the university.

It has been 24 years since I started down the path that led me here – a strange and tangential path, to say the least, one that put, perhaps, an undue stress on my family at different points along the way. So I'd like to thank my parents for all that they have been through, been uncertain about, been fearful of, and, ultimately, for standing in my corner through all the twisted steps – the painful and perplexing ones as well as the celebratory ones - that led to this day. Mom, Dad, you should know, I love you and appreciate everything that you have done.

Speaking of family, I want to thank Art and Barbara Keown, my other mom and dad, whose unflagging support has manifested itself in numerous ways over the last seven years. There are things that people outside of the academy do not understand about the demands and processes of academic life. Not so with Art and Barb who have worked in the academy for just about as along as I have been alive. I have been fortunate these last years to have their counsel on a number of issues, and continue to benefit in so many ways from their intelligence, compassion, love, support, understanding, and encouragement. Mom, Dad, thank you, for investing in and believing in me, in Emily, and now, in our children.

Audra and Mira. A new light shined in my life the day you came into this world. Researching and writing this project took me away from you for strange periods of time. At the same time, it left me working odder and odder hours, with a monitor to you sleeping next to me all the while. Your murmurs, gurgles and plaintive screams have

been joyful been ever present companions through long nights of writing and not writing, as it were. Know I love you. All that I can, everything, for you.

And then there is, of course, Emily, who I could never thank enough, and perhaps that is as it should be. Let me tell you about Emily. Emily betters the world in every way, betters life for all that know her, brings joy to so many. I have been fortunate to share in her light, bask in it, observe it spread and filter into so many lives. I cannot say enough about how fortunate I have been to be chosen as her husband and to have her stand by my side as a partner in everything that we do. Every day it is a lesson in humility as she acts selflessly for others, for me, for our family. She is a brilliant teacher, a brilliant artist, a brilliant mother, a brilliant intellect, a brilliant partner, a brilliant daughter and sister, and more than that she is simply brilliant; her brilliance moving in the world without any of those neat categories circumscribing her. I could never be all that she is, but with her by my side and as an example, I could never stop trying to be better than I am, for her, for our children, for the world. She has inspired so many, myself and our daughters included, to be more than they thought they could be, more than they knew that they could be, or were told they could be. So I say thank you Emily, knowing that I will never finish saying that. Thank you for all that you are, all that you do, all that you give.

Table of Contents

List of Images

Chapter One

Embodied Placemaking as a Rhetoric of Citizenship on Johns Island

Perhaps nowhere has space played a role in shaping the practices of citizenship through rhetorical action at such a mass scale than in the Civil Rights Movement. However, much less studied are the rural spaces that shaped the movement or the rhetorical legacy of these communities in shaping the movement for first class citizenship. What a consideration of how space shapes rhetorical and literate practices brings to this study is the way in which racism, sexism, economic inequity, social inequity, language practices, and civic participation are produced in, sustained, and transformed through the material spaces and embodied practices of everyday life. In this study I provide a rich narrative of how African American geographies, the local knowledges produced therein, and the needs of these communities gave form and meaning to new rhetorical practices and literate practices in the struggle over first class citizenship.

Through an archival study of the rhetorical and literate practices of an African American, Gullah, community on Johns Island in the Sea Islands of South Carolina, I offer a critical reappraisal of embodied placemaking as a rhetoric of citizenship. Embodied placemaking helps us theorize how Gullah discursive traditions and the material sites of everyday life offered ways for marginalized African American islanders to respond to and reimagine their "place" in white spatialities on the island, to rhetorically dwell within the white spaces of the island, and to shape literacy practices that brought island communities to presence in the rhetorical space of the nation through the formation

of the Citizenship School program, the most significant and successful literacy campaign of the Civil Rights Movement. I develop an understanding of embodied placemaking as a mutually constitutive relationship between the material and metaphoric spaces of place, communities, cultural traditions, and the body that broadens our understanding of practices of citizenship.

Stretching from off the coast of Charleston, South Carolina to Florida, the Sea Islands offer an interesting case for thinking about the role space plays in shaping the rhetorical and literate practices of marginalized communities as they organize, argue, and move for first class citizenship. Despite the history and presence of white plantations on the islands, the majority of the islands' inhabitants were African American. In 1880, African Americans made up 70% of the Charleston County population. In the 1930 census, African Americans comprised between 80 and 90 percent of the population living on Johns, Edisto, James, Wadmalaw, and St. Helena islands - the main islands off the coast of Charleston. By 1960, though, development in the Sea Islands and Charleston pointed to a significant shift in population on James and Johns islands, the larger islands most adjacent to Charleston; nevertheless, much of the Sea Islands remained largely African American. Reconstruction era policies offered the possibility for primarily African American communities in the Sea Islands to control and regulate the island spaces. A number of the African American islanders came to own their own farmland, which provided the *possibility* for economic solvency; however, that possibility was troubled by a corresponding history of tenancy farming, white agricultural regulatory agencies, and the difficulty of organizing the dispersed population of the islands - all of which erected a new, white spatial practice over the freed lands of the islands, effectively

replacing the regulatory practices of slavery. By the mid twentieth century, the compromised hope for economic solvency resulted in many islanders[1] routinely leaving the island for day work in Charleston, creating a more permeable border that would help give shape to the ethical position islanders developed in response to the marginalized position they occupied in the islands.

Being physically isolated from Charleston meant that the inhabitants were *relatively* sheltered from *some* of the harshest forms of white violence; however, like many African American geographies across the nation, segregation left the African American communities on the islands subject to Jim Crow practices regulating access to space and services and lacking in many material resources necessary to community health, education, and economic success. The cultural isolation from mainland white culture allowed for African American culture and language traditions to flourish as a positive marker of identity and community identity; however the largely oral traditions, coupled with the troubled educational resources for African Americans, resulted in a high rate of illiteracy that had high economic and political consequences for the islanders.

Because of the high rate of illiteracy, white middlemen exploited many African American farmers when selling their goods. Similarly, under Jim Crow voting requirements literacy was used to minimize African American participation in shaping the political life and exigencies of the island communities, leaving many of the

---

[1] Throughout the dissertation I refer to the African American, Gullah community as "islanders," drawing a textual distinction between the Gullah community and the White community on the island. Many of the early white inhabitants of the island were seasonal residents. Unaccustomed to the marshy, humid environment, many plantation owners would return to the city during the warmer seasons, leaving islanders under the care of white supervisors or respected head slaves. This provided a degree of autonomy to the African American population that was not seen in many parts of the South. In referring to the African American Gullah population as islanders, I do not mean to elide race or culture, but to give emphasis to the communities' placedness on the island.

communities effectively silenced rhetorically. Nonetheless, the shelter provided by geographic isolation, strong identification with shared language and cultural traditions, the prevalence of land ownership, and a legacy of offstage sites (Scott) rhetorical education in sites of everyday life and independent institutions like praise houses provided ideal conditions for the development of a rhetorical tradition and idea of literacy that used the material, racialized sites of the island and mainland as well as citizens' imagined or metaphoric relationship with local, regional, and national spaces as a resource.

Beginning in the early 20th century, the African American islanders began developing new sites and benevolent societies that would draw together community resources to organize the islanders and create new institutions providing health and economic services. The new sites provided a rhetorical space for islanders to develop ethical positions and rhetorical practices to confront the white spatial practices regulating island life, resulting in early efforts to educate citizens about voting registration and organize services meeting the demands of the community. In the mid 1950s, as the Civil Rights Movement was gaining traction, Island citizens Esau Jenkins and Septima Clark, who had also long been active in island civic life, along with Miles Horton of the Highlander Folk School built on this rhetorical legacy of activism to developed the single most successful literacy campaign in the Civil Rights Movement, the Citizenship School program.

As this portrait of the islands suggest, I use "space" in this study to encapsulate material sites, the “invented” rhetorical spaces of the islands, the Jim Crow discursive practices that mapped spaces of difference in material and metaphoric ways, and the

discursive practices used by Gullah islanders to constitute membership in a community through shared knowledge, traditions, and sociability. In order to understand how Jim Crow practices exiled African Americans from rhetorical presence we need to examine the role of space in denying African Americans entry to the sites of rhetorical practice - from the smallest scale of the body or a speaker's presence, to the attention to community exigencies and a cooperative spirit, to the possibility of entering the material and metaphoric spaces of the nation as First Class Citizens. In being denied access to the literal and metaphoric rhetorical spaces of the nation, African Americans were denied a principal resource and constitutive force of publicity, and consequently rhetorical presence. By focusing on the rhetorical legacy evident in the marginalized sites of the island, we see the ways communities drew on cultural traditions to invent new spaces to cultivate rhetorical and literate practices in order to address the efforts to silence the island Gullah communities. Given the confluence of forces and white institutions discussed above, we can see how the production of space in the island is central to configuring the relationship between rhetorical practices, ideas of citizenship, and publicity.

Space, Publicity, and Embodied Placemaking

Cultural geographers like Lefebvre, Soja, Harvey, and Massey have all theorized the production of space as fundamental to how space manages peoples and practices, cultures and traditions, resources and use through regulatory and disciplining acts of power that set the parameters for participation in any social formation. As such, space has a profound, even fundamental effect in shaping rhetorical practices. Through the

deployment of dominant topoi in discursive, material, and symbolic forms, spatiality rhetorically constructs and contains the possibility for who may or may not enter as citizens into public deliberation, what rhetorics and knowledges may be heard, what practices may be recognized as rhetorically viable acts, and what constitutes the public sphere. However, in suggesting that the production of space is rhetorical, and that space exerts a particularly suasive force on bodies of people, we need be mindful that space is never a simple exertion of power. David Sibley has argued that we "cannot understand the role of space in the reproduction of social relations without recognizing that the relatively powerless still have enough power to carve out spaces of control in their day-to-day lives" (76). The "powerless" in the margin are never solely subject to the forces of dominant spatial practices; rather, as this dissertation works to show, the experience of margin spaces provide material and discursive practices used by "the powerless" in a practice of embodied placemaking that has far reaching consequences for conceptualizing and constituting community, citizenship, and publicity. In what follows I trace the role of space as a rhetoric and its effect in shaping rhetorical practices in a reading of spatial theory. I then turn my attention to embodied placemaking in margin sites as a rhetoric of citizenship used to produce a new spatial praxis by reading how margin spaces have been theorized as productive sites for "the powerless" to respond to their marginalization in the production of dominant space.

Space and the Public

In *Placing Words*, William Mitchell makes the case that material spaces "provide context for communication" as a means for shaping and determining "meaningful

interaction" in the communities occupying the varied spaces of the city. Mitchell more clearly is making the case that space is not a simple vessel or backdrop to communicative action, but that space is rhetorical in shaping the very possibilities for rhetorical practice. He proffers that "our movements...and our opportunities to assemble at various points, are far from unconstrained. In fact cities operate as huge machines for sorting their populations and organizing opportunities for face-to-face encounter and exchange"(7). Mitchell offers a spatialized portrait of Burke's sense of rhetorical identification: "Knowing what you can say where is a crucial component of effective community norms that may get you ostracized or exiled-sent to a place of exclusion"(8). In echoing Burke, Mitchell makes the case that city spaces, and spaces more broadly, are symbolic efforts to create shared practices and common grounds for communicative and rhetorical practice, creating a normative, or as I discuss later, a homogenized confluence of materials, concepts, practices, and peoples.

To help elucidate Mitchell's comments, we can turn to earlier work in spatial theory. In his seminal text, *The Production of Space*, Henri Lefebvre provides a theoretical model that rejects the idea that space is a material reality distinct from the lived experience of that space (73). Rather, he posits that the production of space constantly produces and reproduces social relationships: "(Social) space is a (social) product"(26). However, in ascribing a social function to space, Lefebvre is working to assert that space, in being produced, is implicitly inscribed with values, and serves a particular end. Space is/has a social value. For Lefebvre space is a production of capitalist material hegemony. It is planned, organized, and produced, but in turn it is also a *social agent* rhetorically producing the conditions for everyday experience and producing the

material relations of the populace that have far reaching consequences for rhetorical practice.

Lefebvre's theories of space provide a means for looking at how space contains and constrains rhetorical practice through the deployment of a range of topoi that support, validate, and authorize spatial rhetoric as it supports the ends of a dominant mode of social production. For Lefebvre, space is produced and social relations are reproduced through the triad of perceived, conceived, and lived spaces. If we are to understand space as a sorting mechanism that orders and regulates communicative practices, *perceived space* is the material organization of space that reflects the needs of the dominant mode of production. It organizes the flow and distribution of peoples and activity. As a material rhetoric, perceived space produces and reproduces the dominant order by linking everyday routines with particular sites, offering cohesiveness to daily life. *Conceived space* is the discursive and symbolic articulation and planning – the imagining - of space by representatives of the state or dominant institutions. Generally the purview of technocrats, architects, and urban planners, a conceived space defines and conceptualizes the use, value, and organization of space in abstract terms. Invested with the power to imagine and design the use of space, conceived space is explicitly ideological, “the dominant space of any society” as it is symbolically and discursively designed to produce desired social realities (39). The discursive and material rhetorics of perceived and conceived space create a dialectic between materials and use that produces an abstract materiality in-service to the dominant modes of production and divorced from the lived realities of everyday life of the inhabitants. Perceived and Conceived spaces, as the real and the imagined, respectively, are the principle means for producing and "sorting" the

uses, practices, and habitation of spaces by a dominant order. However, the perceived and conceived also create an abstraction of space, distant from the multiform practices of everyday life.

To the dialectic of perceived and conceived space, Lefebvre grounds our spatial understanding in a third term, *lived space*. *Lived space* is the embodied social experience of perceived and conceived space in the everyday life of the inhabitants of any social formation. As such, lived space is not distinct from perceived and conceived space; rather perceived, conceived, and lived spaces are experienced simultaneously. In this sense, "this is the dominated–and hence passively experienced–space"; but Lefebvre is insistent that lived space is also a space "which the imagination seeks to change and appropriate" (39). The imagined and possible use of the topoi deployed in space is an excess that the conceptual underpinnings of a dialectical conception of space (the abstract space of perceived and conceived) cannot account for or fully moderate. Despite the rhetorical force of conceived and perceived spaces, the lived responses to these spaces offers the *possibility* for what de Certeau calls a tactical adaptation and use of the material and symbols of produced space, and what I am suggesting is an embodied practice of placemaking. The sheer variety of lived spaces destabilizes the production of space as an absolute space; lived space reintroduces the everyday into the real and imagined work of perceived and conceived space. Soja has usefully drawn the terms together by framing lived space as "realandimagined[2]" (11).

However, Lefebvre makes an interesting distinction between the *possible*

[2] In Thirdspace, Soja generally marks this as "real and imagined"; however, he introduces his text by saying "the exploration of Thirdspace can be described and inscribed in journeys to "real-and-imagined" (or perhaps "realandimagined"?) places" (11). I have chosen to use "realandimagined" throughout the text to visually mark the interanimating relationship between material, imagined, and lived spaces.

imagined use and making in lived space (realandimagined space) and life subject to a material and discursive rhetoric of symbols. While an attention to the bodily and the everyday *may* destabilize spatial practices through a tactical making or poesis of difference, the “passive experience” of “domination” serves to produce and reproduce the social relations and cohesiveness of a spatial practice in the symbols of that practice (perceived and conceived space). Lived space is an embodied practice of the discursive and material rhetorics, subject to a disciplining “biopower” that acts to homogenize differences and consequently contain resistant practices. At best, lived space is a potentiality that must be considered in light of the homogenizing force of the production of space, the tendency for the production of space to assimilate and reduce to binary categories that which is contained within the purview of dominant spatial practice, as well as that which is excluded from dominant spatial practice.

Lefebvre points out the vested rhetoricity of the production of space. Space "appears homogenous; and indeed it serves those forces which make a tabula rasa of whatever stands in their way, of whatever threatens them–in short, of differences. These forces seem to grind down and crush everything before them, with space performing the function of the plane, a bulldozer or a tank.” (285). Grosz offers a further explanation for the homogenizing tendency of space in her discussion of how power is deployed spatially: “power is what proliferates, and its proliferation in a particular scenario is contingent on its ability to overcome or absorb obstacles in its path, use them as part of its own self-overcoming” (Architecture 102). Power produces space, proliferates the visions and semiotics of a dominant mode of production, in so far as it is able to assimilate a heterogeneity of spaces into a "tabula rasa" - that is, spatiality tends towards

a pure, abstract articulation of space by the logic and rationalities invested with the power to overwrite and "absorb" or exclude difference, to spatially articulate (material, discursive, and embodied) rhetorics of space. It is in this manner that the production of space can, as Mitchell points out, sort citizens, create a normalized field or common ground of rhetorical action, sanction and privilege certain rhetorical spaces, and exclude knowledges, subjectivities, and rhetorics that destabilize the field of a produced spatial order.

As a process of containing and excluding the possibilities of rhetorical action, the production of space has to be understood also as the production of the public. Scott Lyons provides a relatively succinct portrait of how introducing space into our consideration of rhetorics illuminates the way that rhetorical practices and the public are ideologically constructed through the production of space. A modern, capitalistic, and, as Lyons term it, "imperialist" logic of abstract space works towards the goals of homogeneity through "rhetorical imperialism: the ability of dominant powers to assert control of others by setting the terms of debate" that are often "definitional – that is they *identify* the parties discussed by describing them in certain ways"(452): citizen/non-citizen, center/margin. The management of space is a conceptual categorization- a definitional process - of the possibilities for communicative action and the parameters of the public. In creating the geographies of rhetorical action, the deployment of topoi by rhetorics of imperialism create the Burkean identification necessary for participation in sanctioned rhetorical spaces, what we can for all intensive purposes understand as the public sphere. Moreover, the creation of common grounds in the perceived and conceived terrains of lived space provide everyday lessons in rhetorical education as the everyday interaction of citizens is

sorted and distributed in sanctioned, produced spaces: what can be said and where is subject to the historical weight and experience of what has been said there before; the rhetorics of spatiality create the commonplaces and sites of rhetorical education. As a spatial practice, rhetorics of imperialism create stark binary distinctions by categorizing sanctioned and unsanctioned spaces, peoples, practices, and rhetorics - by defining the public as a site of heterosexual, male, white presence.

To illuminate the consequences of this binary categorization in spatial production for marginalized constituencies we might consider Jessica Enoch's comment that "dominant forms of rhetorical education are often linked to cultures of whiteness...[and promote] the idea that the only viable form of civic social involvement was to 'act white'"(177). Space and rhetoric are highly raced articulations of asymmetrical relations of power. Not only is space rhetorical, but also the rhetorics of space are tethered to a white male rationality that define the public and publicity through a series of binary terms: white/other, center/margin, presence/absence, recognized/silenced.

Rethinking space – and consequently rhetoric and the public - as material and discursive productions tethered to whiteness and Western rationalities calls our attention to those spaces, practices, rhetorics, and peoples that are excluded by their differences from the dominant field of production. Spatiality contains, and in doing so, spatiality excludes. bell hooks recasts Lefebvre's premise and more particularly characterizes "dominant materialist hegemony" by drawing out the exclusionary and privileging practices orchestrating the production of space. She characterizes the dominant spatial practices and deployment of rhetorical topoi producing space as "white supremacist capitalist patriarchy" (WSCP). David Sibley has pointed out that the Western conceptual

underpinnings to spatial practice have created geographies of exclusion that exile to the margins those difference that compromise the "purity" or "order" of dominant spatial practices. A WSCP spatial practice creates territories of privilege that excludes differences along racial, ethnic, gender, and class lines.

Because when we talk about space we are also talking about rhetoric and the public, the geographies of exclusion, as raced geographies, mean that the public and rhetorical traditions tethered to the rationalities of whiteness mediate the possibility for heterogeneous practices, ways of acting, knowledges, and bodies tethered to marginalized traditions to enter into the discursive arena of the public. In producing the public and containing/excluding the possibilities for rhetorical action, spatial praxis is a means for authorizing and sanctioning, for granting recognition and acknowledging rhetorical actions, for "the very possibility of an utterance counting as 'true-or-false'"(Code X). However, the introduction of difference makes the public sphere a contested site where the idea of rational deliberation and the attendant forms that deliberation must take becomes a means of silencing those differences. Cintron notes that "the public sphere can never be a place for equally contending 'rational' voices when the society itself is so fissured that an accent, a gender, appearance, or an action can by itself signal in the minds of some discourse that should not be heard"(27). In this way, spatiality can silence the rhetorical practices and exigencies of the communities and peoples cordoned in the margin. We might conclude, then, that the ordering of space is a means of silencing as well as providing access to the public sphere[3].

Thus far I have argued that spatiality contains rhetorical possibility, "granting and

[3] See also LuMing Mao (30) on the constraints for rhetorical practice in contested sites.

withholding acknowledgement" of who can speak, when, and where and reasonably expect to be heard (Code XI). In this sense dominant spatial practices produce the conditions for publicity and the kind of deliberation possible in the public sphere. I have also suggested that there is the possibility for a lived response to the dialectic of material and discursive propositions of space that threatens to destabilize the production of space, rhetoric, and the public sphere. As I noted above, Lefebvre discusses the difficulty of a radical lived response to the duality of perceived and conceived spaces; however, we might reconsider the ways in which those marginalized from the space of "passive experience" of domination reproduce social relations and the ways in which that same marginalization persistently introduces difference into the homogeneity of spatial production. Indeed, Lefebvre asks

> Is not social space always, and simultaneously, both a *field of action* (offering its extension to the deployment of projects and practical intentions) and a *basis of action* (a set of places whence energies derive and wither energies are directed)? [...] and is it not at once the collection of *materials* (objects, things) and an ensemble of *matériel* (tools– and the procedures necessary to make efficient use of tools and of things in general)?" (191).

The margins are contested sites. As such, domination in the margins is never passively experienced, but always pushing at the boundaries of identity, knowledge, and being. In these sites, where difference is always re-introduced into the hegemonic order of produced space, an excess is generated, a way of knowing that introduces a slippage into the dominant order of produced space. In focusing on the sites, practices, and people of

everyday life, embodied placemaking provides the methodological lens to reposition the margin as a site of power for the "powerless" and allows us to reappraise the work done in the margin for developing a rhetoric of citizenship.

Embodied Placemaking as a Rhetoric of Citizenship

A turn to embodied placemaking, as a spatial praxis, attends to the particulars of space, language, culture, power, and the body. Studies of embodiment, Csordas writes, "are about culture and experience insofar as these can be understood from the standpoint of bodily being-in-the-world" (143). To embody something is to give perceptible form or to concretize an abstract concept, idea, or belief. Signs, for example, denoting "colored only," do not just issue a command, they embody a particular historic political-socio-cultural formation of race relations, power, and recognition that have material effects. In producing material spaces, "colored only" signs embody culturally sanctioned subject positions or ways for bodies to act, experience, and be in space. Embodiment, then, also calls attention to the way that we inhabit, experience, and respond to the world, as bodies in produced spaces. However, the sorting of bodies by a belief system embodied in "colored only" signs raises the very question of how these embodied values are experienced and responded to. Throughout this study, I use embodiment to focus my study by 1) attending to how the values and beliefs of produced space are embodied in lived space, the islanders' everyday bodily experience of being-in the-world; 2) to study the diverse ways that abstract ideas are concretized and have material effects on ways of being in the world, particularly in rhetorical artifacts and discursive performances of islanders' cultural traditions; and 3) to theorize islanders' cultural and sociable practices

as embodied rhetorical responses to the production of island space, particularly in the role informal and independent institutions played in shaping islanders practices of citizenship.

In offering an "embodied" view of how space is experienced, embodied placemaking offers the possibility of examining how space is not only produced by agents of power, but also is reproduced, resisted, or reimagined in everyday life. While Lefebvre emphasizes the "tendency towards homogenization" of the production of space, he positions the body as central to any revolutionary project of re-imagining space (166-167). The body not only *has* a space, but through acting in material and discursive ways socially produces space: "It can create networks and links, symmetries and asymmetries" (173). Arijit Sen and Lisa Silverman have suggested that embodied placemaking usefully provides "for grounding not only place but also the body's role within it as mutually constituent elements of the built environment" (2). In studying the rhetorical legacy of Johns Island I expand on their definition here, to frame embodied placemaking as a mutually constitutive relationship between the material and metaphoric spaces of place, communities, cultural traditions, and the body that broadens our understanding of practices of citizenship and offers the possibility for theorizing how these embodied practices respond to the production of space by carving out new dwelling spaces for marginalized communities to develop a rhetoric of citizenship.

P. Joy Rouse notes that "rhetorics of citizenship work toward the common good of the country" and facilitate acknowledging "the inclusion of discourse generated in and addressing more local communities" - including marginalized communities - as actors work to imagine "their role as citizens in their immediate communities" (116). At the heart of Rouse's model of rhetorics of citizenship is a more expansive definition of

citizenship as a set of practices that acknowledges diverse work and discourse conventions used to shape community exigencies in local spaces that have relevance to national concerns. Rouse's theory of rhetorics of citizenship not only provides a more inclusive model of citizenship by accounting for how local actors might engage in meaningfully imagining and performing their role in a local community, but it offers a corrective to theorizing citizenship more narrowly as a status granted, recognized, and defined by the state. Renato Rosaldo's definition of cultural citizenship usefully calls attention to the stakes in theorizing citizenship as a practice: "Cultural citizenship refers to the right to be different (in terms of race, ethnicity, or native language) with respect to the norms of the dominant national community, without compromising one's right to belong, in the sense of participating in the nation-state's democratic processes" (Cultural Citizenship in San Jose, California 57). However, cultural citizenship "operates in an uneven field of structural inequalities where the dominant claims of universal citizenship assume a propertied white male subject and usually blind themselves to their exclusions and marginalization of people who differ in gender, race, sexuality, and age" (37). Attending to the embodied placemaking practices of marginalized communities offers ways of opening and revealing new ways to imagine notions of citizenship and consequently the nation, without the threat of reifying difference by assimilating it into the existent conceptual paradigm (of, for example, spatial practices privileging a white, largely male, financially affluent class).

By considering the role of space in our ideas of citizenship, we are then, imagining new ways of defining and constituting publics that do not simply "allow access" but reimagine the constitutive undergirding of membership and practice: what it

means to be a citizen, who can be included in that definition, what material and discursive practices constitute citizenship, and where citizenship is performed. Embodied placemaking, as a spatial praxis provides a methodological approach to those sites where the spatial production of a dominant order is not "passively experienced" (Lefebvre) within the everyday but rather where the dominant order is *actively* experienced in the process of citizens' marginalization and where negotiations of knowledge and meaningful experience occur - in those sites excluded to the margins where subjectivities, knowledges, and rhetorics are contested, created, and freely circulate in the lived space of marginalized communities' lifeworlds, the realandimagined space of everyday life.

Lifeworlds are the spatially defined common stock of knowledge, beliefs, subjectivities, topoi, and discourse practices that allow for a community to create meaning out of the history of their experiences, understood through the mediation of their own discursive traditions and language practices. As material, discursive, and lived – realandimagined - spaces they shape the contexts and types of communicative action particular to a "place."

In focusing on the particulars of "place," a lifeworld model usefully frames these sites as an embodiable space for thinking of these sites as otherwise than margins, borders, or sites of excluded difference - all of which embed the lifeworld, the realandimagined space, of these sites in an object relation to WSCP spatiality. Rather, they are realandimagined sites where, to echo Ralph Cintron, respect can be gained in conditions of no respect, where power can be asserted in places where power has elsewhere been denied. Where, in short, marginalized populations can engage in practices of placemaking as citizens. They are embodied sites where roles of power can be taken

up, where communities can organize and define shared exigencies, where life and humanness can be "restored" from the dehumanizing silencing of dominant space. As sites of shared meaning, "lifeworld[s]," Cintron writes, "are the sites of rhetoric" (24). By accounting for the concentration of peoples in these spatialities with a shared history and shared practices of meaning making, lifeworlds offer the means of speaking not only *within or to* the dominant order, but also *from* the embodied, shared experience and traditions of meaning making *to* members of the community. In their own lifeworld, community members have the relative freedom to invent or shape the kinds of rhetorical practices and rhetorical actions members employ within this space. Where rhetorical practices in dominant space are freighted with a history of white rationalities, offstage sites offer a different agency to speak, use language traditions, create meaning, and cultivate new ways of engaging in civic participation that meets the needs of that community; to act as citizens engaged in the concerns of their immediate community**.** Lorraine Code notes that the shared traditions, space, and practices within these sites "removes the onus of establishing credibility and gaining acknowledgment away from the abstract, 'generalized,' disengaged, moral-epistemic individual of the Anglo-American tradition, and into the lives, social structures, and circumstances where ‘concrete' moral and epistemic agents are engaged in deliberations that matter to them" (xi). In this sense, lifeworlds constitute veritable publics: a group of face to face, embodied rhetorical encounters that are organized and understood by the relations and traditions stemming from and encapsulating purposive action (exigencies) in the immediate spatiality of a common, shared stock of knowledge or reference points (topoi).

Space in African American Rhetorical and Literate Practices

The study in this dissertation of embodied placemaking as a rhetoric of citizenship builds on and synthesizes work that has been done in the field on African American rhetorical and literate practices, on gender and rhetorical space, and on spatial theory. Royster and Logan offer important work for thinking about the intersection of literate practices, rhetorical practice and the writing of citizenship. Enoch and Johnson offer complementary work on gender and rhetorical space that helps offer a frame for theorizing the invention and invocation of ethos for marginalized citizens within dominant theories of gender and race. Of note, reading Royster, Logan, and Enoch, we can make the case that the literate and rhetorical practices in their study are deeply indebted to material and metaphorical space. Where these scholars' work lays out the groundwork for a theory of space, work by hooks and Nunley build on this by more explicitly theorizing the importance of space in developing ethos and rhetorical practice in African American communities.

Both Royster and Logan tie literacy and the development of new literate practices to rhetorical praxis and the literate practices of citizenship. In *Traces of a Stream*, Royster traces the formation of new literate and rhetorical practices as they are developed out of the contexts of emergent educational possibilities for African Americans in a post Civil War America. Her portrait of the women helps make the case that the development of literate practices offered inventive means for rhetorical action in entering the space of national publics and shaping the discourse of counterpublic activism. Like Royster, in *Liberating Language: Sites of Rhetorical Education in Nineteenth Century Black America*, Logan positions literate practices as central to rhetorical action for African

Americans in post Civil War America. Her study of rhetorical education developed in "non-school" settings offers a legacy of literacy training that is tied to learners acting to redefine their "place" as citizens in the dominant discourse of nationalist narratives. Royster and Logan frame the development of literate practices as an inventive practice central to creating the rhetorical practices and ethos used in the practices of first class citizenship.

Where Royster and Logan help us to frame the role of literacy and literate practice in shaping the rhetorical work needed to carve out new roles of participatory citizenship, Johnson's and Enoch's work on gender and rhetorical space offers a useful discussion of the development of an embodied ethos from within prescriptive gender roles as a means of reimagining and reinventing possibilities for rhetorical practice. In *Gender and Rhetorical Space in American Life,* Nan Johnson's discussion of the parlor rhetoric movement helps illuminate how ethos developed in one context - the gendered space of the middle class parlor - can be adapted and reframed to move into other sites of rhetorical practice. By adapting the performance of gendered roles in gendered spaces and transplanting them to the public space of the podium, female rhetors use ethos to open and place themselves in rhetorical spaces that had previously been closed. Jessica Enoch broadens this model of gender and rhetorical space in *Refiguring Rhetorical Education* by theorizing how female educators worked within the prescribed, gendered role to transform education practices for resistant ends. In reimagining rhetorical education, each of the pedagogues in her study subvert the imperative to replicate the nationalist, marginalizing discourse about race in order to craft new spaces for rhetorical education and rhetorical practices. Enoch notes that rhetorical education cultivates

participant citizenship by teaching students an embodied position "to communicate inside of a culture" (176) by crafting rhetorical spaces where they had previously been denied. Johnson's and Enoch's discussion of gender and rhetorical space offers a useful way of theorizing how marginalized subjects excluded from dominant rhetorical spaces develop, adapt, and repurpose ethos to access and enter an embodied position in rhetorical spaces previously closed to them.

Though we can see how the field has taken up how space is a material and metaphoric resource used to conceive and develop the literacy education and literate practices that would be adapted as rhetorics of citizenship in the pursuit of first class citizenship, here I argue that we need to go further in making this relationship explicit. Taken as a whole, the work of Royster, Logan, and Enoch offer an *implicit* genealogy of space in the literate and rhetorical training of African Americans developing a critical consciousness as participant citizens working to transform the role of dominant discourse and spatial practices in shaping their everyday lives. While space remains in the background in much of this work, their work helps frame the need to consider the ways space is used as a resource in shaping literate and rhetorical practices, particularly in their attention to marginalized bodies inventing new positions in rhetorical spaces.

Although Royster's focus in *Traces of a Stream* is on the literate practices of an elite group, implicated in the nexus of literate and rhetorical practices are the material contexts in which the women were working and their position in the community. Still to be defined are the everyday lives and spaces of the communities the women's activism and rhetorical use of literate practices sought to transform in bringing the communities exigencies to a broader discursive presence. Royster's study helps us to theorize how

space's importance by suggesting that rhetorical and literate practices evolve out of the material conditions, exigencies, and everyday lives of broader communities.

In Logan's work on sites of rhetorical education, we begin to see the importance of space in her discussion of particular sites of African American rhetorical education within the broader spatial practices of a segregated America in the post Civil War era. Of particular interest here is her attention to the role of "offstage sites" in providing a forum for centralizing the exigencies calling for collective response; and for rehearsing, performing, and evaluating rhetorical education through the use of literate practices. Logan offers us a topology of common places to be taken up in considering the development of literate practices in safe havens outside the purview of dominant spatial practices; a topology which points to the centrality of offstage sites, where members can safely gather, in providing a body of common knowledges and shared experiences of dominant discourse.

Logan has expanded her study from the "sites" of African American communities to discuss the role of the body in how African Americans are received as rhetors. In "Black Speakers, White Representations: Frances Ellen Watkins Harper and the Construction of a Public Persona" Logan points out that reviews by white audience members of Harper's public speaking occasions "invariably included comments on her tone of voice, her general demeanor, and her overall delivery, giving support to the claim that 19th-century audiences were fascinated with the articulate blackbody" (25). For Logan, the rhetorical occasion of the "articulate black body" explicitly reminds us that rhetoric is not simply a practice or set of tools, but is an embodied practice that establishes presence - creates a "place" for the speaker - through not only the kinds of

discourse conventions drawn on, but through the figure of the "articulate" body in a particular space. The management, imagining, and reception of the "articulate black body" is not incidental to, she suggests, but central to how African Americans figure presence in public occasions.

Enoch offers a fitting complement to the work done by both Royster and Logan. Enoch's study suggests ways that a consideration of space opens new possibilities for theorizing the development of rhetorical and literate practices in and out of the lived experience of everyday life. For the subjects of her study, connecting literacy and rhetorical training to local knowledges and familiar rhetorical practices provides the resources for developing a critical consciousness in understanding the new position of citizenship. For example, in her discussion of Lydia Marie Child Enoch finds that Child uses racialized commonplaces to transform the textual space of the Freedman's Manual. These commonplaces became central to her pedagogical emphasis on rhetorical praxis, which prompted learners to turn their rhetorical education to the service of their community. The practice of putting literate and rhetorical education in service to the exigencies of learners' communities reflects an implicit spatial practice that we see explicitly in the Citizenship Schools' literacy campaigns, but more persistently in the ways that Johns Island community members constitute membership and invent dwelling spaces on the island.

Several scholars in the field have more explicitly developed our understanding of space and provided the spatial groundings for theorizing the centrality of spaces in everyday life to developing embodied rhetorical and literate practices. In particular, bell hooks and Vorris Nunley offer explicit spatial theories addressing the way identifications

within the margin provided African American commonplaces for developing discrete new dwelling places around rhetorical and literate practices. Together, hooks and Nunley help theorize the way space is central to how islanders presence in the island was constrained by a white spatiality, as well as the way that local spaces, traditions, and knowledge provided rhetorical dwelling places used to build a black spatiality serving islanders' needs.

In her collection *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*, hooks theorizes several tropes of everyday life: "the chitlin circuit," "homeplaces," and "the margin." hooks attributes the development of a critical consciousness (ethos) to the commonplaces of shared histories, knowledges, and language; identifications within a community; marginal spaces; segregated schools; and communal efforts at mutual aid. In doing so, she asserts a new paradigm of spatial topoi in everyday life, broadening our understanding of the spaces of rhetorical education mapped out in Logan's topology by injecting the everyday spaces of African American communities into the discussion. hooks frames "homeplaces" as sites where African Americans could cultivate an ethos that does not reproduce the subjugated position articulated by a dominant order. She writes:

> one's homeplace was the one site where one could freely confront the issue of humanization, where one could resist...where all black people could strive to be subjects, not objects, where we could be affirmed in our minds and hearts despite poverty, hardship, and deprivation, where we could restore to our-selves the dignity denied us on the outside in the public space. (42)

In hooks' testimony “homeplaces” are an embodied way of dwelling in margin space. Out of the material, lived spaces of African American communities, hooks argues, developed a rhetoric of citizenship based on love, shared history, and liberation; an embodied practice of placemaking used to create "spaces of radical openness" whereby African American could transform dominant spatial practices and effect a new spatial justice as critically conscious, committed citizens.

Vorris Nunley is perhaps the most explicit in theorizing the ways in which isolated communities like those of the Sea Islands provide rhetorical commonplaces for African Americans to develop distinct rhetorical traditions and practices. Echoing the work done by hooks, Nunley draws on the tradition in African American history of "hush harbors" to productively theorize those spaces where "Black folks affirm, share, and negotiate African American epistemologies and resist and subvert hegemonic Whiteness"(222). Nunley argues that the "The material configuration or spatial location of a site mediates rhetorical performances which enable certain kinds of discourses and rhetorics while constraining others"(228). Hush harbor sites "reconfigure and flatten asymmetrical power relations to provide a measure of safety and solace through authorizing or legitimating voices that typically lack jurisdiction in non-hush harbor spaces" or dominant public spheres (235). These spaces sheltered from the disciplining gaze of dominant space and practice "are not just Habermasian public spheres with a black difference. They are *singularities*–aspects of black civil society. They are black life worlds" [emphasis added] (236) where members engage in embodied practices of placemaking. By facilitating new epistemologies and rhetorical acts, these sites provide the topoi for African Americans to develop and engage in productive counter-hegemonic

discursive practices and provide the rhetorical "dwelling places" and ethos necessary to developing embodied counter social formations outside of the dominant, hegemonic public sphere as a rhetoric of citizenship.

Roxanne Mountford has suggested that the rhetorical situation is best understood as the "geography of a communicative event," one that cannot be understood independent of the material spaces in which the event seeks to produce and give meaning to the exigencies given voice. I argue that likewise, our understanding of rhetorical and literate practices are best understood with a consideration of the geographies shaping the form, value, content, and purposes of how, why, where and with what consequences Rhetorical and literate practices circulate and get taken up in any particular community. Developing the constitutive role of space, and more specifically embodied placemaking as a spatial praxis, as work by hooks, Nunley, and others has begun, helps us to see not only how the development of rhetorical and literate practices are indissoluble from the everyday spaces and practices of the communities, but also that these embodied practices and spatialities are themselves central to the struggle for first class citizenship throughout African American history.

Chapter Descriptions

The dissertation is organized into two large thematic sections. The first section, comprised of Chapters Two and Three, examines the ways that spatial rhetorics shape notions of citizenship and who has access to participate in island and, more broadly, national publics. By looking in Chapter Two, first, at how the space of Johns Island was produced and imagined through a rhetoric of mapping, I argue that dominant conceptions

of island space effectively disembodied Gullah islanders, absenting these communities from civic life. I then trace how this disembodied representation of islanders circulates discursively and shapes ways of knowing place and people that have material consequences by looking at the attitudes of the African American community in nearby Charleston towards the Gullah communities of Johns Island. In Chapter Three, I suggest that spatial rhetorics provide a way of imaging the practices of citizenship that disrupts the production of dominant space and epistemologies. As a contrast to the absenting spatial imagining of Gullah Communities seen in the discursive and material production of island space and people, I develop a reading of citizenship "on the ground." I read Septima Clark's walking tours of her time on Johns Island, through the lens of mêtis, a "wiley" and "cunning" embodied rhetoric that reveals and introduces the islanders' absented practices of citizenship to national publics.

The second section is comprised of Chapters Four, Five, and Six and turns to examining the embodied placemaking practices of the Gullah islander communities. Beginning in Chapter Four with a survey of traditions of storytelling and folk medicine, I argue that these were rhetorical, embodied practices that shaped islander ethos and made claims of presence in the islands. Building on these traditions to trace the rhetorical legacy of the island, I focus in Chapter Five and Six on looking at the development of independent institutions in two primary sites. First, the development of a praise house and the benevolent society associated with it, institutions and sites of island life that would draw on the traditions of storytelling and folk medicine; and second, in Chapter Six, the site of the Citizenship Schools housed within the Progressive Club.

In Chapter Five I begin by discussing the role that the Moving Star Association, a benevolent society, played in developing islanders' ethos. I then examine the epideictic practices of the praise house as an embodied rhetoric of citizenship that "places" islander bodies in island space. In Chapter Six I discuss the formation of the Citizenship School's rhetorical space. I begin with a study of the origins of the Citizenship School – initially in a mobile literacy program developed by Esau Jenkins and given shape in a Highlander Workshop on the United Nations. I build on this by framing how islander activists and members of Highlander Folk School began conceptualizing a rhetorical space that would respond to islanders needs. I conclude the chapter by "placing" the rhetorical space of the Citizenship School within the affiliated institution of the Progressive Club to argue its centrality to islanders developing and putting into practice the new citizenship practices of the Citizenship Program.

A Note on Methodology and the Shape of the Dissertation

I am cautious about my role as an outsider looking back at a historical movement that involved an oppressive silencing of African American voices; I attempt to account for this by drawing on analytical methods that foreground openness to the materials over a theoretical framework. As a methodological trope mediating my approach to archival materials I draw on the inventive practice of *listening*. Listening has gained substantive currency in rhetorical studies as a result of Krista Ratcliffe's work, particularly for the possibilities for researchers positioning themselves in relationships across differences of race, ethnicity, and culture, where meaning and significance may be occluded by the researcher's own identifications.

Jean-Luc Nancy offers a fitting complement to Ratcliffe's theory in his discussion of listening as a means of "inclining oneself" or opening oneself toward meaning in the *resonance* of voices, those sounds that exceed the clear signification of a statement. Since I am articulating a theory of space that is present in direct and indirect ways across a range of archival materials, I find Nancy's notion of resonance helpful in assembling a broader portrait of the role of space in the everyday lives of the communities' acquisition of literacy and the pursuit of first class citizenship. As an inventive practice, listening to the way voices and exigencies resonate with each other across time, space, participants, and materials offers the possibility of attending to the shared exigencies and tactics that appear in the resonance between a range of archival materials.

At each step along the way, I have been fortunate and flustered by the materials available in key archives about the islands, the people of the islands, and the everyday life of the islanders. The Avery Research Center for African American Culture and History, The Highlander Folk School, The Southern Folklife Collection at UNC-Chapel Hill, and The Wisconsin Historical Society all have extensive archives related to the development of the Citizenship School program in the late 1950s. Despite the thousands of pages of documents detailing the program's evolution, a portrait of Gullah life on the island in the earlier 20th century is noticeably absent. Given the largely oral and disparaged culture of the Gullah communities, the isolation from the mainland, and the firm hold on the material and imagined island life by white culture, economies, and plantation history, this absence is, perhaps, not surprising. To reach back into the history of the island, I have worked to find artifacts of island life that offer some glimpse of the "place" of Gullah islanders within the white spatiality of the island; their absence is

telling, as many artifacts present a vivid portrait of antebellum life, the reimagining of the plantations as historic sites, and the development of resort areas. The development of the two primary sections of the dissertation evolved out of the kinds of artifacts that could be found in the archives.

The first section of the dissertation works out of two kinds of artifacts: maps produced by white islanders and institutions; and a narrative testimony to island life and culture by Septima Clark, a Charlestonian that worked extensively with the island. After spending some time in the archives of the South Carolina Historical Society and the Historic Charleston Foundation I left with several maps that offered a rich narrative of how island space was produced and imagined through a white spatial lens, and the effect that these spatial rhetorics had on absenting Gullah islanders and traditions from a presence in island life as citizens. Once the maps framed a narrative of the rhetorical legacy of a white spatiality on the islands, Septima Clark's autobiographical work on her time in the islands and her careful presentation of the islanders as richly engaged in practices of citizenship took on a renewed focus. In addition to providing a rich topography of Gullah islander culture, language, traditions, and sociability, Clark is mindful for how to present this oft-disparaged community to a national audience. Taken together, her walking tour of islanders' practices of citizenship and the narrative of a white citizenry and culture in the spatial work of the maps offers a clear line for studying the way that island space lay at the center of how citizenship on the island is rhetorically imagined.

The second section of the dissertation focusing on the embodied placemaking practices of the islanders evolved out of the available testimonies collected by Guy and

Candy Carawan. Methodologically, a study of the largely oral nature of the informal institutions of island life and the community development of the independent institutions of Moving Star Hall and Association is troubled by the scarce resources available documenting those traditions of storytelling, folk medical knowledge, and the services and formation of the praise house and the benevolent society. Browning notes that

> Since [benevolent societies'] activities were so often veiled in the utmost secrecy because of the fear of being misunderstood by the whites, the adoption of white fraternal organization procedure, and the unconscious secrecy which evolved from holding meetings in Negro neighborhoods, these factors together with a lamentable lack of documentary evidence have screened their development. (420)

The most extensive and readily available record of the association's foundation, services, and subsequent activities available is found in the testimony of Moving Star Hall and Association members in Guy and Candy Carawan's collection of oral testimony, *Ain't You Got A Right to the Tree of Life: The People of Johns Island, South Carolina - Their Faces, Their Words, and Their Songs*. As a whole, the book serves as an interesting rhetorical document designed to make island life visible and the Gullah traditions of the island legible to the broader public space of the nation.

While the text is rich in providing first person testimonies, I am conscious of being over reliant on this material and that that reliance on a single text may provide too "little" of a narrative. Nonetheless, the testimonies about islanders participation in Moving Star Hall, the Association, and the development of rhetorical education offer insights and narrative depth that cannot be ignored or matched in providing a substantive

portrait of Gullah islanders everyday life on Johns Island *by islanders* over the course of the first half of the 20th century, so I draw heavily on the material in this text, in particular on the material concerning the importance of Moving Star Hall and the Association in providing new rhetorical dwelling spaces for the islanders. The original recordings of the oral testimonies are housed in the Southern Folklife Collection at UNC-Chapel Hill, and I am currently working through that material to enrich the edited presentation of island testimony in the Carawans's text. To provide some context and to illustrate the significance of the association in creating new rhetorical dwelling spaces for the islanders, I position Moving Star Association within the historical practice of African American benevolent societies. By listening to the resonance of benevolent societies historical centrality in the lives of broadly dispersed African American communities of the nation, I hope to provide some depth to my engagement with material concerning Moving Star Hall and the Association.

By contrast, a study of the Citizenship School program is bolstered by the literacy of the principle actors in the development of the program. Highlander wrote substantive reports about the development of the program and attended closely to archiving letters, meeting minutes, workshop itineraries and other materials related to the program. Moreover, the importance of Highlander's work and the program in the Civil Rights Movement as a whole has resulted in intensive scholarly interest in the program.

From listening to the available materials in the archives and related materials, the two primary foci of the dissertation took shape, and both sides of the narrative – the imagining of the island by "outsiders" and islanders embodied practices of placemaking - have much to say about the role of space in shaping rhetorics of citizenship. In building

on spatial theory and the way that that theory has informed the field I use the materials to offer a portrait of a community working within the discursive traditions, shared history and knowledge, and everyday sites as embodied practices that would not only shape the idea of citizenship, but the ways that islanders could create a new ethos in the dwelling places of the island to bring the community to a presence in the island, the Lowcountry, and more broadly in the nation.

Section 1: Imagining the Islands

Chapter Two

The Production of Space and Citizenship

In this section I start with a wide-ranging premise: that the production of space is deeply connected with how we understand citizenship. On the surface this seems like a facile statement. We can point to the historical precedent of segregation as an obvious example of how a strict dichotomy between first and second class citizenry persisted between African Americans and whites. Signs denoting "whites only" and "colored" apportioned public spaces between the races. Narratives of the Civil Rights Movement are rife with instances of violence, charismatic leaders, and monumental events that draw our attention to the sea change in legal rights achieved through the movement. This attention to the spectacles of the Civil Rights Movement allow us to imagine a body of citizenry moving in concert towards a more equitable nation. The marking of the temporal space of the Civil Rights Movement as a historically specific narrative suggests both a beginning and an end to the struggle. Far too often though this simple dichotomy translated to an emphasis on achievements in voting, literacy, and equality - access to legal rights - without offering a more nuanced portrait of how "habits of citizenship" (Allen) shape, problematize, and, I want to argue, offer ways of envisioning relationships between the nation's citizenry differently to address the resolution of legacies of inequality.

An attention to the role of space in shaping citizenship usefully transforms the discussion of citizenship as a set of rights and legal procedures, to include a discussion of not only how and where citizens perform citizenship but who is sanctioned, or not, to

perform citizenship in public spaces and what constitutes the performance of citizenship. Allen usefully calls attention to space in defining *habits of citizenship* as "the basic habits of interaction in public spaces"(5); the "unspoken norms for interaction that constrain who can speak where in public and how"(6). Allen's definitions framing citizenship as a performance of "habits" usefully suggests that citizenship takes on a more expansive definition that includes not only citizenship duties (voting for example) but also those practices of shared sociability that are central to citizenship being performed in everyday life. While her definition is useful, it is similarly constraining in framing "public spaces" as the contested sites of a dominant public sphere. Allen notes that "For decades, white Southern citizens had been accustomed to maintaining *key public spaces* as their exclusive possession"(4). To illustrate her point, Allen uses the example of a young African American girl, Elizabeth Eckford's entry in 1957 to the previously white, but now legally integrated, Central High School in Little Rock. Certainly, her example bears out her definition, by discussing the contested entry of Elizabeth Eckford to a site that was a critical and recurrent source of contestation over claims to citizenship, the integrated space of schools in America. In this chapter and the next, I want to draw on and also trouble this definition of public spaces by looking at how the production of space on Johns Island in the Sea Islands constrained citizenship, and how the production of space might be understood differently in the margins of Island life by "bringing to light" islanders' practices of citizenship inside the space of the margin[4]. Doing so does

[4] My use of "light" here and throughout reflects a common trope in spirituals and African American literature. Moreover, it appears in Septima Clark's narratives (*Echo* 96, 167), and reappears in islanders' songs and discussions of the changing possibilities on the island (see Bligen in Carawan; see also Robinson's interview with Olendorff).. Throughout the dissertation, I refer to the African American Gullah communities of the island as "islanders." I do this for several reasons: 1) to reflect the historical fact that African Americans constituted the majority of island residents up until the mid 1970s; 2) to acknowledge

two things: it expands how we understand the performance of citizenship by expanding our conception of citizenship to include those spaces out of view of whites invested in "maintaining key public spaces," and it also allows us to bring these practices into a new way of thinking publics and publicity.

In this chapter I am particularly concerned with how spatial rhetorics of the island are produced, received, and responded to by constituencies that frame the islanders as their rural, "primitive" other: the white community of the islands and the African American community of nearby Charleston. I address this in two parts, first by looking at how the island space is produced in rhetorical artifacts of the island; and secondly by looking at how that production of space circulates discursively and has material effects beyond the islands. I examine the production of dominant space in the islands by reading two maps of the island produced by white members of the community, a white plantation owner and a surveyor representing state interests. The maps offer what de Certeau discusses as a voyeuristic view from above, offering a synecdoche of African American and white lived, material relations in the socially produced space of the islands. I argue that the maps illustrate a socially produced space in which the presence of white culture, values, and economies are constitutive of citizenship in the islands. Complementing this position, I argue that the maps leave only traces of the African American Gullah community of the islands, effectively denying this population a presence in the space of the islands and disembodying the population's position and embodied placemaking practices as citizens. Yet the difficulties white spatialities pose

---

that a large percent of the white population on the island was historically transient, living on the islands at certain times of the year to avoid the difficulties of the climate - mosquitos, disease, etc. 3) to acknowledge and mark the text with the embodied placemaking islanders engaged in as a rhetoric of citizenship.

for Gullah communities to develop first class citizenship have a force beyond the immediate spaces on the islands.

In the second section of the chapter I demonstrate how the production of island spatialities circulates discursively outside of the islands and reproduces the relations of presence and absence on the islands in the city space of Charleston by listening to Septima Clark's narrative of Charleston African American's attitudes about the islands and islanders. I argue that the Charleston African Americans' reception and assimilation of narratives defining the produced space of the islands reproduces the "view from above" of white spatialities seen in the maps and has material effects for islanders entering and moving in city space. By enframing islanders in a discourse of rural otherness, Charlestonians perform "habits of citizenship" that constrain island and islander subjectivities, knowledge, and rhetorical traditions to another absence in city spaces, problematizing efforts to build affiliative relations between island communities and the, comparatively, resource rich African American communities of Charleston. The production, circulation, and acceptance of the discursive and materially produced spaces of the island by white communities and Charleston African American communities offers a simple dichotomy for understanding how spatial rhetorics constrain citizenship practices by denying islanders a place to stand.

Clark, however, offers another narrative that problematizes this simple binary relationship of presence and absence by offering a perspective from "on the ground." I conclude the chapter with a discussion of Clark's narrative of well-respected islander committed to servicing the island communities, Esau Jenkins, being invited to speak about the difficulties in the islands to a Charleston audience. Here, I am interested in how

a view from the ground offers the possibility for engaging the production of space in order to disrupt established epistemologies and establish a thirdspace, neither absence or presence but a tactical engagement with ways of knowing that offers the potentiality of imaging and producing space differently. What is most instructive for my purposes in Clark's narrative about Jenkins speech is the suggestion that there is a deep connection between the experience of space, rhetorical practices, and epistemologies that suspend the praxis and force of the production of space.

Mapping Island space

Between the years of 1826 and 1836, plantation owner Kinsey Burden set out to map the plantation lands of Johns Island. Burden himself was an important figure in the economies of the Islands. Not only did he own two large plantations, but also he was responsible for introducing the primary strain of high quality cotton grown on the islands

Figure 1: Kinsey Burden's Map of Johns Island in 1836. Courtesy of Charleston Library Society.

into the 1920s when it would be decimated by a boll weevil epidemic (Preservation Consultants Inc.). In his map, he marks the boundary lines of 67 plantation tracts covering the entire landscape of the island.

Figure 2: Mary Clark's map of Johns Island in 1934. Courtesy of South Carolina Historical Society.

In 1934, nearly 100 years later, long after the end of the reconstruction era, Mary Clark compiled a property map of Johns Island and Wadmalaw Island for J.T. Kollock Inc reflecting the, then, current land ownings. The map traces the new property lines of the islands, and while the names on the property tracts have changed, the new owners are largely descendants of the former plantation owners noted in Burden's map (Haynie 19). Together the maps offer a portrait of the islands' economic and racial geographies spanning almost a century of land ownership and farming practices. Moving from the

antebellum era of slavery to the post reconstruction era of the early 20th century the maps also provide images of how the spaces of the islands were mapped by lines of power tied to the regions' capacity to produce agricultural goods; they are, in short, maps of dominant spaces conceived and imagined out of the white spatial praxis of the respective eras in which they were created. Denis Wood notes that maps are rhetorical imaginings of material spaces that represent a vested interest by selectively rendering visible (and leaving invisible) facets of social space (Power of Maps 1). Burden and Clark's maps reflect this vested interest in shaping the social life of the islands by joining the terms of citizenship to a legacy of white land ownership and institutions, like slavery during the antebellum era and subsequently in the continued production of space by white spatialities in the praxis of the James Island Agricultural Society during reconstruction and beyond.

As rhetorical artifacts, maps reflect a process of securing territory through the sanctioning power of a particular aegis with the power to monitor and mediate the use of that space. Maps “secure” territory in that they 1) provide a right to the land by setting boundaries; and 2) as bounded spaces, they provide security: under the aegis of a recognized body of power they mitigate threat and transgressions against the sovereign claims of the land owner. In *Geographies of Exclusion* Sibley discusses how spatial production/boundary construction helped articulate "who is felt to belong and not to belong,” a process which "contributes in an important way to the shaping of social space"(3). In doing so, maps reflect a geography of power sanctioning acceptable uses of the land, promoting/making legible cultural values and narratives, and setting the terms of citizenship in the bounded territories by identifying bodies that can move within those

spaces. As figures of white geographies of power the maps are particularly insightful for how the representation of the economic conception of the island maps the presences and absences of island residents, providing a stark portrait of how citizenship is bound to ownership of the spaces of production. In the spaces of the islands the terms of citizenship are particularly clear as the maps offer an embodied presence to white landowners, and consign African Americans to a disembodied margin.

We get a clear picture of the kinds of rhetorical work that Burden's and Gaillard's maps do in considering the production of island spaces, as they existed under slavery and in the post reconstruction era. In Burden's map of 1836, the African American presence on the island is literally positioned outside of the space of the island in the map's legend. Burden notes the population of the island: "190 whites; 2,666 negros slaves; 6 free negros"; with an additional notation of the ratio of "1 white: 14 blacks." African Americans are nameless, a mass sum representing the majority of the island's residents. Along the left edge of the map, next to the population key, the legend includes an indexed list of the proper names and titles of the white landowners that gives the map its definitional power. In identifying the absent spaces with proper names and titles, the map effectively produces an embodied space of the island for white citizens, while simultaneously conceiving of African Americans as a nameless, faceless, disembodied mass. African American presence is both outside of and disembodied, but a significant, marked, constitutive part of the island. In Galliard's maps, African Americans are similarly disembodied: a small space of James Island is labeled "negroes." One source notes that in the map "The smaller plots owned by African Americans are not detailed"(Bonstelle). While many African Americans had acquired their own land during

and after Reconstruction, the system of tracts developed from the plantation era persists in the maps of the islands, reproducing the praxis of a white spatiality and effectively disembodying African American presence on the islands. As Sibley suggests, the conception of an economically conceived and produced space has profound affects on the experience of social and cultural life in the (socially) produced (economically framed social) spaces of the islands. Beyond securing the territory, the reduction of island life to a rational ordering of island space reflecting a history of slave economics leaves, at best, a trace of African American presence, constituting "who is felt to belong and not to belong"(3).

In Burkean terms, the maps provide a constitutive identification (19-27) for white islanders, whose culture, values, and histories are legible in the (re)production of space. Reducing the visibility of the African American presence on the islands, offers a totalizing system of white culture, values, economies, and political practice. In short, the production of space, as it is imagined from the maps, leaves African Americans with seemingly no place to stand; the material and metaphoric spaces of African American life - culture, values, exigencies, language, and belief - are illegible in the production of dominant space. Citizenship in the islands, then, is tied to the historical ability to command and produce space, particularly as citizenship claims have been tied to a history of economics and racial subjugation (the two cannot be disentangled) granting some bodies of people citizenship, while denying others the selfsame sets of practices. To claim citizenship and access to the resources of citizenship in dominant space requires the right to claims of sovereignty and cultural presence, as the maps reflect in the historical process of marginalizing specific populations from presence in Island life. Like the land,

the production of space in the maps suggests citizenship is something that is "owned," and not necessarily practiced, a point to which I will return below.

Maps offer a useful way of thinking about how ways of knowing “place” circulate. In no small part, the rhetoric of these maps performs dominant space by crafting an absolute space divorced from the lived experience of islanders. Absolute space, Harvey has noted "is the space of private property and other bounded territorial designations" like the "state, administrative units, city plans and urban grids" (Space as a Keyword 2). It is a particular way of imagining and conceiving of space. The absolute space of the maps offer a historical overview of particular ways of imagining the islands, their purposes, their use, the relationships between the people inhabiting the material space, and the presence or absence of islanders in dominant social space. However, employing a rhetoric of geometric lines, measurement, and marginalia (legends, the proper names of stakeholders, etc.), maps employ a truth function to argue that the absolute representation of space is a neutral rendering of how space actually exists. The presentation of space “as it is” through these logics reduces any ambiguities or uncertainties, smoothing over the contestatory nature of space. Herein lies another power for absolute space to produce dominant space.

Absolute space produces a representation of space that detaches “ways of knowing” place from the multiform life on the ground. In this case, the maps do not simply offer a way of imagining island spaces through the eyes of a dominant position, from above, as it were. The absolute space of the maps offer a cognitive map that reduces the complexity of everyday life in the islands to a measurable, territorial - and we should note, seemingly neutral - rendering of white values, beliefs, and economies. The

discourse so produced is a way of knowing the islands divorced from the islanders' experiences, knowledge, traditions, and practices of citizenship on the islands - those very aspects of everyday life that might give the lie to the vested interest of the "as is" and restore a multiplicity of narrative positions to the monophonic narrative of absolute space. What absolute space suggests, and in this case the maps evince, is that the narratives informing how we know "place" circulate freely, providing a cognitive map of "place" with no need for a connection to the lived lives in their local origins. The effects of this can be problematic. As Harvey notes, the imaginary offered by absolute space is tied to power - the state, urban planners, etc. - and so has a vested interest in shaping narratives organized around binary relations about who belongs and who does not belong, who is present and who is absented, who is a citizen and who is silenced in dominant space. In the next section I will take this idea up and look at how the production of absolute island space circulates discursively with material effects in reproducing the binary relations of island dominant space in spaces outside of the islands.

The Discursive Circulation of Place and the Material Consequences

Drawing from her tenure in servicing island communities Clark offers a critical understanding of the island spaces, Gullah culture, and the struggle for citizenship in the islands, as evidenced in her narratives of the practices of islanders seeking to transform their position as citizens in the islands as well as the nation (discussed below). Yet we also get a sense in her narratives of the rhetorical force the production of space on the islands had in shaping the representation and lives of African American islanders, not only on the island when she discusses the high illiteracy rates and disenfranchised sense

of islanders own political sovereignty: “In those days no Negro entertained any idea of voting, and that was true even after the Democratic Party primaries were ordered opened to Negroes” (50); but also in how the dominant representation of island Gullah culture and African Americans circulated from the rural space of the islands to the urban communities of Charleston. For many Charlestonians the circulation of discourse about the islands would constitute the entirety of their knowledge of the islands. Clark recalls, "Growing up in Charleston we knew little about these islands or the people on them. From time to time we would see stories in the papers about them and often we would hear snatches of weird tales told about them by fishermen, and other seamen who had visited them.” They would see “them from the docks at Charleston” (33) with few occasions to venture into the islands or interact firsthand with the islanders themselves. Having little first hand experience with the islands or islanders everyday life, for many Charlestonians, the material sites and traditions undergirding everyday life of the island were manifest and reproduced solely in the circulation of narratives about the islands

As an insider she offers a fairly incisive critique of how the island was viewed as a space apart from the privileged position of the mainland, a perspective reflecting the ideology of white supremacy not only in the white population of Charleston, but in the assimilation of these discourses into the African American population of Charleston’s own way of viewing the islanders as well, many of who looked on the islanders as "primitive” (143). Given the isolation of the islands from the mainland and the difficulty of traveling through the islands throughout the antebellum era and into the middle 20th century when the islands were opened to more traffic with the development of new bridges and new transportation infrastructures, the islands and the African American

population on the islands were broadly perceived as complacent and lazy, as well as lacking critical resources, education, and, in a broadly conceived critique of Gullah culture, civilization. Conceiving of the islanders as "primitive," "These [African American] Charlestonians' attitude toward the poor Johns Islanders was like the attitude of many white persons toward the more backward Africans" (142). William Saunders, an islander active in the citizenship initiatives of the 50s and 60s, recalls of his time bussing into schools in Charleston in the middle 20th century, "Black people from Charleston used to regard us islanders as country people. They used to look down on us"(Sea Islands Then and Now 489). For many Charlestonians, these perceptions were definitive ways of mapping an otherness onto the bodies of the islanders. "Most people would take one look at me," Saunders recalls, "and hear me and automatically say I was stupid, because they think if you speak country, then you're automatically stupid" (491). Few of the Charleston African American communities had much interaction with the islands, instead, relying on the discourse of white supremacist space to enframe islanders visiting city spaces and to perpetuate a fixed, "gaze from afar" – a view from above (de Certeau) - of the islands themselves[5]. In evoking the self same supremacist discourse of Jim Crow spaces used to limit and constrain African Americans in Charleston, Charlestonians rhetorically invoke a mythic discursive conception of island peoples and spaces to mark islanders' bodies with a rural otherness, an otherness that is founded on class differences, as we will see.

The attitudes about the islanders in Charleston reflect these spatial tropes, as the acceptance of dominant discourses about the islands serves to re-produce the selfsame

[5] Omi and Winant usefully characterize this process of inventing the islanders by enframing them in a racialized discourse as a "racial formation": ""the process by which social, economic and political forces determine the content and importance of racial categories, and by which they are in turn shaped by racial meanings"(61). See Racial *Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*.

marginalizing discourse that disembodied the rural people and island spaces on the maps in material ways. As late as the mid 1950s, Clark notes that women she worked with were so susceptible to the colonizing mythos of the islands in Charleston discourse that when she would petition members of her sorority to help with a health program on Johns Island, "invariably these women would have excuses for not going" (142); despite their absence of interaction with the islanders “they didn't like the people on the islands and didn't want to be seen associating with them" (143). Exasperated by Clark's activities in the islands, she would repeatedly be told, "I just can't see how you can do it" (143). The islands are draped in a widely accepted discourse, linking “primitive” conceptions of the islanders to ideologies of fear and risk that problematize developing productive models for expanding the resources available in the city to service the islanders: Clark had to rely on “debs” in her sorority who did not have the luxury of refusing the opportunity for service to further her work on a health care program serving Johns Island. For her colleagues in Charleston, "the islands were taboo" and "they wouldn't be caught out on those islands after dark." The islands embody an affront to the city body, particularly to the gendered, classed body of her colleagues: "Nobody would respect a woman," Clark was told, " who would stay out there in one of those islanders homes overnight" (143).

Clark is highly conscious of the material effects of the circulation of dominant island discourse about the islands and islanders. In a summative comment, Clark offers her most scathing and direct critique of Charleston attitudes, which is worth quoting at length:

> Most of the Charleston women still feel that way about the islanders. Charleston still follows the old ways; the city and its people, Negro as well

> as white, don't change fast. The caste and class system continues to rule; hasn't yet taken in the islanders socially; the Negro Charlestonians feel that the island folk are far beneath them on the social ladder. (143)

In Clark's comment on her colleagues and the space of Charleston, urban space is posed against rural spaces, using class as a principal axis of difference; that the citizens of Charleston were similarly subject to Jim Crow practices as the island is left critically uninterrogated. City space, and consequently the Charlestonian women's place in the city, is circumscribed by middle class values[6]. The issue, here, as in the maps is a matter of "caste," marking who belongs in the city and who is different and does not, whose presence threatens the ideology of a middle class ethos. As a class issue, the imposition of "taboo" and "primitive" is instructive. The embodied life and culture of the islanders, in its difference and marginalization in the production of dominant narratives, calls forth the association of the racialized body with the hallmarks of supremacist ideology: that African Americans are ignorant, uncivilized, incapable, second class citizens, and so forth. Clark's comments have much to say about the production of dominant space. The ready acceptance of dominant discourse about the islands and the islanders illustrates the homogenizing force of the production of space. Leveraging a discourse of otherness on rural spaces effectively fragments the shared political reality of African Americans' social position in the Jim Crow south. The islanders are not only alien, or other, in their "otherness" they are an affront to the subject position/social space of the city and the subject-ed citizenship position of the African Americans in the city (geographically different from the rural islanders, but still absent in, other-ed by the dominant discourse

[6] For a different discussion of how middle class values were used to disrupt Jim Crow practices, develop a claim for presence, and establish community, see Mamie Garvin Fields; also Clara Juncker on Fields.

of a Jim Crow city). Furthermore, as Saunders and Clark note, for islanders entering the space of the city, there is material risk: to enter the city they enter as a disembodied absence. The space of the city reproduces dominant discourse about the islands and islanders, rendering the potentially presencing figure of the islanders' body in the city another absence.

Imagining Space Differently

In Clark's narrative, Charlestonian attitudes are, importantly, the reconstitution and imposition of a view from afar, a view which de Certeau and Lefebvre both note is one outcome of the homogenizing *tendency* of the production of space, whether it be the voyeuristic view from above (de Certeau) or the leveling of social space by powers that have access to the resources necessary to perpetuate the production of social space. "On first inspection [social space] appears homogenous," Lefebvre writes, "and indeed it serves those forces which make a tabula rasa of whatever stands in their way, of whatever threatens them–in short, of differences. These forces [first and second spaces] *seem* to grind down and crush everything before them, with space performing the function of the plane, a bulldozer or a tank" [emphasis added] (285). The homogenizing attitudes of the Charlestonians is perpetuated in part by the limited occasions for interacting with the islanders, heard about in "weird" tales of fisherman and seen primarily at a distance "from the docks in Charleston" (Clark 33). However, Clark's biographies and the resistant attitude to the discourse of Charleston in Saunders' own testimony suggest that the homogenizing tendency of the production of space not only provides the possibility to think otherwise about the "truth" value of the dominant discourse of the islands, but a

suggestion that the marginalized positions in the production of space provides the mechanisms, knowledge, and tools needed to initiate this possibility in the lived response to space (what Lefebvre calls representational spaces and which Soja theorizes as third space).

Lefebvre argues that while the production of social space *tends* towards homogenization, the lived response to social space also "contains potentialities - of works and of reappropriation -… responding above all to the demands of a body 'transported' outside itself in space, a body which by putting up resistance inaugurates the project of a different space (either the space of a counter-culture, or a counter-space in the sense of an initially Utopian alternative to actually existing 'real' space)"(349). The production and re-production of dominant space "transports" the body outside of itself by denying the placemaking potentiality of a lived, bodily response to the "institutional and ideological superstructures" (349) organizing social space. As the maps of the island suggest, and the reception of dominant discourse in the city seems to reinforce, the production of space operates by disembodying the presencing potentiality of "differences"; in this case the material, cultural, and geographic differences of the islands as they are mapped onto the islanders' bodies as a "rural otherness." Islanders entering the city enter already enframed by the received discourse and material relations of dominant space, positioned as others "far beneath [Charlestonians] on the social ladder." The movement in city spaces is not, as Saunders and Clark both illustrate, without material effects. Intimately familiar with the disembodying practices of the island, "transported outside itself in space," islanders had long been accustomed to moving in dominant space and had ready experience in employing tactical practices of resistance in

carving out alternative social spaces and appropriating dominant discourse on the islands. Despite the disdain Saunders has for being constrained by a "rural otherness" in the public schools of Charleston, he used the opportunity to open new possibilities for himself, and in participating in the development of the Citizenship Education Program on the islands in the late 1950s would play a significant part in transforming the opportunities of islanders in the struggle for First Class Citizenship.

In a brief but telling anecdote, Clark narrates how the very discourse which enframes the islanders in city space serves as a site for the reproduction of white spatiality and rural otherness *as well as* a tactical site to cunningly "put up resistance" and "inaugurate the production" of new spaces for differences to establish new affiliations between the islanders and Charlestonians. In the mid 1950s, Clark invited Esau Jenkins, a Gullah resident of Johns Island to speak on a panel at the Charleston YWCA. Jenkins was a noted personage in the islands and had long been a central figure in the movement for first class citizenship on Johns Island. By the 1950s Jenkins had established financial independence on the islands as a truck farmer, had invested in business ventures and real estate in Charleston, and had founded the Progressive Club to address voting conditions on the island, an organization which evolved out of the community practices of the Moving Star Hall praise house and which would, in 1957 provide the space for the first Citizenship School classes. Concerned about the limited opportunity for education on the island, he had bought a bus to transport island children to the high schools in Charleston and women and men to jobs as domestics and laborers in Charleston. Jenkins was both intimately familiar with Charleston and used the resources of the city to transform opportunities for himself as well as his community.

Yet, despite the ethos Jenkins had established in island and city communities, Charlestonians expressed dismay when Esau Jenkins was invited to speak at the Charleston YWCA. “Why in the world," Clark was asked "would they have a fellow like that, a fellow from Johns Island who can't even speak good English, come over to speak at the YWCA?"(143). Like Saunders, Jenkins is marked by a rural otherness. Despite his ethos in the islands, his Gullah dialect serves as a way to map onto his body the primary discourse available to the Charlestonians: marking him as “primitive,” “taboo,” Jenkins’ Gullah language is another way of absenting Jenkins presence in Charleston. “Good English” serves as a way of reiterating middle class values of propriety and worthiness by affiliating language practices with intellectual capability, “rightness,” and the right to speak, to be present in Charlestonian rhetorical space.

While Jenkins was perceived by Charlestonians as an embodiment of “primitive” island culture, his presence on the panel and the effect Jenkins has on his audience is instructive for thinking about the tactical “potentialities” of lived space for opening new spaces through the use of a *cunning rhetoric*[7]. After hearing Jenkins speak, Clark notes, "It wasn't long before they had to recognize this 'illiterate fellow' from the islands"(143). Clark playfully reiterates the attitudes of the Charlestonian audience, but she does so with an acknowledgement of the difference his speech introduces into the rhetorical space of the panel. While it would be a mistake to suggest that Jenkins’s speech occasioned a radical shift in attitude - “the city and its people, Negro as well as white, don't change fast” Clark reminds us; his speech does open a new space by establishing an alternative presence in the discourse of the city when “they had to recognize him.” “Esau spoke and

[7] Mêtis, Detienne and Vernant notes is a cunning rhetoric. I mark the term here, simply to introduce the idea. I take up Mêtis and develop the discussion in the following chapter as a way of imagining space differently.

he did well," Clark notes. Jenkins employed his ethos from a marginalized position to narrate a new reality of life on the island and make new affiliations for the Charleston audience. "He had-an interesting story to tell," Clark remembers, "and he was enthusiastic and full of the work. […] And, do you know, in recent years the islanders actually have been helping pull up the Charlestonians, and much of it is due to the enthusiasm and willingness to work hard and never-give-up spirit of Esau Jenkins"(143). Denied the presence accorded fellow Charlestonians, Jenkins marginalized position in the city's discourse would not have been unfamiliar to him. As a resident on Johns Island, living in/under the voyeuristic gaze of a Jim Crow spatiality, Jenkins would have been well acquainted with moving in the absenting praxis of dominant space, "of responding to the demands of a body 'transported' outside itself in space"; and as his economic success and service and role in the island community suggest, he was similarly familiar with tactically mobilizing what I suggest is a cunning rhetoric (mêtis) in thirdspace occasions to effect change.

The anecdote about Jenkins offers a neatly framed narrative for how the production of space "contains potentialities" to be re-appropriated in "[inaugurating] the project of a different space": as an embodiment of Gullah space, Jenkins' enthusiasm, knowledge ("an interesting story to tell"), and commitment (he is "full of the work") disrupts the mapping of islander bodies with a "rural otherness" and compels recognition in his audience. In discussing the possibility of tactically mobilizing for change, David Harvey notes that until marginalized groups "learn how to confront the bourgeois power to command and produce space, to shape a new geography of production and social relations, it will always play from a position of weakness rather than strength" (Spaces of

Hope 48). Harvey upends the emphasis on history (in which African Americans are granted legal rights to citizenship, and so can be construed as citizens, with all the privileges and benefits that this designation entails) to argue that the terms of access and exclusion, dominance and subordination, citizen and non-citizen are tethered to the material and metaphoric ways of being in space as historically positioned subjects. Powell notes something similar, that "lived experience of place is so intimately linked to the experience of history [of place]" (129). In that the social is produced in and through space, the struggle for voice and presence occurs through the process of engaging and resisting the interpolation of dominant spatialities and the terms of participation deployed in the production of space and concomitant containment of spatialities. By setting the terms of citizenship and defining access to civic and economic spaces, the production of space manages and, as we see in Jenkins narrative, contains the rights and possibility for participating as first class citizens in the political spaces of the nation.

Clark's narratives of Charlestonian attitudes and islanders (Saunders, Jenkins) response to the "othering" praxis of Charlestonians suggests, as Brundage has noted, that for African Americans, space and public spaces are "the most important arena for struggles over public power, resources, and values"(6), and importantly over citizenship and presence in the nation. Central to the struggle to transform the production of dominant space, which maintains a marginal subject status in material and metaphoric ways, marginalized communities must "come to terms with the geographical as well as historical conditions and diversities of its own existence" (Harvey 48) as resources for the production of new spatialities; without the production of, in Soja's terms, these third spaces, marginalized communities "will be unable to define, articulate, and struggle for"

alternatives to the sanctioned subjectivities and practices of dominant spatialities. As I will discuss in the following chapter guided by Clark's walking tours of the island spaces and life, by adapting, or "coming to terms" with dominantly produced spaces and their sanctioned subjectivities, islanders have developed and taken part in a long standing tradition of embodied place making by creating discursive and material sites as rhetorical dwelling places. Yet, in the discourse of Charleston, these practices of responding to dominant space within the margin are noticeably absent.

Conclusion

Barber has suggested that how we conceive of the role of public civic spaces is vital to citizens efforts to make sense of their roles in a democracy; furthermore, how a space is conceived and "made sense of" in everyday life, shapes and delimits the opportunities for gathering and developing the praxis necessary to address community exigencies (Barber 47-48; see also Sennet). Yet, the question remains, when access to public spaces is constrained by race, class, or gender, when the material resources and spaces necessary to rhetorical action are prohibited, as a matter of law, how is a marginalized citizenry to insert themselves into a civic discourse, much less develop the "sense making," or place making practices that delimit the possibility of acting in that space as citizens, of the possibility for entering into a civic space and acting to address their needs? For African Americans in the antebellum era, during reconstruction, and in the Jim Crow south, this often meant inventing spaces and occasions to constitute the political subjectivity necessary to imagining (ala Lefebvre's artful response in lived space) themselves as agents acting in civic spaces conceived, produced, and discursively

circulated as spaces of exclusion by dominant spatialities. The persistent historical practices of inventing third spaces in African American communities as a means for acting and making sense of their role in American democracy gives us cause to revisit the entangled relationship between the rights and practices of citizenship and the production of dominant spaces, as evidenced in the maps of the islands and the way that island space and life is absented in the perpetuation of a rural otherness in Charlestonians reception of representations of the island from afar.

In tying citizenship to economic spaces, the maps reflect a practice of conferring the status of citizenship on particular bodies of people, blurring the practices of citizenship with the legal designation "citizen." Citizenship as reflected in the maps is a status, a cogent, fixed identity - "citizen" - that excludes as it sets the terms of participation. Thus, the proper names accorded territorial rights make “citizen” synonymous with “citizenship,” rendering citizenship a status, rather than a set of practices that might offer a more inclusive portrait of how citizenship is performed. In the city space of Charleston, the reproduction of rural otherness performs a similar practice. The circulation of representations characterizing islanders as primitive denies the traditions, epistemologies, and ways of being with/in island space that constitute islanders practices of citizenship. Rob Asen argues in his discourse theory of citizenship that rather than conceiving of citizenship as a status, something that is conferred on citizens, as a legal designation that they can possess and own, the historical practices of citizenship should compel us to conceive of citizenship not as a "what," something owned by a privileged body of people, but as a "how," a set of practices available in particular and diverse contexts to both “citizen” and those not recognized in dominant spaces as

citizens, the non-citizen, alike (203). Conceived in this way, citizenship is not a status conferred upon the individual but is rather a "mode of public engagement" that is "a fluid, multimodal, and quotidian process"(191). Citizenship is the process, as Barber notes, whereby citizens make sense of and enact their roles in a democracy, perform their "habits of citizenship." Citizenship is produced, not conferred.

The social turn in composition and rhetoric resounds with Asen's idea of a discourse mode of citizenship: social constructionism helps us to see webs of discourse as a means for constructing reality. By attending to citizenship as a discursive mode, we can recognize ways that acts of citizenship "may be enacted by non-citizens" as they engage in public activity (the habits of citizenship recognized or not by dominant members) in traditionally unrecognized practices, outside of the framework of a dominant public. Yet, the emphasis on language in the social turn has risked reducing "the things themselves...to a function of language" (Selzer 4). The spatial turn in composition and rhetoric has given us a new set of tools to understand how the material, and the imagined are inseparably intertwined with lived, bodily, or social life (see Lefebvre, Soja) and to account for the ways in which discursive practices draw on and reimagine material relations within particular social milieu. We might rephrase and clarify Asen's position here, from looking not at the *what* of citizenship but to the *how* of citizenship, to attending to the *how* and the *where* of citizenship, to the "examination of specific contexts of engagement" (205). Conceiving of citizenship as a spatial praxis allows for us to look at the deeply imbricated relationship between place and space and the bodies and practices that are sanctioned in the production of dominant space and in the tactical invention of third spaces, the new rhetorical dwelling places developed through

unsanctioned and unrecognized acts of placemaking. de Certeau has suggested that tactical responses to dominant space have no place, that they are made manifest in the movement of citizens, "always on the watch for opportunities that must be seized 'on the wing'" in dominant space (xix). Attending to the "hows" and "wheres" of citizenship compels us to re-examine those spaces, those "contexts of engagement" that allow for us to imagine the production of space differently, to re-examine ways that citizens mobilize tactical possibilities to open new spaces for understanding citizenship as a practice.

In the following chapter, I look at another way of imagining the spaces of the islands and islanders.

Chapter Three

Mêtis in Septima Clark's Walking Tours of Johns Island

In this chapter I want to return to the point made earlier that citizenship is produced, not conferred, by looking at how island space and citizenship practices are imagined differently through a lens of mêtis. Both the maps of Johns Island and the circulation of arguments in Charleston about place based on an absolute conception of space are examples of how dominant spatialities produce a way of being in space that perpetuates a binary relationship between center and margin, between citizenship and primitive, between self and other. If absolute space produces a binary system of powers that shape the possibilities and conception of citizenship in discursive and material ways, we might wonder, what are some of the tactical resources available for placemaking? What might be gleaned and theorized about mêtis by developing a view from on the ground, rather than "from above"?

In this chapter, I use mêtis as a an embodied cunning rhetoric born of a tactical intelligence to theorize a spatiality that opens new possibilities for imagining the empty signifier of strategies' binary construction of place, the "others" of proper place. I read Septima Clark's walking tours of Johns Island in her autobiography *Echo in My Soul* to theorize ways that mêtis might be performed narratively to reveal habits of citizenship and to put them in relationship to the power of a strategic spatiality to offer new ways of imagining how we conceive of citizenship, its practice, and the spaces where habits of citizenship are performed. I argue that Clark employs a "wiley," "oblique" narrative

approach in using a cunning rhetoric (mêtis) in her autobiography to bring island communities to light in the nation.

After introducing Clarks walking tours, I develop a theory of mêtis as a practice of embodied placemaking in a close reading of de Certeau's framing of mêtis as a tactical intelligence. I then examine three sites where she cunningly troubles tropes of primitivism and "rural otherness." I start with her narrative of material conditions on the islands and argue that she disrupts the primitive trope by affiliating the conditions of the islands with a legacy of white spatial praxis. I then examine her attention to islander citizenship practices - what Allen calls "habits of citizenship" and Asen calls the "hows" of citizenship - in her narrative of islanders' social life. Her narratives of festivals and wakes reveal islander dwelling spaces as islanders are "placed" and "place" their bodies, traditions, and epistemologies in island space. In the final site, I focus on her narrative of Gullah and Lowcountry language geographies as a way of troubling the relationship between Gullah language, identity, and space. I conclude by arguing that in her movement through these sites, Clark employs mêtis as a rhetoric of citizenship to bring islanders into the imagined space of the nation in order to transform what Danielle calls the "habits of citizenship."

Earlier I suggested that Jenkins' talk in Charleston is an example of mêtis, a point that needs some unpacking here. Notably, in Clark's anecdote we have only a limited portrait of his speech, his performance of the narrative, and how it affected the Charlestonians. Jenkins is as enigmatic at this point in the narrative for the reader as he was for the Charlestonians. Their, and our, knowledge is incomplete; the narrative portrayal of the event though is suggestive in calling our attention to the trope of moving

in space as a (margin) spatial praxis: a means of producing new knowledge and responding to the logics of spatial rhetorics in invented geographies. Jenkins chooses to embody Charlestonians idea of the primitive body in speaking to them in Gullah. He then proceeds to re-envision the islands, narrating and inventing a new sense of place from his embodied experience. Jenkins uses a tactical intelligence developed from years of moving in and responding to marginalization in the white spaces of the island and Charleston to disrupt Charlestonians' mapping of primitive otherness onto his body. I am particularly interested in how Jenkins moves in his marginal place as a speaker to establish a thirdspace epistemology: he both arrives in city space and moves his audience to a new understanding of place from his own position "on the ground." Clark's narrative suggests that a deep connection exists between the experience of space, rhetorical practices, and epistemologies that suspend the praxis of spatial production. Moreover we see Jenkins "cunning" approach to re-envisioning place for his audience as a mobile, embodied placemaking practice for audiences that are denied a "place proper" (de Certeau) in publics to respond to the rhetorics of space.

Clark employs this trope of movement in her autobiography to take up and trouble conceptions of the islanders as primitive and uncivilized. Clark's entry to the island in her autobiography is illuminative for her choice to walk us into unknown space; we start with little but her own incomplete knowledge in 1916 of the islands "from afar." Written in 1962, Clark has had decades of work, directly and indirectly, with the spaces of the island, has lived there on several occasions, has become an integrated member of the community, is familiar with island traditions and knowledges, and working with the islanders' own expressed desires and needs has shaped the movement for first class

citizenship in multiple ways - a movement that she notes has had a significant effect on helping the very Charlestonians she critiques above mobilize for first class citizenship. She has, in short, a deep, if not "comprehensive," embodied knowledge to draw on of the islands, the islanders, their ways of knowing and being in the spaces of the island born out of her own lived experience as an islander in the subjugated/subjugating spatial praxis of the islands.

Yet, she chooses a walking tour over a synthetic, rational presentation of the islands. She moves the reader from the safety of knowable dominant space (the city) to the margin spaces of the island and island life, those absented spaces of the maps that reduce lives, knowledge, beliefs, and ways of being under the nominalization of proper and (im)proper nouns, to the incommensurable known and the unknowable, dominant and margin space. As she boards a ferry to be carried to her first teaching assignment on Johns Island, she, we, enter the islands with an incomplete, and partial knowledge. From this vantage point Clark is able to (re)produce a deeply textured, non-teleological experience of the islands. Partial, yes, but in that partiality she defies any essentializing practice that would fix the islands and islanders as "known" and risk reducing the islands and islanders' practices of citizenship to the logics of dominant space; the islands are, rather, only "knowable" through an unfixed recursive movement. Clark assumes a "thirdspace" in writing her narrative: conscious of being both "of Charleston" and, from her experience in island life, "of the island." In walking with her, navigating the landscape and sites of the islands, we bear witness to the citizenship practices of the islanders, blurring the dichotomy between margin and center, between citizen and non-citizen. Her choice in using the walking tour offers the reader the possibility of forming

consubstantial space with the islanders, an offering for identification with the islanders' movement for citizenship; she calls to the reader to co-invent and co-produce the space of the islands, islander life, and ultimately the nation from the narrative position of third space epistemology.

Mêtis: Cunning Rhetoric as Tactical Embodied Placemaking

de Certeau's distinction between strategies and tactics has oft been used to illuminate the ways that bodies produce resistant capabilities in places where they may have little or no power and little or no "place" (they are the "weak" in de Certeau's terms). de Certeau writes that a strategy is an operation of power that "assumes a place that can be circumscribed as proper (propre) and thus serve as the basis for generating relations with an exterior distinct from it" (xix). However, belonging to the "other," a tactic is a "calculus which cannot count on a 'proper' (a spatial or institutional localization).[...] because it does not have a place, a tactic depends on time - it is always on the watch for opportunities that must be seized 'on the wing'" (xix). In de Certeau's terms, Strategies reflect the capacity of a dominant powers to produce space and the relationships of that "place," whereas a tactic is a mobile, transitory *time based* practice that "insinuates itself into the other's place, fragmentarily, without taking it over in its entirety, without being able to keep it at a distance" (xix). "Whatever it wins," de Certeau writes of the momentary and propitious deployment of a tactic, "it does not keep"(xix). Yet, Clark's anecdote about Jenkins troubles this when she suggests that Jenkins work on the island and in Charleston has been instrumental in changing possibilities for Charleston African American communities; his speech does seem to

"keep."

In a study of slaves tactically adapting plantation space to develop new spaces from the habits of gathering in unsanctioned spaces, Lynn Stewart argues convincingly that tactics are not fleetingly deployed as a simple temporal act, but are inherently spatial as the way slaves habitually used space invest those places with unintended significance and meaning. I want to build on how she helps us rethink tactics by examining de Certeau's claim that tactics are *an intelligence*. I want to argue that tactical intelligence is a rhetorical attunement[8] to place developed through the habituated use of place in unsanctioned ways and employed to invent new ways of dwelling and new spaces in proper places, and so is deeply spatial[9]. Though tactics have their time in the spaces of proper places, de Certeau does not deal with the habituated use of these places, those habits of use that engender inventive practices in which an "intelligence…inseparable from the everyday" might conceive of and produce different spaces, spaces that may throw in question the order of a strategy, or produce spaces of another order entirely[10].

Little discussed in how de Certeau's discussion of tactics - as "ways of operating" - is taken up is his claim that "the Greeks called these 'ways of operating' mêtis" (xix),

---

[8] See also Leonard and Rickert for a discussion of rhetorical attunement.

[9] Reynolds writes that while "habitual pathways" are rich in signs of the built environment, through everyday use - habit- the signs of the built environment are no longer needed to move in social space (81); habit transforms the propriety of place into a space, "a practiced place" where "place" is made differently meaningful through the habituated iterations of walkers movement in "place" proper. We can understand habit then as an inventive practice, a way of finding possibilities to produce or know space differently. In Stewart, slaves took the presence of the woods on the plantation, an ordinary feature of the "proper place" of the plantation, and produced social space differently through new habits of use. Here I modify her term from habitual to habituated in order to emphasize habit as a production of different social space.

[10] See also, Brian Morris "What We Talk About When We Talk About Walking in the City " for a discussion of how the body-city relationship offers a "feedback" loop productive of new spaces.

that the Sophists were principle actors in employing rhetorical cunning, and that tactical intelligence extends to time immemorial in the adaptive cunning of plant life and fish that lends a "continuity and permanence" to the presence of these tactical, cunning intelligences (xx). de Certeau's theory of tactics reflect a deep familiarity with the largest extant study of mêtis done by Detienne and Vernant.

According to Detienne and Vernant in their seminal text on mêtis, *Cunning Intelligence in Greek Culture and Society*, "mêtis is a type of intelligence, a way of knowing" (3) that is "usually thrust into the shadows, erased from the realm of true knowledge" (4). However, its pervasive presence and influence lies "at the heart of the Greek mental world in the interplay of social and intellectual customs" (3) though its variable performance and form makes it difficult to quantify, as there is no single way in which it is performed, no philosophy of this "wiley intelligence," and no treatise on it, as there are treatments of logic and rhetoric. As de Certeau argues about tactics, mêtis "always appears more or less below the surface," employed in "practical operations" that do not reveal its form, though its traces are visible in the effects it achieves. As rhetoric, the cunning intelligence of mêtis is "a complex but very coherent body of mental attitudes and intellectual behavior" (3) encompassing "all forms of wiley intelligence and adaptable cunning" (3). The "wiley intelligence" performed through the "resourceful ploys and stratagems" of mêtis "combine flair, wisdom, forethought, subtlety of mind, deception, resourcefulness, vigilance, opportunism, various skills and experience"(3) in "transient, shifting, disconcerting, and ambiguous, situations which do not lend themselves to precise measurement, exact calculation or rigorous logic" (3-4). Though operating in "transient" situations , mêtis is not simply born of the moment, as de Certeau

has often been taken up. The cunning rhetor's intelligence is born of their experience with power and "weighty reflection" (16) about how best to respond to achieve the goals for the future. Taking the moment, looking to the future, cunning rhetoric (mêtis) "operates by continuously oscillating between two opposite poles…in a situation of confrontation" with the strategies of power (5), though its "wiley" approach may mask the rhetor's rhetorical purpose.

Rhetoric scholars have taken up the "wiley intelligence" of mêtis as a cunning rhetorical practice in a useful ways to theorize mêtis as an embodied tactical intelligence central to placemaking practices. In a discussion of pedagogy, Kopelson echoes Detienne and Vernant when she notes that mêtis "accepts and works within and because of its implication in power and precisely by eventually twisting that power against itself" (131). She argues that the rhetorical strength of mêtis lies in seizing **"**[the moment] with forethought, preparedness, and thus with foresight as to how events should unfold" (130). Tactics are thus, not momentary, but "ways of operating" with foresight to achieve new outcomes that change the t=strategy organizing "proper place." Fully situated in the strategies of power (a proper place), the "wiley intelligence" of mêtis responds to and imagines a course of action using a "twisting" intelligence to achieve its goals. As a fully situated response "of the weak" to power, we can suggest that mêtis usefully carves out a new space to realize the rhetor's goals. Kopelson though seems to view the intelligence deployed in "adaptable cunning" as a tactic, not necessarily a bodily art.

Hawhee, however, suggest otherwise in her project to recuperate the role of the body in rhetoric. "Thought does not just happen within the body," she writes, "it happens as the body…thought isn't just 'embodied' – it is bodily" (58). Thus for Hawhee, mêtis is

“a tacit style of movement” calling attention to “the very corporeality of mêtis”(47). For Hawhee, mêtis is developed out of the habituated training of the body, a point which is worth noting for thinking about the development of a bodily intelligence developed out of the habituated experience of everyday life. Dolmage, in a discussion of disability and body norms echoes Hawhee, noting “mêtis is a distinctly bodily intelligence” (119) developed out of the body’s movement in space. In extending Hawhee’s theory of the relationship between mind and body, Dolmage adds an explicitly spatial understanding of mêtis as a bodily intelligence: "mêtis is an application of ingenious bodies to the problems the world presents, answering the shifting contexts of existence with shifting rhetorical, mechanical, and corporeal positions" (129). Dolmage has noted that the “distinctly bodily intelligence” of “mêtis values bodily difference as generative of meaning” (121) and "as a rhetorical framework, a way to move, rhetorically” (135). While he draws on Detienne and Vernant’s discussion of Hephaestus’ "bodily difference” to critique and question the limits of a hegemonic, normative conception of the body for expanding work in disability studies, his discussion of marginalized bodies as a construction of normative values seems eminently applicable for theorizing mêtis as an embodied rhetorical practice of African American bodies enframed by an absenting spatial praxis or marked by a primitive “rural otherness.”

The shift to theorizing mêtis as an embodied, tactical intelligence productive of ways of moving in and inventing new spaces by rhetoric scholars helps reframe some of the way we understand the possibility for tactics as embodied placemaking. By tying tactical practices to mêtis de Certeau offers a way of re-introducing the body into space as a productive geography. The tactical embodied intelligence of mêtis, as a response to

the fixity of strategies and the production of space, Hawhee argues, “invokes an idea of intelligence as immanent movement" (48), and as Dolmage argues “a way to move rhetorically.” In fortuitous moments the cunning rhetor moves between poles of power with the recognition that these practices of power are not immaterial; rather, the placedness of mêtis, the effort to transform rhetorical space, the response to a particular conditions that demand an inventive response (lest the cunning rhetorician “loses”), calls attention to the ways that mêtis makes use of material environments, whether it is a bodily intelligence (responding to being transported outside of the body in absolute space), a way to move rhetorically in the production of space, or a setting on oblique trajectories the forces of power that bend the panoptic vision to hide new spaces “in them” or to reveal new spaces that require us to reconsider the strategies of a proper place.

Clark employs just such an oblique movement from her thirdspace position in her narratives. de Certeau’s discussion of narrativity as mêtis usefully accounts for how Clark invites the audience to “move with her” in island space as she uses a cunning rhetoric to narrate island life and offer a new way of imagining island geography and the placemaking practices of islanders’ citizenship practices. Not limited to the improvisatory tactics of the everyday, "storytelling narrativity is also something like mêtis" (de Certeau 82). Employing mêtis, "The story does not express a practice. It does not limit itself to telling about a movement. It makes it. One understands it, then, if one enters into this movement oneself" (81). For de Certeau, the storyteller "follows [their stories] in all their twists and turns and detours, thus exercising an art of thinking...with the 'curved' movement of these stories" (81) as they "[undo] the proper place" (82). The story is a

movement both in space, as the narrator follows twisted pathways, and of space, as the narrator “makes” and reimagines place. de Certeau notes that "narrated history creates a fictional space" (79) in which "the theory of practices takes precisely the form of ways of narrating them" (80). In narrating the islanders’ practices of citizenship through her time in the islands, Clark does not simply give expression to a tactical practice, but "makes it" an embodied experience – gives it a “place” - through her narratives so that "one enters into this [tactical] movement oneself" (81). In narrating the islanders' practices of citizenship she simultaneously, cunningly, making visible a new space in/to the nation.

Clark uses mêtis as practice of embodied placemaking to develop a rhetoric of citizenship. Clark's narratives cunningly blur the boundaries of territorial space (proper place) by introducing, posing, and demonstrating island practices to the national imaginary, as becomes evident in how she frames her narratives of the islands in a national vision: “I am convinced that the advancement of our lowly ones to the opportunities of first class citizenship also will lift to a better life those who now enjoy a higher status”(Echo in My Soul 48). Clark’s invitation to walk with her in island space is an invitation to dwell in new ways, making use of the very strategies of power to re-view them.

Primitive/Not Primitive

Thus in her walking tours she uses the very facets of the island life that would have been repeated in dominant discourse about the island community. Indeed, she admits that they were "primitive," much as her Charlestonian colleagues had argued; although, importantly, she qualifies this by observing that they "were not so much

immoral; I would describe them as unmoral, primitive" (49). Her need to qualify the discourse of the city opens a new space. Rather than imposing the un-interrogated discourse of the city on the bodies of the islanders, she positions the material lives of the island in relation to white spatialities that have generated a body of disenfranchised and impoverished communities. She notes that there were unwed mothers "everywhere" (49) and "large numbers of... ill-fed and improperly cared-for illegitimate babies" (50). Without the conveniences of modern sanitation seen in the resource rich city, disease on the islands ran rampant among the islanders. The changing economic conditions of the island stemming from a boll weevil epidemic that destroyed cotton farming on the islands radically transformed farming practices and left "older people" without the material resources needed and unable to "adjust to the situation" (50). Younger islanders, though, responded by using "the little schooling" they received in the impoverished educational opportunities available to leave the island and find jobs in Charleston or elsewhere (particularly New York) (50). Islanders had little voice in shaping the political realities of the island; reflecting a legacy of disenfranchisement "no Negro entertained any idea of voting" (50). Left un-interrogated, Clark's observations of the social and material conditions on the island risk reproducing the very discourse islanders had been subject-ed to in the white spatialities of the islands and city: primitive, uneducated, filthy[11].

Rather than simply reproduce this discourse, Clark cunningly affiliates her observations of "primitive" conditions with a legacy of deprivation resulting from the historic centrality of white spatialities in shaping the material conditions and limited access to resources on the island. The unwed mothers and improperly cared for babies

[11] See Sibley for a discussion of the association of the margin with tropes of disease, filth, and decay.

she descries as the result of "a great proportion of the population [being] desperately poor" (49-50) due to island economies. Similarly, the high rate of disease on the islands stemmed from islanders' economic conditions and limited access to resources. Islanders' poor diet stemmed from years of poverty and making do with what could be cultivated from the land after selling prime crops and fishing hauls at a disproportionately lower price than white farmers would garner for a similar yield. Not surprisingly, in the post emancipation space of the islands, when plantation owners were no longer invested in keeping a healthy population of slave labor working on the land, there were few, if any, health resources servicing the African American communities. Not until the late 20th Century would any health clinics be established on the islands. "Being isolated for so long," Clark writes, "these island folk knew very little about the few public service benefits that even the Negroes of the mainland had come to have" (51); even then, where proximity to the mainland on the larger islands made some services available, the difficulty of travel to the islands and the dispersed population resulted in doctor visits costing upwards of a hundred dollars (51). Tethered to a farm economy that kept islanders impoverished, few members of the community had the financial resources to enlist what scarce resources were available. In employing the discourse of primitivism to complicate the representations of islanders and the islands by connecting the material realities of lived life on the islands to a marginalizing spatial praxis Clark opens a space for imagining island realities and islanders' bodies differently from the vantage point of a third space epistemology. She offers a new way of knowing the islands by re-narrating and entangling the dominant, primitivizing tropes of the islands with a marginalizing spatial praxis. Clark cunningly moves between the two poles of dominant island

representations, bringing the unvoiced, silent, and invisible practices of lived life into the "light.” As a rhetorical trope, light suggests "presence,” “visibility,” and "legibility," offering a useful contrast to the "absence" and silencing of islanders’ lived life, culture traditions and epistemology (both in the production of dominant space and in the circulation of that discourse in the city) of a broader and richer material, realandimagined representation of the historical complexity of life in the space of the islands.

Were she to stop at this point, we would have, at least, a more complex portrait of island life that helps define the exigencies of a movement for citizenship. Alongside this, though, Clark’s walking tour offers a counter narrative of the islanders’ efforts to mobilize and make use of the limited resources available in the island, particularly in education and traditions of oratory.

Clark continues her discussion of "primitive" conditions on the island in discussing the complex conditions organizing children's education, her reason for being on the island. In her presentation of conditions shaping education on the island she not only troubles the trope of primitivism by tying conditions on the island to the legacy of material deprivation, but offers a narrative of uplift to demonstrate the island community engaged in a movement for sovereignty and first class citizenship through the development of a collaborative ethos. When Clark arrived on the island in 1916 to teach at Promise Land School, there were 14 schools serving the large African American population on the island. These schools were generally "constructed of boards running up and down, with no slats on the cracks"; "The board walls had been nailed up before the boards had been properly dried and I remember how on chill and damp days the wind often howled through the cracks between" (38). The schoolhouses themselves were

racialized spaces, as oftentimes these school houses would be painted with black creosote, signifying to all that these poorly built structures were the "black" schoolhouses and that education of the African American population was of secondary concern. Children's attendance was governed by the island farm economies, "and while the crops were being harvested, as a rule only the children too young to work in the fields were allowed to come to school" (36). On rainy days, Clark notes, attendance would be larger, but "if by noon the sun came out, the plantation overseer would ride up to school and call for the tenants' children" (36). The poorly constructed structures and the farming cycle were not the only ways that education on the islands was troubled.

For the students on the island, education was an embodied experience of the larger inequalities of spatial relations on the island. Despite there being 14 schools serving the African American Communities on the island, the dispersed settlement patterns meant that for many of the children schools were quite a distance from their homes, and the large African American population meant that teachers dealt with large numbers of students of widely varying age and skill set. In Clark's schoolhouse 132 students were cramped into the small hall. "Some Johns Island children," she notes "walked eight or ten miles a day to attend school" (36) Her own "feet were horribly frostbitten from the long walk in the cold and the chill schoolroom all day" (55). Once in the school house, students sat on "a few crude benches without backs" that had been built by "an unskiled carpenter" (36), leaving "the poor youngsters slumped on these benches with their little legs dangling, their feet inches from the floor" (36). The poorly constructed structure further troubled education of islander youth. In the two room schoolhouses, a centrally located chimney opened onto either room, and in the one room

schoolhouses, an open fireplace at one end heated the whole space. Lessons were interrupted when "the school children themselves had to go out and get the wood and keep the fires going" (36). The uneven heating of the fireplace "cooked the pupils immediately in front of it but allowed those in the rear to shiver and freeze on their uncomfortable, hard, back-breaking benches" (38). On blustery days, "the wind blowing down the chimney would send the smoke spiraling back into the room"(39). Here, as before, Clark troubles the idea of a "primitive" population by demonstrating how sites of education reproduced the relations of dominant space.

Yet, islander adults collaborated with Clark in transforming sites of education - both in the schoolhouse and in the extra curriculum - into spaces of hope for the islanders. Against the material conditions embodying and troubling educating the youth on the island, Clark offers a narrative of uplift in discussing the development of a collaborative ethos with the adults she worked with on the island. Despite the secondary role education held for islanders in the praxis of dominant space of the islands, she felt islanders were deeply invested in the education of their children[12]. While the island schools were spartan in materials and islanders' contractual commitment to harvesting seasons meant that the school year was subject to a limited window as the children were pulled out of the school to help with harvesting, the adults she worked with saw the value in the possibility of education and found value in having African American teachers that

[12] Not all it should be noted, as the fraught legacy of illiteracy on the island troubled the relationship islanders had with institutions of dominant culture, including sites of education which had been historically taught by white women around a pedagogy of shame. Rather than emphasize this, Clark's narrative space acknowledges this while emphasizing a community based pedagogy based on the rhetorical trope of lifting up the community.

respected the island traditions and shared in their collective experience[13]. Moreover, adults, Clark recalls, respected and collaboratively built and shared an ethos with African American teachers on the island. Many of the adults on the island had limited education. After experiencing white teachers' disinterest and a pedagogy of shame, the arrival of an African American teacher in the community was received favorably. "When the teacher told them anything about their children," Clark writes, "however bad to them it might seem to be, they believed her. The teacher's word was not questioned, her reports were authoritative" (57). One of the difficulties facing Clark and her assistant in the one room schoolhouse was that the students ranged in age, experience and level of skill, which ultimately led to disruptions in the classroom as students felt unable to participate, discomfited by the material conditions of the schoolhouse (benches, smoke, uneven heating) bored, or disengaged with the material. The parents respect for Clark's commitment to the education of all Island students allowed for a collaborative ethos to develop which expanded the space of the classroom into the social life of the home, a relationship "that lessened the problems related to discipline" (57), allowed students to focus on their education, and allowed Clark to develop a pedagogy working with the variable skill sets the students brought to the classroom.

Placing Bodies in Island Space

"Sometimes I close my eyes and see those folks way back there almost half a century. [...] From a primitive people they have advanced to become a pattern for progress" - Septima Clark, Echo in My Soul 173

[13] See hooks *Yearning* for a discussion of how the importance of a shared history in margin spaces shaped the development of resistant and empowered subjectivities in the classroom.

As demonstrated by the absence of public spaces in the maps and the general absence of knowledge in Charleston of the nearby islands and islanders, perhaps one of the least visible aspects of island life was the occasions for social gathering. Simply "not included" on the maps or subsumed underneath the epistemological trope of primitivism in Charleston, the absence of any representational space for African American social life in the production of dominant space on the islands obscures from view the very practices that offer a different spatiality and illustrate a vibrant and rich tradition of island community based citizenship practices shaping the ethos of the islanders. Clark's narratives by contrast calls attention to these spaces and occasions for social gathering on the island that remain unrecognized in a view from above, but which illustrate the central role islander sociability played in shaping a community ethos. Ethos, Hyde has argued, develops primarily from a position or place in material, social environments - "the 'places,' 'habits,' and 'haunts' (ethos) where a people bond and dwell together" (xvi). These places where "a people bond and dwell together" form the center of democratic practices as "a people" mutually constitute and perform group identity, beliefs, and values. By offering a view from "on the ground," Clark's discussion, even joy in remembering, of the social spaces and occasions of the island shows the community participating in a tradition of dignifying the spirit of the individual, the body, and by analogy, the community (seen in her discussion of wakes); provided the dissemination of community knowledge and beliefs in songs; provided occasions for constitutive, embodied placemaking practices (festivals and dances); and demonstrates a cooperative spirit (an annual party for making syrup or molasses).

While she focuses on ritualized social gatherings as a way to bring to light the dignity of islanders' lived life against the absenting praxis inherent in arguments of primitivism, she notes that everyday "Life for me on Johns Island was never boresome. There was always much to do, and even our social life was varied and entertaining" (54). Clark's focus on ritualized occasions, then, works tactically to suggest the "haunts" or places that may not be as explicitly visible in narratives of everyday life; the gathering of the community on these occasions helps “bring to light” islander practices of citizenship that may not be as visible in the smaller gatherings and chance encounters seen in islanders’ everyday life. Ritualized and recurrent occasions not only provided a break from the organization of everyday life by labor; in bringing together the dispersed islander communities these occasions provided the opportunity for fraternal socializing as islanders participated in community beliefs and traditions. Clark briefly narrates festival occasions on the island but offers the most complex narrative about islander practices of citizenship in social life through her discussion of wakes. While Clark uses the festival occasions to suggest a community crafting consubstantial space “where a people bond and dwell together,” the wakes offer Clark an opportunity to develop narratives of uplift, to “place” islanders’ bodies in public space, and to cunningly develop a narrative space to attend to islander spiritual beliefs that might otherwise risk reproducing dominant tropes of “primitivism” and silence the rhetorical work done in the community’s epideictic practices.

Festival Occasions

As a complement to her entangling tropes of “primitive” islander life with the

marginalizing praxis of white space, Clark uses the narratives of islander sociability at festival occasions to map out citizenship practices constituting a "black spatiality" (Lipsitz) in the islands. In her festival narratives, we see the islanders "augment the use value of their neighborhood" (Lipsitz) to develop alternative economies on the islands by pooling their resources in collective celebrations; we see in community gatherings the performance of a collective identity in the islanders' shared cultural traditions; and we see ultimately, not a primitive, "unmoral" community, but citizens engaged in habits of citizenship inhabiting the dwelling spaces of island life.

One festival she notes occurred "at the end of harvesting season" when "the boys and girls who had been gleaning cotton left in the fields" were able to sell the left over harvest to the plantation store and earn some extra money to buy "apples and oranges and other such delicacies" brought in on the boats from Charleston. The community would hold "a party to which the teachers were always invited" (55) and "the young men would treat the teachers to these fruits and candies and whatnot" (55). During these festivals, gathering sites provided the rhetorical space to bring together the dispersed population of island communities and to share and affirm local culture: "there were fiddlers and dancing late into the night" and moonshine liquor would be sold by the drink to the revelers" (55). The timing of the celebration is significant in its own right, as Clark's attention to the children gathering the remnants from the harvest suggests. During the planting and harvesting season, islanders' everyday life was marked by the rhythms of labor to fulfill tenancy contracts that troubled islander sovereignty. While the fall harvest celebration did not signal a definitive break from the regulation of daily life by tenancy contracts, it did change the rhythms of island life; children for example, were often

conscripted to labor on the plantations during the farming season, but after harvest could return to the classroom. The fall harvest celebration was an opportunity for the islanders to mark a differential presence in island space as islanders performed a community ethos.

Clark uses another gathering to "bring to light" islander epistemology and to reiterate that the sites of these social occasions not only demonstrate a cooperative spirit, but provided the rhetorical occasion to invoke and affirm the presencing potentiality of islander consubstantial space through the communal performance of songs and stories. Through narrating "the annual task of boiling the sugar cane to make syrup, or homemade molasses, as it was generally called"(55) Clark describes step by step the production of a common good on the island, molasses. Her narrative is worth quoting at length to illustrate the way that she is "bringing to light" an island tradition:

> This was the way the boiling was done: after the cane was cut, it was brought in wagons to the boiling place and run through a press operated by a mule hitched to a long shaft that came out from it. The mule would tread, hour after hour, in a circular path as the cane was fed into the hopper. Then when the juice had been squeezed out, it was poured into a huge iron pot under which fire was kept burning. (55-56)

Clark's attention to the process of making molasses opens a new space for understanding how intricately connected island traditions are to the practices and spaces of everyday life. Over the course of the hours long process, islanders took advantage of the occasion for gathering to rhetorically perform songs and stories and to narrate histories of the community's inhabitation in island space: "And while the syrup bubbled and boiled, the men and women and children assembled there sang old hymns and ballads and spirituals,

told and listened to old tales of the islanders, often thrilling and exciting. And about midnight they began serving"(56). I will return to the role of storytelling traditions in shaping island space in the next chapter, but here it is worth noting how these rhetorical performances shaped citizenship on the islands. The "old hymns and ballads and spirituals" developed out of the islanders' experience as slaves and were orally transmitted (and transformed by everyday life) across generations. Oftentimes the adaptation of Christian spirituals introduced resistant practices and language, providing the rhetorical space to give expression to alternative ways of imaging the slaves and freedmen's individual and collective humanity. In listening to the "old tales of the islanders" community members participate in an alternative history of the islands, a "hidden transcript"(Scott Domination) constitutive of islanders shared experience and presence as critical agents in shaping island space. Clark suggests as much in noting that the storytelling practices of the islanders offer a new way of imagining life differently from the legacy of subjugation in the islands when she interjects that the stories were "often thrilling and exciting." On these occasions for "entertainment" islanders' transmission of beliefs and critical attitudes in song and shared histories assured the maintenance of the cultural traditions that defined islanders relationship to island space.

As a final aside and comment on the islanders' power in performing citizenship Clark concludes the molasses festival narrative by discussing the "refreshments" of "candy made of fresh coconut" and "gra-nut," or ground-nut cakes "dropped into the drippings left when the newly cooked syrup had been poured off into barrels" (56). She critically sets island traditions and culture against the economies of white spatiality: "I'm sure none of these factory-made candies of today can surpass that coconut-syrup and the

gra-nut cake eaten hot from a blackened iron pot" (56). In this final comment Clark cunningly notes that island folk traditions offered alternative - and potentially richer - economies to the economic systems that organized the spaces of island life.

Clark's festival narratives are illuminating for understanding how islanders' citizenship practices in everyday life demonstrate an embodied placemaking. The annual festivals show the community engaged in practices of sociability and communality; pooling resources and collectively celebrating; dancing and singing songs. In short, the festival narratives show a communal presence of islanders, a collective "we" acting as citizens; through her attention to islanders' relation to the land we see citizens crafting a distinct "black spatiality" by participating in and maintaining traditions, and, in narrating a history of the margin through songs and stories, ways of knowing and being present in the space of the islands.

Wakes

Clark's discussion of the burial practices and wakes offer the most complex portrait of the meeting point of island geographies. Clark's narratives of the wakes are illuminative of her cunning tactical practices in bringing to light the traditions of the island as practices of citizenship. In her autobiography, she discusses the burial practices in separate chapters. Initially she frames the burial practices as an example of how the islanders improved their conditions over time; a *becoming* citizens. Subsequently she returns to the wakes as a life affirming celebration in a discussion of the richness of islander social life. Taken together, the narrative framing of burial practices suggests that the changes in handling and preparing the deceased's body over time served to create a

rhetorical space in the community for celebrating the deceased's life, provided the rhetorical occasion to reaffirm the tenacious will to struggle against conditions on the island, and to epideictically participate in the community's beliefs. Central to this was the practice of dignifying the individual's life and body, and by analogy the lived presence of the community itself.

Reading Adrienne Rich, Nedra Reynolds notes that "a politics of location begins with the body, 'the geography closest in'" (212). In attending to the bodily, material, and spiritual practices of the islanders Clark uses the discussion of the practice of dignifying the body to move from affirming the trope of primitivism, to narrating a black spatiality in which islanders actively engage in constituting a collective "we" through practices of citizenship. She initially frames the discussion of burial practices by broadly commenting on the state of the island, noting that "Living conditions …were very crude" and islanders seemed to "care little, in fact, about improving themselves" (40). The narrative she offers, though, suggests that the burial practices were a means of coming to terms with the material resources of the island and uplifting the dignity of the whole community; Clark cunningly adds that "as the years went by, customs on the islands changed" (41).

As a practice of citizenship, burial practices reflected a, relatively, new claim to presence in the islands by affirming the human dignity of the islanders. As the maps suggest, the islands were marked by economies tied to a legacy of slave labor that effectively reduced the African American population to the status of objects by defining their worth through their labor value. After the collapse of slave labor, when island life was tethered to new forms of labor in tenancy farming, burial practices reflected one way that islanders demonstrated sovereignty in articulating their individual and collective

humanity. Clark contextualizes the centrality of the body in 1916 as an embodiment of citizenship practices of dwelling in the islands. When an islander died, "The plantation boss customarily suspended work in the fields so that the hands might attend funerals. This was in contrast, of course, to the practice of some slave owners in the old days - I've heard my father tell this - who buried dead miles away from the big house at night in order not to interfere with the next day's work" (41). Burial practices offered a way to sacralize the deceased by "placing" the deceased in the community, as well as affirming the right and practices of the islanders to cultivate new rhetorical dwelling spaces.

Denied a place in the production of dominant space in the islands, the treatment of the body - "the geography closest in" - is worth further consideration for how Clark narrates the burial practices as a becoming citizen through the production of community ethos in the dwelling spaces associated with the burial practices - the coffin, the bedside of the deceased, and the praise house or church. As a ritual process of memorialization, burial practices entail a number of rhetorical practices: they create memory spaces, they create a space to epideictically narrate community values and beliefs, and finally, by placing islanders in lived island geographies, they affirm the bodily presence of the islanders. As "the geography closest in" the body becomes the site for revisiting the individual's position in social space.

In the first of the two discussions of the wakes, Clark offers a particularly harrowing account of the material evolution of burial practices to suggest that the islanders right to memorialize the body and place it in the community reflected a process of liberation from the histories of violence and dehumanizing subjugation characteristic of their position on the islands as second class citizens. Clark narrates how the body was

placed in a coffin using two time frames - “those days” and “as the years went by”(41) - to demonstrate the islanders progressively acting to “improve” their conditions on the island. In “those days” coffins were “hewn from rough boards left over from the building of their rude shanties” (41). When the body was too big for the ill-fitting coffin, “the corpse was taken out - this I have known of, for a fact-and the legs broken to permit it to be squeezed into its inadequate last resting place”(41). Similarly, bodies of islanders suffering from rheumatism or arthritis “could not be made to fit into these coffins until the offending limbs had been broken”(41). Violence is anonymous, as she makes no mention of who would have broke the “offending limbs.” Though accorded a place in the community, the deceased carried to their “inadequate last resting place” the material conditions of life on the island.

Against the images of violence exacted upon the body of the deceased, Clark uses the narrative of “as the years went by” to show the islanders engaging in a process of “uplift” by developing more dignified, communal practice of burial. Rather than crafting makeshift coffins from the materials at hand, islanders began shipping in “pinto boxes,” a “coffin with one end square and the other pointed” that would accommodate the body without subjecting the deceased to the violence of breaking limbs. Community members participated in bedside watches as the islander passed. Family members of the deceased would ornament the box, “often add[ing] a softening, *human* touch by lining it with discarded cotton lint and white muslin” [emphasis added] (41). Once the coffin was prepared, “The body was prepared for burial by neighbors and friends” (41). “As the years went by” offers a stark contrast to “those days.” Where the body was subject to violent disfiguration, here the body is treated with a practice of devotion; rather than “the

offending limbs" being broken, here we see the body being "prepared for burial"; rather than being "squeezed into its inadequate last resting place," the body is placed in the "softening, human touch" of the modern coffin. Where death seems anonymous in "those days," here family and community members attend to the bedside of the dying and collectively bear witness to the scene/event of passing. In each instance the treatment of the body suggests burial is ceremonious, ritualized, and a site of communal experience. Clark is narrating the islanders acting as citizens, with a collective investment in the emotional, spiritual, and material presence of the body. The body is a constitutive site for re-imagining and giving expression to an individual and collective humanity; where slave masters would traffic the body away in the middle of the night, here, the body is a claim to presence, the wake and burial a new dwelling place in the imagined life of islanders' collective memory.

On the surface, her narrative is not without problems though, and a consideration of her placement of the narrative of the burial practices in discrete chapters suggests she has a tactical purpose in narrating these practices for her audience. Clark's narrative shows the islanders progressively engaging in humanizing practices familiar to dominant space: the collective witnessing of passing, the ceremonial treatment of the body by family and community members, and, as will be discussed, the memorialization of the individual in sacred spaces. Absent from her narrative of "those days" are any of the practices of dignifying the body through testimony or ornamentation seen in "as the years went by." Rather, the burial of the deceased is narrated through a lens of violence. Living on the island in "those days" Clark would have been well familiar with Gullah beliefs in properly burying the deceased to safeguard the deceased's journey and to ward off the

threat of the deceased's spirit haunting the island spaces and the islanders. Having demonstrated the islanders "acting to improve" their place in the imagined and material spaces of the island through identifiable citizenship practices, Clark creates a new space to discuss the islanders' spiritual traditions that might have otherwise been construed as elements of "primitivism" but which were central to islanders' understanding of their material and imagined life in the islands as a practice of embodied placemaking. Thus, Clark's tactical decision to cunningly reveal a partial portrait of the islands is instructive, as it allows her to tie practices of memorialization to a collective narrative of uplift and change.

It is then, only once the body is accorded a dignified "last resting place" through a process of citizenship that Clark discusses the spiritual traditions of the islanders in the rhetorical practices of memorializing the deceased's life through the related acts of bearing witness and testimony. If, as I have argued, the body is a constitutive site for re-imagining and giving expression to an individual and collective humanity, bearing witness and testimony are central to understanding the move from figuring the geography of the body as a rhetorical claim to presence, to the role of the body in constituting the collective body of the people, and to an embodied presence in the dwelling places of island space. As a rhetorical practice, Geneva Smitherman notes that "Testifyin," involves "concepts referring to a ritualized form of black communication in which the speaker gives verbal witness [bearing witness to] to the efficacy, truth and power of some experience in which all blacks have shared"(58). Rhea Lathan has recently taken up Smitherman's definition and usefully expanded it to frame testimony as a process of knowledge making that has the power to reshape the audience's position in the world: "In

African American sacred or religious contexts, testimony is the retelling of an occurrence that includes visual accounts, prophetic experiences, and narratives. The storyline is visually delivered in dramatic fashion, re-creating a spiritual reality for the listener, who at the moment shares, vicariously, the experience that the person has gone through" (33-34); "the purpose of testimony is to persuade or communicate valuable life giving/ changing knowledge" (41). As a way of "placing" the body "vicariously" in collective experience, Smitherman and Lathan both offer a way of understanding bearing witness and testifying as a spatial praxis producing new ways of understanding how islanders "place" themselves in island space. Lathan notes that testimony "accounts for formal, cultural, spiritual, and material ways of knowing, thinking, and being" (39). Through bearing witness and testimony islanders' beliefs are embodied in material ways, both in the "geography closest in" and the geography of island spaces, as practices of memorialization "place" the body in sacred sites and the collective body of the community. "Placing" the body in the "vicarious" collective experience of testimony, islanders produce ways of being in island space that challenge the absenting praxis of dominant space and empowers islanders with new ways of knowing; the "valuable life giving/changing knowledge" of testimony is a rhetorical claim to ethos and presence for the islanders, an embodied dwelling space in the geography of the island.

Clark is highly conscious of the foreignness of islander spiritual beliefs to outsiders, and initially she frames her discussion of Gullah spiritual practices by noting that "Superstition was widespread, and many amazing stories were reported from the bedside of the sick and dying" (41). Despite pejoratively calling island practices "superstition," she is quick to position testimony - "stories" - as an embodied practice

mediating the material world with the power of the spiritual world; stories "*declare"* the "truth" of the spiritual world's materiality: "During this desperate struggle the poor fellow might even be seen to cough up small animals, *some islanders declared*" [emphasis added] (42). Here, the spiritual world is not a metaphor, divorced from the lived space of the islands, but has a role in constituting material relations and producing social space; spiritual beliefs are material practices. Knowledge developed in the narratives of the deceased's material struggles with the spirit world are a "life giving" epistemology affirming and embodying islander spiritual beliefs. It is then, only in this context of affirming the power of islander beliefs to shape and produce space that Clark writes of the islanders' belief in "root medicine": "Some of these people even feared others on the island; they called them 'conjur' men or women and *declared* that such persons could cast spells upon those they disliked or had been paid to harm" [emphasis added] (42). Clark, however, is not dismissive of island beliefs here, as the division between islanders in "some of these people" might suggest. She marks the text with the power of islander beliefs in shaping island space: islanders "declared" or testified to the real material effects of spiritual practices. By positioning the islanders as the agents in "declaring" a truth, Clark cunningly narrates islander spiritual belief as a means to power in producing island space.

Perhaps nowhere is testimony as a means to power more evident than in the power accorded bedside watchers to narrate the individual's experience in dying to the collective body of the islander community. In her narrative bedside watchers are accorded a respected position in the community, an ethos, as they bear witness to and are responsible for narrating at the wake the story of "the departed one's journey down into

hell, the people he had met on his direful journey, and of the desperate wrestling he engaged in with the devil in trying to escape the satanic empire"(42). Bedside watchers not only bore witness to the process of the individual grappling with and conquering spirits. As witnesses, the watchers testify to the finality of the individual's liberation in death from the hold of the "satanic empire" faced in the dying's material struggles with spirits: "As long as the evil eye or spell was on the man his soul was being tortured, *it was solemnly declared* [by the islanders], and as soon as the spell was broken, he died" [emphasis added] (42). Here Clark references complex Gullah beliefs informed by West African spiritual traditions about what happens to the spirit of the deceased, traditions that are central to islanders' dwelling spaces. There are varied narratives about what happens in death. Amongst these narratives is the belief that the deceased may take flight and return to Africa, or take on totemic significance as an ancestral guide. However, a common thread in Gullah beliefs is that the soul of the deceased attains new significance, a life in death: the soul of the deceased may serve as an ancestral guide, speaking to the family or appearing in dreams, or the soul of the individual may haunt the islanders if their death is complicated by some force, like the placing of a spell on the deceased. Through witnessing bedside watchers are accorded the ethical position, the ethos, to prophetically narrate the individual's successful struggle and participate in producing new knowledge about the island by *declaring* that the "evil eye or spell…was broken." The declaration holds significant force in the islanders' imagined relations to space on the island: having died the individual is not troubled in the afterlife, attains the position of an ancestor, and will not haunt the landscape of the island. The declaration of the imagined relations on the island takes on significant force in the rhetoric of wake

proceedings, as bedside watchers narrate "life giving" knowledge - ways of dwelling intimately connected to island space - to the collective body of the island community.

Despite her hesitant, if not seemingly skeptical, discussion of the islanders' "superstitions" and belief in "conjur" men or women, Clark tactically mobilizes narrative space to develop the role islander traditions and beliefs play in practices of citizenship. Clark's placement of islander spiritual practices in the first of the wake narratives accords the islanders spiritual beliefs a presence in constituting the relationship between spiritual and material ways of being in the islands; framed within the second narrative of uplift and progress, Clark complicates understanding the islands as primitive sites by narrating islander spiritual beliefs as a driving force in shaping islanders practices of citizenship. When Clark returns to the wakes in a subsequent chapter in her discussion of the social life of the island, she does not discuss the narratives of the bedside watchers; rather she relies on the reader to understand that the community's epideictic celebration of the individual involves the retelling of the deceased's encounter with the spirit world as one aspect of. This elision though, is not without significance, as Clark signals that she uses the second discussion of the wakes to offer a new way of understanding the role of testimony and bearing witness in placing the body in the islanders' material and imagined geography: as practices of citizenship through which islanders collectively constitute new dwelling spaces in epideictically dignifying islanders

Clark makes a cunning wink at the reader when she prefaces her second discussion of the wake by noting that the wake "may seem hardly to be listed under social activities," in the same way as the festival occasions discussed above "that fell more easily into the social category" (55). As suggested above, burial practices on the island

were communal events in which neighbors and friends shared the responsibility of preparing the deceased for entering the afterlife. At the "all-night" wakes, the family of the deceased would provide a "big wash pot" of coffee and serve food, which attendees would eat for and in memory of the deceased (55). In the sacred space of the church community members all participated in celebrating the life of the deceased in song, prayer, preaching, bearing witness, and testimony. While eminently sociable occasions, the wakes, she suggests, are something more than a social activity as their placement in the sacred space of the praise house or church emphasizes both the spiritual- Gullah *and* Christian - and epideictic character of the occasion. As a cunning move, developing a second narrative about island burial practices allows her to demonstrate the practices of islander spiritual life in a Christian context, while leaving a space for the reader to understand that the wakes draw on the elided Gullah spiritual beliefs and practices. The second narrative then offers a thirdspace in which Clark can offer a portrait of the islanders engaged in habits of citizenship that are both familiar to a broader public and which brings to light some of the particular ways in which islanders have adapted Christian traditions in the epideictic practices of memorializing the deceased.

As something more than a social activity, Clark calls attention to some of the particulars of the islanders memorialization practices to demonstrate the ways in which the islanders celebrate the body of the deceased and in doing so constitute a new communal ethos through which islanders reimagine their place in island space. I will deal with the epideictic practices in more depth in Chapter Five, but want to here note the general tenor of the wakes in Clark's narratives for how she suggests that the wake proceedings created a new consubstantial space and collective ethos for the islanders in

the dwelling space of the church.

During the wakes, the body of the deceased would be placed at the front of the praise house or church from which the burial would proceed. Particularly striking in Clark's narratives is the participatory nature of the wake, as islanders join in a call and response performance of island traditions, gospel, and testimony. Over the course of the evening, Clark writes, congregants would take turns leading the congregation as they drew from a shared knowledge of island spirituals and "sang song after song" with a rhythmic hand clap and foot stomp accompaniment. Songs would give way to the preacher reading from the gospel and "exhorting the assembled throng" to join in. Taken by the spirit, participants "arose to pay tribute to the one gone" by bearing witness to the deceased's life, testifying to their own experience, and affirming the role of their faith in guiding them through the hardships of daily life (55). Though she does not mention it here, it is in this context of collective audience participation, prayer, preaching and song, that deathbed observers would bear witness and testify to the deceased's journey into the afterlife, detailing the deceased's "journey into hell," "the people he had met," and "the desperate wrestling" with the devil to "escape the satanic empire" (42) and be assured of safe travels in the afterlife. Clark's elision here is understandable though, as her narrative instead emphasizes that the community participates as whole. In the call and response process of testifying and bearing witness islanders constitute a collective body of the people as they epideictically perform and affirm community beliefs and values. In the wake proceedings islanders craft a collective ethos for narrating the deceased's life by individuals testifying to his/her death and to their own personal experiences; by dignifying the human in the collective experience of faith and suffering in song; and by

preachers guiding the congregants in interpreting the experience. In the collective celebration, islanders affirm the deceased and in doing so affirm their own will to persist through faith in the hardships they encounter in daily life. Clark notes of the wakes that "It always seemed to me that at these wakes the mourners, despite loud protestations of sorrow and great loss, were having a most wonderful time" (55). In collectively performing "valuable life giving/changing knowledge" islanders "place" not only the body in the geography of the island, but constitute a "place" for the community in the imagined and material relations of the island.

As in her festival narratives, where she narrates the deep relationship between social activity, island economies, and the landscape of the island, Clark is attentive here to the deeply felt relationship between place and islanders' presence. By placing this second narrative in her discussion of social activities on the island, Clark's walking tour also calls attention to the centrality of the praise house's and church's role as a dwelling place in shaping islander ethos, not only as a symbolic site but as a co-constituent of islander ethos. In Clark's narratives, the experience of memorializing the body is not only embodied in the congregants' performance, but is also embodied in the material site of the church. From her description we can imagine the scene as Guy Carawan would later bear witness to, that the "hall was rocking and swaying" (Carawan, Christmas Eve Watch 103) with the congregants as the space takes part in the call and response of the rhythmic stomping and ambient environment of congregants stretching out in song. The church itself embodies the affective experience as congregants and the material site give voice to their experience of mourning. Clark suggests here, as she has throughout her tour of social life in the islands, that islanders' relationship to island geography is a critical

component of islanders' practices of citizenship and the production of a black spatiality, of "placing" islanders in the absenting praxis of the production of dominant space on the islands.

Walking in Geographies of Language

As Clark's discussion of Charleston African American attitudes about the island suggests, language practices bore the ideological weight of difference and served as a spatial praxis for differentiating between membership in city spaces and rural otherness. Clark finds echoes of this attitude in no less an authority than the dictionary. The dictionary, she quotes, defines "Gullah" as "one of a group of Negroes inhabiting the islands and coast districts of South Carolina and Georgia; also, their dialect, now essentially a corrupt form of English"(44). The dictionary authority rests in offering "neutral" truth claims reflecting accepted dominant attitudes and usage. Yet, the dictionary is anything but "neutral" in framing Gullah as "corrupted." As a framework for "knowing" the dictionary offers a connective tissue between dominant concepts in/of the nation and the relations of power that produce the spaces of the nation. Defining Gullah as "corrupt" offers another lens through which Gullah space and peoples are absented from the life of the nation. In each instance - the production of dominant space seen in the maps, the circulation and reception of that discourse in Charleston, and the definitional and conceptual fortitude of the dictionary as a "neutral" reflection of national epistemologies - Gullah language became a synecdoche for the "primitive" - "corrupted"- space of the island and the islander body.

As a literacy artifact the dictionary is troubling for Clark, but it also serves as a

another point of departure for using a cunning rhetoric to establish a thirdspace vantage point complicating the conceived, material, and lived space that the Gullah people and language holds in the conceptual underpinnings of the region as well as the nation. Against the definition of "corrupt," Clark suggests that "no more distinctive tongue is spoken anywhere, perhaps, in all America than that of the Negroes who live on the sea islands and the coastal areas of South Carolina and Georgia." Rather than a corrupt form of English, "I believe you could properly call it a language" (44).

Gullah is an English based creole born out of the context of trade, slavery and colonialism. Gullah, Clark and others note, bears traces of East African languages stemming from the coastal slave trade, as well as the importation of slaves from the Bahamas and the West Indies, but as a creole, it also reflects the heritages of the white planter class, descended from Swiss-German, French Huguenots, and Scots-Irish. Although serving as a defining means of distinguishing between city space and peoples and island geographies and communities, Clark problematizes this, noting that as a Charlestonian, "I, myself, spoke very much like them. In fact, Charleston people speak it just as do the people on the island. On Henrietta Street [where Clark grew up] Gullah was spoken just as it was on Johns Island" (44-45). As she has done throughout her spatial narratives of the island Clark cunningly uses her thirdspace ethos to pluralize coastal space and shatter the dichotomy of differentiating between island and city spaces by language practices. Rather than a "corrupt" defining trait local to "primitive" island communities, Gullah travels throughout the region.

Not only do "Negroes and whites generally speak the same way, particularly if they have stayed close to the coastal areas" (45), but the movement of Gullah language

practices in the coast penetrate even the language practices of the "most aristocratic" Charlestonians. Recounting a radio address by white South Carolina Senator and future Governor Burnet Maybank, the most "Charlestonian of the Charlestonians" (46) Clark both affirms the difference of Gullah and elite white language practices and critically undermines this geography. While she is quick to note that Burbank did not speak Gullah proper and that "he spoke Charlestonese straight and unadulterated," she goes on to recall the particular character of his "Southern" inflections: "The gray-et stay-et of...Sou-uth-'Car-ro-lina,'...welcomes the citizens of its sister stay-et, the gray-et stay-et of Nawth Car-ro-lina!"(46). Maybank's "straight and unadulterated Charlestonese" is made "other" next to Clark's unmarked language in her biography. She further troubles the purity of Burbank's address by recounting instances of Gullah heard on the streets of Charleston: An old man selling shrimp from a cart calls out "Shrwoimp! Fresh shrwoimp!"; a young boy calls out to a white baseball player carrying a bat to the Battery, "Say, Mister...cap. Oi ca'y yo' bot down to the Bot'ry?" (46). Placing Maybank's language next to the rendering of Gullah language practices in the paragraphs surrounding it, Clark's text offers a new space in which island "patois" and "straight and unadulterated Charlestonese" exist side by side, a part and parcel of the language practices of a broader regional geography: "[Maybank] was understood perfectly by the people of the island who spoke Gullah and I'm quite sure he understood what they were saying" (46). In othering Maybank's elite language she suspends the spatial partitioning of absences and presences to offer a more democratic portrait of communicating across the differences of a pluralized geography of language.

However, Clark is not offering a simple multiplicity as an antidote to language

geographies; this would risk essentializing the language practices by ignoring the material differences of lived life in the islands and city. Although Clark pluralizes the linguistic geographies of the coastal region by hinting at/tracing the interpenetration of language practices, Clark simultaneously claims that Gullah language, and associatively Gullah people, is "distinct" (44) in defining the value of Gullah practices and traditions. From this claim, Clark plays with dominant conceptions of language difference to provide a new vantage point for understanding Gullah as a habitable and dignified spatiality.

While Gullah's creole reflects primarily a meeting place between English and West African reference points, the language bears trace of other European languages: "The Gullah's have a strong mixture of the French," she notes (46), and some languages bore a striking "German derivation" (47). As a contrast to the "corrupt form of English" Clark traces common reference points in the language to demonstrate the cultural richness of the islanders' language. "The older people," she points out "always spoke of the baby as 'd'enfant,' pronouncing the enfant as the French do rather than as infant"(47). She remembers, "that virtually everyone would swear 'Py God.' That must have had a German derivation. 'Py God!' they would say when ruffled" (47). By affiliating Gullah with traces of French and German languages Clark further pluralizes Gullah's language geographies and raises it from a local, "rural" language used to other and exclude islanders, to positioning Gullah as a polyform, cosmopolitan space born out of and responsive to the geographies of the west as they have born traces through the years of the legacy and mixing of colonial projects.

For Clark, the principal "delight" and "interest" in the Gullah language stems from

what Clark calls the "unusual" inventiveness of the language. In narrating her "interest" in Gullah language practices, Clark performs mêtis in another double movement, using the examples to establish "distinct" membership in the community while simultaneously disrupting the essentializing production of knowledge about Gullah culture and peoples characteristic of the epistemologies sanctioned in/by the production of a margin subjectivity by dominant space.

Clark offers a few pointed examples concerning religion and song; these are not incidental reference points as they are principal facets of the Gullah culture on the islands Clark is at pains to frame to outside audiences as practice of citizenship. However, Clark's examples are interesting because they further problematize the way a dominant definition of Gullah conflates a "people" with a "corrupt" tongue. Clark poses a few examples to illustrate her point that Gullah is a distinct regional language that cannot be constrained to a marginal position. To illustrate the problematic in conflating language, space, and race in definitions of Gullah Clark employs a dialogue format between an islander and a white outsider. In one dialogue, the outsider asks a Gullah woman to sing a song: "For instance, you might say to a Gullah woman in speaking of a certain song you wished her to sing. 'Sing it your way,' you might tell her, and she would reply, 'Well, this is my echo'." In a second dialogue the outsider asks about church attendance: "'Are you going to the preaching at the Methodist Church tonight?' you might ask. 'No,' would be the reply, 'that's not my signal.' By signal she would mean denomination" (47 Clark's emphasis in both examples). The dialogue format is particularly apt here. In the dialogues, the outsider "calls to" (Althusser) the islander with a request, compelling the Gullah woman to respond. In each instance Clark uses the dialogue to illustrate the

outsider's interpellative vision of Gullah as a discrete, fixed place, people, and language. In the dialogues, the Gullah woman though responds tactically by performing Gullah and using it to resist the outsider's interpellative request. In doing so, Clark draws on the centrality of religion and song in island culture as critical spatial practices for inventing thirdspaces. Here, the outsider interpellates the islander with a reified understanding of Gullah and in each instance the Gullah woman performs Gullah identity by answering the call, but also resists that interpellation by framing the response with a difference born out of the "distinct" language practices; her response suggests that the "distinct" and "unusual" and "delightful" way Gullah is used cunningly opens resistant spaces. Clark however adopts "an oblique course" (Detienne) and does little to call attention to this, letting the dialogues do the work.

In the dialogue about the islander's church attendance, Clark calls attention to the speaker's position as a white outsider and hints at the partiality of the outsider's knowledge of island history and religion. When the outsider asks the woman if she will attend the Methodist church, a denomination largely historically serving the white population on the island, she indirectly calls attention to her own subject position. In responding "that is not my signal," the island woman both offers an acceptable and polite response to the interpellative and simultaneously calls attention to the historic racial divide between churches serving the white community and those serving the African American population of the island.

"Echo" has a significance of its own for Clark - her autobiography is titled "Echo in My Soul" - and bears some consideration for the use here in understanding the power relationships between outsider and insider and the use of Gullah's "distinct" practices to

signify resistance. Here, the outsider requests that the Gullah woman sing her a song she is familiar with, but to sing it "your way." The request signifies that she is not a part of the community and as an outsider wants to voyeuristically hear something of the exoticism that a "Gullah" perspective would add to the song; she calls for the woman to perform a Gullah difference. The islander though, responds to and unsettles the outsider's interpellation, "this is my *echo."* "Echo" suggests that the "song" is something different for the Gullah woman. While it means "tune" it also reflects an embodied legacy of using song in African American culture as a means of responding to the subjugation of racial difference in dominant space (47). As an "echo" of that experience, the song is positioned as a critique of the outsider's reified conflation of Gullah people and language.

The dialogues offer a wiley, "oblique" way of moving between the poles of Gullah as a "corrupt" tongue and Gullah as a "distinct" language. In each instance the Gullah woman "performs" an interpellated subjectivity while introducing a thirdspace epistemology resisting that interpellation. In characteristic form, Clark again takes the opportunity here to further unsettle the affiliation between race and language. Although she is speaking principally of the African American communities that she worked with on the island she takes care to point out that these distinctions of the Gullah language "are common to Negros and whites alike" (47) on the island. By undermining the position of white and Gullah, Clark is able to make a double movement cutting across the territorial mapping of the islands. She is able to claim Gullah as a distinct language practice constitutive of a people and immediately undermine the definitional threat, as she is at pains to do throughout the discussion of language geographies, by spatializing the affiliation between language and a people.

In a pointed reflection, Clark repositions Gullah language practices as a vibrant marker of regional, not racial, identity and offers a critique of the reductive geographies shaping “ways of knowing” the citizenry of the low country: "There's no end, of course, to examples of the unusual, as outsiders consider it, in the Gullah talk. But to me it's delightful, just as Charleston and the coast country, our beloved Low Country, constitute for me the garden spot of the world" (47). Clark acknowledges the reductive ways of knowing that rely on an inside/outside binary. For outsiders, Gullah is marked by “examples of the unusual.” Yet, Clark employs her thirdspace position as both “of Charleston” and “of the islands” to offer another way of knowing low country language geographies. Gullah is not only “delightful” but also constitutive of “the garden spot of the world” - a nearly Edenic space of plenitudes and fecund possibility. In pluralizing language geographies, in arguing for the distinctiveness as well as regionally constitutive force of the Gullah language and people, Clark makes an argument for a way of being in the world that breaks the binarism of dominant spaces: Gullah, as a habitable language practice offers ways of becoming that are irreducible to the primitive tropes used to mark islanders and island space.

Conclusion

Clark's walking tours of Johns Island offer a way of imagining the stratagems of the production of space in a different way. In particular Clark's narratives bring to light island life not as simply present or absent, but something other, that can/may be both present under one order (the production of another order) and absent under another (the production of dominant space on the island) at the same time. de Certeau's theory of

walking is predicated on moving - making "turns" - within a static, territorial space - the stratagems of proper place. Clark's narratives suggest by contrast that another order exists within or alongside these territorial renderings, pluralizing space by attending to the habits of citizenship in which everyday life is neither solely colonized by stratagems, nor entirely liberated. The appeal for employing a cunning rhetoric in her walking tours is that it reveals island space not as a purely unified, hierarchically ordered space which would risk reproducing the citizen/primitive binary she has carefully unfixed, but as Elizabeth Grosz has suggested, "a fundamentally disunified series of systems and interconnections, a series of disparate flows, energies, events or entities, and spaces, brought together or drawn apart in more or less temporary alignments" (Space, Time 108).

Clark's discussion of material conditions on the island offer a tentative way of re-envisioning primitivism, as a produced subject position, one which is neither wholly accepted, nor attributable to an un-civilized set of practices; rather her discussion of primitive conditions reveals a body of responses accommodating and responding to the legacy of material inequities in the island. In her discussion of the island festivals, the islanders elide the marginal position they hold in island space as disenfranchised and disembodied laborers in island economies to craft occasions for privileging and constituting membership in islander communities by sharing islander knowledge, culture, language, songs and develop a critique of dominant narratives of islanders' placelessness in the islands through storytelling practices and re-narrating islanders' role in history in "a most exciting way." Her discussion of language geographies blurs the articulation of Gullah with primitive culture by offering 1) a critique of this presumption in showing the

presence of Gullah in shaping a regional language practice that is not constrained by a fixed notion of Gullah identity; and 2) a habitable embodied dwelling place from which islanders can resist the production of dominant ways of knowing and affirm their position in island space. Perhaps most explicitly, Clark leverages a critique of conceptions of citizenship that marginalize citizens by reducing citizenship to a status, something that only certain citizens (white landowners) may "own."

Though this is evident throughout her walking tours, we see this critique most explicitly in the example of the second wake narrative where we get a vivid image of islanders' habits of citizenship, those accepted ways of speaking and being heard in "public" spaces of the nation. The "life giving/affirming knowledge" of testimony produces an affective space that is transformative in drawing together "disparate flows, energies, events or entities, and spaces." "It always seemed to me that at these wakes the mourners, despite loud protestations of sorrow and great loss, were having a most wonderful time," Clark points out (55). By narrating the all night wake practices in which the congregants collectively testify to the deceased and memorialize the deceased's life by reflecting on their own experiences in the islands, Clark suggests that the affective space of the performance produces a citizenry by offering ways of imagining and placing oneself in the shared traditions and spaces of a collective body that may not be easily reducible to tangible or measured effects, like the civic duties granted by first class citizenship. Emphasizing the collective, affective performance of citizenship she suggests that there is something vital, that is un-capturable in the performance of citizenship, that communities are shaped and constituted through multiform practices, and in doing so Clark obliquely expands how we might imagine

citizenship by coming to terms with the varieties of practices and modalities shaping citizens publicity and reframing what constitutes the “public” spaces where communities gather, participate in community traditions, speak together, and produce lived space.

Clark is not simply presenting the islanders to an outside audience. Clark's walking tour offers a radical project for nation building, a project that is not only contingent on working in the sites of the margin to transform the lived life of the margin, but, in bringing to “light” those habits of citizenship, affecting a sea change in how the nation imagines itself and its habits of citizenship. Recalling her time on the islands, Clark recounts how instead of the primitive, “uncivilized” people that Charlestonians imagine in the islands, that she daily encountered "bright faces among them, eager faces”(53) that bore the promise of transforming the community's position in the nation. She uses spatial narratives to build a thirdspace vantage point to tie addressing the inequalities of the socially produced space of the islands with the hope for spatially reimagining the nation. Her statement is worth quoting at length:

> Despite the fact that during virtually my whole adult life I have been fighting the dominant citizenship of my Low Country-though I feel that actually I am fighting for them as well as for the less privileged and the silent-I love them, all of them. I want to see their lots, as well as the lots of the less fortunate, improve steadily. And I am convinced that the advancement of our lowly ones to the opportunities of first class citizenship also will lift to a better life those who now enjoy a higher status. (48).

Clark's national vision is instructive. Drawing on a pedagogy of love[14], Clark moves between dominant ideas of citizenship and margin practices to re-envision a new space for the nation's habits of citizenship. As in her discussion of language geographies, Clark nimbly ties the fate of the center to the struggle for citizenship in the margins without denying the productive possibility of the margin for illuminating practices of citizenship that would expand and enliven the participatory nature of American democracy.

Employing a cunning rhetoric to offer a national (re)vision of the idea of citizenship, Clark is not simply making an intervention in ways of knowing, she is performing an interruption in how we understand the production of space. Employing the "oblique" movement of mêtis, Clark is able to tactically suggest that the production of space is constant and multiple. As an "interruption," she is calling into question the logics, rationalities, and economics of dominant space that constantly produce and reproduce the binary split between center and margin space and the practices of citizenship shaped by that production. Her text is not an overthrow of this - rather it lodges a new argument by demonstrating a rich heritage of citizenship practices in the corpus of space to effect a shift and to make visible the co-constitutive relationships that construct and are constructed through space. Here is a nudge, a push, an oblique insinuation that offers new possibilities in the becoming of space by bringing to voice the multiple narratives intersecting and constituting space. Bringing to light the practices of the islands is a way of articulating the space of the nation "with a difference" (Sandoval). That is, it offers a new position from which arguments can be made, a necessarily

[14]Though Clark's statement has echoes with Freire's pedagogy of love, Clark had not yet met Freire, nor had Freire's revolutionary pedagogical beliefs yet been disseminated in the USA in 1962. Freire has suggested that a pedagogy of love has the potential for literacy learners to "write" the word and the world differently along shared ethical concerns, advancing the condition of everyone.

incomplete position that makes use of the available to employ space as an open, unfulfilled or incomplete/partial project (Massey). As a cunning rhetoric the walking tours suggest directions for reintroducing the movement of everyday life into our conceptions of citizenship, no longer owned, a thing, but a practice, "ways of operating" that encapsulate the constitutive force of “something more” than fixed meaning making activities in the specific places and contexts of citizens.

Section 2: Embodied Placemaking in Island Spaces

Chapter Four

Informal And independent Institutions of Island Life

In this section I move from an examination of ways that the islands have been imagined and their effects on ideas of citizenship to a focus on case studies of salient practices of citizenship, moments, and sites in the development of islanders' rhetorical dwelling places on Johns Island. Turning to the embodied placemaking practices of the islanders themselves, we can see not only how islanders conceptualized ideas of citizenship, but the constitutive role of informal institutions of island life in islanders' practices of citizenship and the development of independent institutions as rhetorical spaces in which islanders negotiated their subject positions as second class citizens to "place" themselves in island space as agents addressing and responding to islander needs. Specifically, I treat traditions of storytelling and folk medicine as ways that islanders shared values, histories, and knowledge to constitute membership in the community and craft rhetorical dwelling places and practices that resisted the absenting praxis resulting from the production of the island as a white space. Framing these traditions as informal institutions not only speaks to the spatial praxis these practices held in answering a need that arose from islanders negotiation of their position as citizens in the island, but, as "habits of citizenship," helps frame the centrality these practices had in producing independent institutions of island life – sanctioned and unsanctioned public spaces - where islanders could negotiate "the unspoken norms for interaction that constrain who can speak where in public and how" (Allen 6).

We might better understand the role and development of islanders' traditions as

embodied practices of placemaking in light of the mapping of island spaces as white space by considering the tactics islanders historically responded with to the experience of subjugation in a white spatiality that disembodied citizenship in the material and imagined life of the islands. Sibley posits that we "cannot understand the role of space in the reproduction of social relations without recognizing that the relatively powerless still have enough power to carve out spaces of control in respect of their day-to-day lives" (76). Though absented in the production of island space as a white space, islanders had used traditions of storytelling to constitute membership in the community and share traditions, knowledge, values, and histories. Similarly, deprived of health services because of the absence of medical institutions serving Gullah communities, the economic cost involved in doctor visits, and the geographic distance from Charleston, where services existed to serve African Americans, islanders in the post-emancipation era had long relied on their neighbors and friends to provide resources for each other. Islanders drew on traditions of folk medicine dating back to the community's origins in West Africa and developed through the antebellum period to address injuries, illnesses, and disease. Traditions of folk medicine are deeply tied to spiritual practices in Gullah Culture, most commonly through practices of root medicine. Root doctor's knowledge is accorded a significant degree of respect, and so they have a distinct ethos amongst community members. However, in everyday life, islanders (not limited to "root doctors") commonly developed solutions for illness and injury from a deep knowledge of the natural landscape of the island. The knowledge, acquisition and application of folk medicine traditions become embodied in treating islander bodies in specific contexts.

Here, I suggest that these traditions are best understood as *informal institutions*

that reflect a deep knowledge of island resources, islanders' sociability, and the shared investment in the well being and imagining of the community. Patrick Harris offers a useful definition of institutional ethos: "Institutional ethos…is a symbiotic process by which one's memberships play a part in one's personal ethos, while the reputations of each member of any given organization contribute to that organization's overall ethos in the world" (1). As "traditions" the shared knowledge and practices developed in storytelling and folk medicine reflect constitutive practices that define islander ethos, how islanders dwell in island space. The traditions reflect a shared knowledge and set of practices already existent in the community and are thus central to understanding how islanders carved out a "space of control" through embodied practices in the marginalized space of island communities; they are central to understanding islanders' imagined relationship with the community and how islanders dwell in and respond to the production of island space. In short, these traditions and their relationship to island space are mutually constitutive of islanders' ethos and the way that islanders "dwell" in the material sites of an absenting spatial praxis. Institutions, Porter et al. argue, play a significant role in spatially managing "how our public lives are organized and conducted (both for us and *by* us)" [emphasis added] (620). A consideration of the traditions of storytelling and folk medicine on the islands as informal institutions shows the rhetorical legacy of islander practices of embodied placemaking working to "define, articulate, and struggle" for citizenship and produce dwelling spaces where white spatialities effectively disembody the rhetorical presence of large numbers of the island populations, exiling them to the margins of public civic spaces. Framing traditions as informal institutions of island life helps illustrate the centrality of these traditions force in shaping the

independent institutions of island life, as is most evident in the islanders' adaptation of the praise house tradition. In the praise house, islanders produced a material and discursive space that drew on informal institutions shaping community sociability and discursive practices and would provide services that islanders did not have access to on the island. Praise houses would share the institutional centrality of the church in islander community in bringing islanders together to provide services as well as religious practices; however praise house spaces are importantly constituted by the islanders' traditions of informal gatherings and practices of informal institutions through which islanders shared their history, traditions, and body of knowledge.

More specifically, I argue that storytelling and folk medicine traditions of the African American communities of the island are informal institutions used to produce discursive space and shape material relations to the spaces of the island. Taken together, the traditions of storytelling and the development of folk medical knowledge bring together two key components of place making practices –discursive space (story and the circulation of a shared folk medicine tradition) and physical space (whether it be the scene of the storytelling, the history of subjugation in island space, or the knowledge of island geography embodied in folk medicine) - to offer new possibilities for defining and inventing rhetorical dwelling spaces of the islands through a practice of embodied placemaking.

Developing the discussion of public spaces through the lens of informal institutions, we might benefit from understanding/need to define public spaces differently, in broader terms that account for spaces that lie outside of or silenced in how we define "the public." Fraser, Nunley, and Scott have all laid the groundwork for

attending to the rhetorical work and tactical appropriation of dominant practices in sites they describe through the figures of "Counter Publics," "Hush Harbor sites," and "offstage sites," respectively. Here I build on this work by looking into recurrent practices and sites where African Americans gather, disseminate community values, produce new knowledge, and resist the praxis of dominant spatiality by developing black spatialities and praxis. Doing so helps cast our eyes upon sites that generally bridge the private and public divide that constitutes much of the way we traditionally think of public spaces, like public squares, or civic spaces, where people congregate and deliberate over shared concerns. On the islands, where the idea of "public space" is troubled by the dispersal of communities across the islands, an economy that maintains white dominance, and the unequal power relations that moderate access to public space as well as what constitutes those spaces, we need to think about this differently. As disenfranchised and often impoverished citizens denied access to the public (whether it be through formal procedures like literacy tests and land ownership requirements, fear, prohibitive segregation laws, or a historically produced alienation from political life and the institutions governing island life) an understanding of informal public spaces helps to make sense of those spaces that the communities did create through informal institutions in the traffic of everyday life.

Twining notes that social intercourse, embodied in the habits and sites of everyday life is central to islanders constituting themselves through the practices of citizenship, the "hows" of citizenship that constitute meaningful interaction and membership in the lifeworld of the islands. "Groups of Sea Islanders" she writes,

> can almost always be seen socializing in aggregations under the

> trees…They also lean against cars in convenient spots and gather in the little stores, 'grab-alls' and 'piccolos' for talk and occasional dancing or beer drinking. Set occasions for parties are not as important as the ongoing, more or less continuous, casual contact which characterizes Sea Island social life…. The display of verbal agility exhibited at these junctures establishes one's reputation in the surrounding neighborhood[15]. (92-93)

Twining calls attention to those spaces "on the ground" that are in excess of the representation of island spaces seen from an omniscient view in the maps, a view that reduces the heterogeneity of island spaces to a geometrically precise rendering of land, presence/citizenship, and economics. As an "excess" of the production of space, these sites illustrate moments of placemaking, tentative at times, but highly habituated practices of gathering and discourse through which islanders' sociability perform membership and constitute an embodied presence - "establishes one's reputation" - in the geography of island communities. While tentative, these habituated moments colonize island space with acts of publicity and practices of citizenship.

Turning our eyes to those spaces where those traditions were developed and disseminated helps to understand the role traditions played in forming members shared identifications and shows some of the resources that were employed to invent a consubstantial space that would be central to islanders' embodied placemaking. We

---

[15] It should be noted, that Twining is discussing the Sea Islands in the latter half of the 20th century, a time when island space had changed in significant ways, not the least of which was the ease of gathering facilitated by changes in the transportation infrastructure of the island and the development of more resources within the African American community as a result of islanders' rhetorical work. I start by focusing on an earlier time when islander mobility was more difficult and when there were fewer stores. Her discussion represents a material change rather than a wholly different change in sociable and discursive practices.

might consider Cintron's concern with studying how members of a Latino/a community earned respect in conditions where they were denied respect. Here, Cintron's observation offers a nice shorthand for forming the central question of section two: how did members form spaces of publicity when they were eminently denied those spaces, and what practices of citizenship shaped the consubstantiality at the center of that publicity? To do this we might understand "public spaces" as spaces where members engage in and embody shared traditions that form a particular critical practice and attitude through the shared knowledge of a community. Understood in this way, we can provide a snapshot of how island traditions of placemaking not only constituted membership in the community, but how these embodied practices of inventing discursive and material space would become a central component of building independent institutions, like the praise house, and shaping the rhetorical practices of the island community. Through folk medicine practices island geography became embodied in the treatment of the body and through Gullah spiritual beliefs. Through storytelling and occasions for gathering islanders discursively invented public spaces in the scenes of everyday life, a practice that is most clearly illustrated in the trope of the "porch." In each instance, these informal institutions were central to islanders embodied placemaking as a rhetoric of citizenship. Tracing the rhetorical legacy of these informal institutions helps illustrate the values of a black spatiality that would shape the kinds of spatial praxis islanders developed in adapting the praise house traditions to meet expressed needs within the community for a common site to meet, organize, and fellowship around islander traditions.

As I proceed in discussing the informal institutions of island life as an embodied practice of placemaking, I have firmly in mind the development of the Moving Star Hall

and Association praise house and benevolent society that I discuss in the next chapter. It would be a mistake to suggest that Moving Star Association and Moving Star Hall represented a spontaneous eruption of wholly new practices. Rather, just as Moving Star Hall reflects a legacy of praise house traditions, Moving Star Hall and Association also draw on island traditions of gathering, production, and placemaking through the rhetorical practices of storytelling and the transmission of folk knowledge and history that constituted membership in the communities.

Folk Medicine as Embodied Practice

One such embodied practice islanders used to "dwell" in and constitute island space as a "public" space serving islanders' needs was the informal institution of folk medicine practices. Folk medicine practices illustrate the centrality of island geography to constituting citizenship practices in which islanders use a shared knowledge of the land to tend to the welfare of the community. Speaking of the folk medical tradition, Mrs. Janie Hunter observes, "We doesn't go to no doctor. My Daddy used to cook medicine" using folk knowledge to prepare remedies from the island's natural resources, like "jimsey weed" to combat "worm," vinegar and mud to treat broken bones, sugar to stop bleeding, St. John to treat sores, and fiddler crab to fight whooping cough. "All this from old people time when they hardly been any doctor. People couldn't afford doctor, so they had to have and guess…they worked their own remedy and their own remedy came out good," she remembers (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 27). Hunter's narrative of folk remedies illustrates both the ways that islanders used folk medicine knowledge to produce a healthy body as well as the ways that islanders invented resources as a

response to the paucity of services available to islanders by dominant institutions. William Saunders recalls:

> Most people needed to hold onto money for their nickel–and–dime insurance. Most illnesses that came up, *someone had a remedy for it*; we called it root medicine. They would take roots and things (such as "life everlasting" for colds) and boil them into a medicine. We would also pack open wounds with sand or sugar...*we were independent*. [emphasis added] (482)

Both Hunter and Saunders testify to a deep knowledge of island geography being central to islanders' development of an informal institution that served islander needs. They also, though, attest to the sociability of islanders' development of alternative practices to respond to the absence of institutions providing these services: "Someone had a remedy for it."

In their comments we also get a sense of the role that the informal institution played in shaping islander imaginary and developing islander ethos. "We doesn't go to no doctor," Hunter asserts. Rather, "they worked their own remedy and their own remedy *came out good*" [emphasis added]. Saunders offers some insight to how folk medicine shaped islanders' imaginary when he takes Hunter's assertion a step forward. In his claim that "we were independent," he suggests that folk medicine traditions provided not only a practical solution to the absence of institutions serving the health needs of Gullah communities, but that the sovereignty they provided for the community shaped islander ethos in dwelling together in the island. Here, speaking in the mid 20th century Hunter and Saunders suggest that the practical knowledge of folk medicine was a means for

islanders' development of ethos and in drawing on the natural resources of island geography, illustrates the mutually constitutive relationship between islanders, the land, and cultural traditions that shaped how islanders dwelled in island space.

However, if we go further back, to the antebellum period we get a sense for how folk medicine traditions' origins in the community's spiritual practices served as a critical way of asserting community beliefs and values. Trott writes that folk medicine traditions were an "embodiment of an African perception of spirituality"(v) and as such provided a sense of ethos to the practitioners and, in embodying the worldview developed in Gullah spiritual beliefs, of the Gullah community as well: folk medicine knowledge provided an embodied presence on the island.

We get a sense of this "place" by considering how folk medicine traditions existed on the islands alongside the practices of dominant medical institutions. In one oral history, Trott notes, a former slave tells of how a sick slave did not feel that the plantation doctor understood her sickness and was treated in secret by a root doctor who felt, as the patient did, she had been conjured (127-128). However when faced with the efficacy of folk medical knowledge, representatives of the white institutions tended to "to ignore it. To try to treat some illnesses with European-based medicine, to patronize them, or to become intimidated or worried about their lack of knowledge or understanding" (128). The female patient's belief that she may have been conjured is an implicit critique of the way white medical regimes treated the body divorced from the social and spiritual context, and reflects another way of viewing the body's relationship to the island through the lens of spiritual beliefs.

Whites lack of understanding of Gullah folk medicine offered the opportunity for

practitioners to develop a sense of ethos, both within their community, as the narrative above suggests, but also as a way to assert their presence in white communities that sought to trivialize these practices. While often disparaged by whites on the island, practitioners of folk medical traditions were also accorded a degree of prestige as healers and spiritual leaders on the island; prestige that would on occasion be recognized by whites, who would disseminate knowledge of Gullah remedies in other, oftentimes white, communities. Thus, as a spiritual practice folk medicine traditions provided critical ways of embodying Gullah beliefs and values in the treatment of islander bodies, of bringing to presence Gullah practices of citizenship, and constituting a deep relation to the land as a public space central to the community's worldview.

Folk medical knowledge was shared and developed in everyday life as a tradition of medicine that was at express odds with the medical regime of the modern era. This informal, but highly respected body of knowledge was passed down through family and kinship relations as remedies for ills or injuries were needed. The embodied knowledge of folk medical traditions contributed both a sense of agency to the islanders and an evolving knowledge base. The informal institution of these medical traditions, shared knowledges, and sociability was adapted by and became a central component in the services provided by praise houses on the island, as I will discuss below. On the one hand, these traditions served a practical end in providing medical services; on the other hand, these traditions also served a rhetorical purpose and provided an informally transmitted, shared tradition that would be adapted in imagining the role praise houses would play in providing services that would be otherwise unavailable to the islanders from dominant institutions. "We were independent," Saunders testifies.

Storytelling and Public Spaces

One of the more evident spatial practices in which the exchange of community knowledge provided a constitutive force in developing islanders dwelling spaces was the meeting in varied places around storytelling occasions. For the islanders, these were often highly ritualized, social, and visible occasions. Storytelling in African American communities has long been considered a practice of resistance and community building, but it bears marking here the role it has on the islands as a discursive practice used to embody islanders' relations to island space. Moreover, as a dialogic practice of sharing, disseminating, and deliberating over community ethos and values it illustrates a rhetorical legacy of discursively inventing "public spaces." Members of the community often would gather to hear folk tales derived from the meeting place of West African traditions and slave culture. Here, neighborhood spaces used for gathering, like the porch or a fire pit served as public spaces, where members of the community would gather and demonstrate their rhetorical prowess through storytelling.

As Patricia Jones-Jackson notes, members of the island communities were intimately familiar with the Gullah tales, and storytelling occasions provide community members the opportunity to develop and perform the narrative and critical tradition in an engaging way. The sociable practices of entertainment were stridently rhetorical, for foregrounding considerations of audience, occasion, and language aptitude; as well as providing a body of shared knowledge that constitutes group membership/identifications and knowledge. Birthed in the contested space of slavery, folk tales such as brer rabbit and other animal tales embody a critical attitude and subversive use of narrative to resist

white spaces of control and invent a communal space for the transmission of knowledge and community values. Jones-Jackson helps frame the rhetorical occasion of storytelling by noting how storytelling was a participatory exchange between audience and speaker that invited islanders into the story traditions and community knowledge: "the relaxed social atmosphere in which tales are told permits more exchange between speaker and listener...[the group] will participate in the event by responding to certain cues given by the teller" (99-100). Importantly, all members of the community *could* participate in storytelling occasions as storytellers; although, as a practice of knowledge transmission, stories were principally told by adults, who might be assumed to have the requisite ethos as holders of a body of folk knowledge to assure the persistence of a shared cultural tradition used to “place” islanders in island spaces and history. As a rhetorical practice storytelling constitutes membership in the island communities, while "coming to terms" (Harvey) with the historical production of spaces and subjectivities by white spatialities. My intention here is not to provide an exhaustive catalog of stories in the island though. My interest is principally in how these storytelling occasions are discursive and material practices of embodied placemaking that would constitute how islanders thought of, imagined, and created “public” spaces on the island.

The regularity that people on the islands would gather on porches or other common sites to tell stories, provide entertainment, and share news suggests that these spaces, while variously constituted over time, were public spaces, a point which needs some elaboration. In *Their Eyes Were Watching God*, one of the most prominent literary examples of African American storytelling practices, Zora Neale Hurston uses a protracted, ritualized telling of Janie’s narrative to call attention to the ways lives and

values of African American communities in the South were rehearsed and performed in informal public spaces like porches. Neal Lester has noted, "for Hurston's characters and for African Americans generally, the porch and the porch-sitting talking rituals become *a life source to those denied livelihood and legitimacy in other American social, political, and historical arenas*" [emphasis added] (24). For Janie in *Their Eyes Were Watching God*, the sociality performed on the porch offers a way of dwelling in the community. But in her narrative the porch is also a point of departure, a means of calling forth and embodying narratives, a site to reimagine and perform critiques of community values and patriarchy as Janie reimagines women's place in the community and offers the "life giving knowledge" (Lathan) of her testimony to her friend.

bell hooks similarly theorizes the porch as a "life source" when she discusses the way that the porch served as a central vantage point in the community, as a rhetorical space in which members shared a history and knowledge of each other (Yearning 41-43). Furthermore, as hooks discusses her experience, the sociability of the porch and the informal space of the neighborhood became a way of regulating behavior and holding individuals accountable to each other, thus it also serves as a highly rhetorical space for rehearsing and performing the rhetorical practices of exerting judgment about community behaviors and maintaining community values.

In islander testimony, storytelling and sharing of community knowledge in the spaces of everyday life recur as constitutive sites for embodying community values and the placemaking practice of citizenship. Mrs. Janie Hunter recalls that in her youth "we didn't 'low to go no place [after dark], we have all we fun at home…we sit down and we all sing different old song, and parents teach us different game and riddles. […] we all

stays by the fire chimbley and listen to stories" (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 96). For the children, restricted from moving in the island spaces after dark, the porch and the homespace served a liberating possibility, to move in island space metaphorically through narrative, and to become a member of the community by learning island histories, beliefs, tradition, and values through games, riddles, and stories[16]. For the adult community more broadly, the porch becomes a place of dwelling and rhetorically moving in the production of dominant space, an invented space, for islanders to embody particular discursive positions in the material spaces of the island as a practice constitutive of islander citizenship.

As hooks suggests in describing the porch as a rhetorical space used to exert judgment about community values, the sociable gathering in everyday geographies of island life also provided a measure of islanders' practices of citizenship. Alice Wine, speaking in the late 1960s, reminisces on how island life has changed as a result of the influx of money and the increase of island traffic resulting from tourist developments on the island. Wine testifies to how the older practices of sociability in a black spatiality have undergone a significant change as the island became transformed with new spatial practices. However her testimony is worth quoting at length, as it helps frame the centrality common geographies played in drawing together island sociability and citizenship practices:

> 'Course that day, coming in 1919, all around like that, people was more

[16] Movement in island spaces after dark posed some risk to island children. Tidal patterns threatened to strand children in the wooded spaces of the islands, cutting off their home environs from distant neighbors. Gullah spiritual beliefs also presented a threat to children's movement at night. Mamie Gavin Fields' narrates how islanders' spiritual beliefs discursively colonized island spaces with "hags" and other spirits imagined to inhabit the landscape. These beings appeared principally at night. Though critical of Gullah traditions, Fields narrates the effects these discursive practices had on material practices and shaped islander imaginary about the space: how islanders slept, how they protected their homes from hags, etc.

> friendly to one another. People come and sit with you and read the Bible. But these days you don't find anybody come visit. Everybody sitting on their own stoops. You don't find nobody to my house. When you're sick, people used to go around and have meeting for you and pray for you. Now the people who live in the house with the sick people got to come and ask somebody come pray for them. But before, people know you is sick. Not now. That's done pass. (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 54)

Wine's lament about the loss of community awareness is intricately tied to the way that islanders' public space has changed[17]. Though she is speaking at a time when island sociability has undergone a significant change, her memory of earlier times paints a vivid picture of a community with shared, vested interests in crafting dwelling spaces. The "stoop" is a place for visiting and a place to engage the shared faith based beliefs that held a common place in shaping islanders attitudes and values. As Wine notes, the sociability of the porch was central to practices of citizenship. By sharing traditions, by checking on and providing service to neighbors, and by educating themselves in Christian belief, islanders discursively produce and embody their place/dwelling spaces in the community.

The porch is not simply a symbol of island sociability though; as a space to visit and engage in shared traditions, the porch is a central site - "a life source" for embodied placemaking - in producing awareness of needed services and a knowledge of difficulties islanders may be experiencing. As sites for displaying rhetorical prowess in telling a story, these everyday spaces provided an informal rhetorical education with material

[17] Speaking of the same time that Wine is speaking of, hooks similarly notes, "The 'chitlin-circuit' - that network of black folks who knew and aided one another - has long been broken" (Yearning 36).

consequences: islanders developed an ethos in the community as they "established [their] reputation in the surrounding neighborhood" (Twining 93). As a "public space" porches and sociality in everyday spaces reflect "a sense of the Sea Islanders' conception of themselves" as citizens "and their place in the world" (Twining 91). The sociability Wine remembers being produced in habituated moments of gathering offered a way to not only place themselves in the geography of the island, but served as a central means of producing and maintaining group values and integrity.

For the island citizens, storytelling was not only a means of transmitting knowledge, cultivating a critical perspective, and building collective identities around common traditions and histories, but was a central, informal means of rhetorically "colonizing" "public" spaces of the neighborhood through discourse; as a "life source," the storytelling developed on the porch and other common neighborhood geographies (like fire pits, wooded spaces, churches, store fronts, street corners, etc.) were critical components of embodied placemaking used to invent rhetorical dwelling places in which white powers, spatial praxis, and histories of subordination were disrupted and African Americans articulated their humanity, shared and practiced community values, and developed embodied placemaking as a rhetoric of citizenship. As with folk medicine traditions, the sociability, discursive practices, and embodied placemaking would be drawn together in the adaptation of the praise house tradition.

Praise Houses: "Placing" the Informal Institutions of Island Life

"*The praise houses represented hope, hope for our ancestors, because they would come in here, they had a few moments to themselves, they could talk in their Gullah Language.*

They could exchange news about who died down the road. Who was sick up the road. Who had a new baby. Who was sold off on another plantation. So it was a place where they could finally come for two or three or four hours and communicate with each other in their own language." - Mary Rivers Legree

During the antebellum period praise houses provided a material site where slaves could reimagine their place in island geography by communicating about the conditions of the slave community. As a rhetorical space, it provided a site for regularly gathering and reasserting slaves' humanity by communicating in their own discursive traditions. In order to serve the dispersed communities' social and religious needs after emancipation African American communities built praise houses modeled on the tradition of antebellum plantations. Though community churches had served the African American and white community of the islands dating back to the late 1700s (see Jones Jackson; also *James Island and Johns Island Historical Survey*), these official institutions of island life were not easily accessible to the African American communities. Previous to the construction of bridges joining Charleston, James Island, and Johns Island in the 1950s the Sea Islands had largely remained isolated from the mainland, leaving the islands' spaces fairly underdeveloped with little infrastructure, making travel in the islands difficult and time consuming. Given the demands of work and the dispersal of the communities across the islands, most African Americans could only travel to the churches for the occasional Sunday morning service. While central institutions to island life, churches were designed for bringing together larger numbers of islanders from the communities surrounding the churches. Developing praise houses in their own

communities provided a local answer to finding a place to regularly meet around community concerns and beliefs, to discursively invent new ethical positions, and to develop services that addressed the needs of the community. Offering meetings on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Sunday evenings, the praise houses became a center for community members to mediate their position as second class citizens/subjects in Jim Crow spatialities and served as a constitutive force in shaping a new ethos for the islanders, laying the groundwork for the subsequent push in the late 1950s for broader participation in the life of the nation. Praise houses provided a “place” for islanders’ to “be” and act as agents in shaping the practices of citizenship that constituted islanders’ lives.

Slave Years

The praise house tradition has its roots in slave owners' efforts to regulate slaves politicization of slavery, movement, education, and religious life. During the antebellum years, the material sites of the praise houses were conceived to regulate and contain slave life. Initially used on plantations to encourage adaptation amongst the slaves of religious principles of love and forgiveness, the praise houses were hoped to cultivate less agonistic attitudes to the practices of slavery and the subject position of slaves. The praise houses were small, bare, one room buildings; oftentimes the houses of head slaves were used as "safe" sites for the praise practices. By allocating such a small space plantation owners hoped to limit the potential for large numbers of slaves to congregate and develop means of organizing and rebelling against the institution of slavery or fermenting plans for escape. By centralizing slave gatherings and instating a

space visible to the overseers and plantation owners, the praise houses were meant to dissuade dissent and activism. However, the slave communities commonly adapted these spaces as a shelter from the dehumanizing onslaught of slave life. As Rivers Legree notes, the praise houses in the antebellum era became spaces of "hope" and served as central nodes in a communication network for slaves to resist white plantation owners' efforts to hegemonize the culture, social practices, language, communicative practices, and knowledge base of the Gullah communities. In the shelter of the praise house, slaves could reassert their humanity through dialogue in "their own [Gullah} language."

Post-Emancipation Years

As spaces of "hope," though, praise houses served a vital community function, and their model of spatial praxis would be adapted again and again in the emancipated spaces of the islands. Given the isolation, poverty, and scarce resources of the rural islands, in the post emancipation era the African American communities were reliant upon each other for their social and religious lives. Freed of the watchful gaze and regulated movement of the plantations, the African American population began creating spaces that would facilitate "independent" institutions to service the new needs of the freed citizens. Central to these efforts were the praise houses. After emancipation, the large plantations on the islands were split up into smaller farms, and many of the former slaves settled in tight knit family style communities, either on their own land or as tenant farmers on land owned by white planters. Many of the freedmen chose tenant farming over other forms of contract, like group contracts, which bore too much a resemblance to the plantation model, "because it enabled them to be free from direct white supervision,

and gave them the hope of accumulating capital with which to buy their own land" (James Island and John Island 27). While tenancy was chosen as a preferred method of contract farming, it did little to ameliorate the freedmen's subjugation to white farm owners, and the newly emancipated space of the islands soon gave way to a new regulatory body of white farmers who would exert control over the formal economies and material lives of the island.

Formed in 1872, the James Island Agricultural Society would soon spread to the other islands and become the de facto regulatory body of the post emancipation era, setting up farming practices and market economies that would sorely limit the money African American farmers earned; the opportunity for sovereignty over their land and organizing the institutions governing their daily lives; and impact education on the islands, as African American students were pulled out of school to plant, maintain, and harvest the farmlands. As had been the case on plantations, the new regulatory body mapped a "white spatial imaginary" on the freed space of the islands, effectively transforming and containing the potentially liberatory possibilities of new spatial praxis for freedmen. However, Lipsitz notes that while a white spatial imaginary "functions as a central mechanism for skewing opportunities and life chances in the United States along racial lines" (13) by reducing space and the concomitant material, lived spaces of minorities to a "pure space" based on exchange value, "at the same time, communities of color, especially black communities, have developed a counter-spatial imaginary based on sociability and augmented use value" (14). Thus the efforts for citizenship, democratic participation, and sovereignty in the freed African American communities on the islands were particularly troubled as they moved, on one hand, between the spaces organized by

the exchange value of their labor, a spatial praxis that effectively reduced their humanity and individuality to a pure, non-individuated body, and, on the other hand, the invented spaces of the communities, like the praise houses where they could reassert their humanity by developing community services and practices that provided a voice, institutional support, and the rhetorical space to articulate ways of resisting the new efforts at dehumanizing the freedmen.

Constrained by the paucity of resources available and servicing their communities, freed African American communities in the United States had long joined together in benevolent societies to create new occasions and possibilities to advance their social, political, and economic positions within the white spatialities of the nation, a practice that became particularly salient throughout the early 20th century. Lipsitz notes that communities "augmented the use value of their neighborhood" by creating new institutions, by establishing African American owned businesses, by mobilizing collectively, and by establishing informal economies through bartering goods and services. In the islands, where poverty in the African American communities was particularly dire, and economic opportunities were sorely constrained by tenancy contract farming practices and the isolation from the resources on the mainland, the praise houses served as a primary site for developing a "black spatial imaginary," a political, spatial praxis of embodied placemaking that would draw together the material lives and subjugated experiences of the islanders, pool their resources, and develop rhetorical practices to address the exigencies of African American life in a white spatial imaginary.

Evolving out of the land distribution and settlement patterns of the freedman in the Sea Islands, the "black spatial imaginary" of the praise house tradition persisted into

the 20th century as a community forum for organizing, for worshiping, for spreading news, and for building community solidarity. These community forums served as sites of rhetorical education. By providing a space for coming together and “fellowshipping" with others in “face to face” encounters, the praise houses became vital sites for developing rhetorical skills through members’ call and response participation in delivering sermons, contributing testimony, and joining in “shouting.” In addressing the material, health, and economic needs of the communities, the praise houses served as sites for organizing into independent institutions the informal institutions of the islands, developing community resources, and providing support for various “charitable” needs like food, health services, and burial practices (Nancy 251; see also Carawan and Carawan). Through this “cooperative spirit” - or “sociability” in Lipsitz’s terms - these new economies fostered a consubstantial space for the islanders to constitute new subject positions, and to rhetorically call into being a new “people” (see Charland) by providing a new rhetorical dwelling place to respond to, give voice to, and critique the institutions regulating their lives. Situated in the epicenter of community life, the praise houses provided a medium and a site of agency to interpret and engage the dynamics of white power as it was reconstituted, leveraged, and maintained in the islands through new farming practices, the parceling out of land, and the formation of new farming bodies overseeing the economic and social life of the islanders.

Conclusion

In considering the embodied practices of folk medicine and storytelling as informal institutions, we might understand these geographies of storytelling and the

"independence" provided by folk medicine practices as *modes of publicity* (Brouwer and Asen, Public Modalities) that would be drawn on to invent new spaces for community deliberation over shared exigencies, as would be seen in the islanders' re-imagining of the praise house tradition. Publics scholars have long noted the marginalizing effect of the metaphor of the public sphere, which locates publicity in particular sanctioned sites and limits how we conceive of communities efforts at gaining publicity (see Brouwer and Asen; Frasier; Nunley). As Brouwer andAsen note, using the metaphor of modes of publicity broadens how we conceive of publicity in more inclusive ways, to account for practices that may otherwise not be understood as publicity (Public Modalities 16-23). Thus the citizenship practices we see of storytelling in everyday geographies and the practices of folk medicine are informal institutions providing and shaping embodied practices that would serve as cornerstones to the development of the independent institutional practices of the praise house tradition. More to the point, we might consider these spaces of everyday life in which members practiced their rhetorical skills through story telling and developed alternatives to dominant institutions, as seen in islanders' legacy of folk remedies for health concerns, as informal institutions constitutive of a people and mode of publicity in which consubstantial space is invoked for producing a particular subject - an islander citizen versed in Gullah language, community traditions, and knowledge.

Importantly, it should be noted, these informal institutions would persist and function alongside the independent institution of praise houses. As embodied practices of citizenship they were central to islanders sense of themselves and their place in the island. Islanders adaption of the praise house tradition to meet the social, health, and

economic needs of their community, however, is notable for providing a shared material site for islanders dispersed across the community to routinely gather as a group and invent a new social space that would become central to islanders efforts to establish a presence in island spatialities

Chapter Five

Moving Star Hall and Association as Independent Institutions

"I remember when Moving Star Hall was built," recalled Mrs. Isabel Simmons, "'round about 1913, '14. Father help build the hall. Mother too...All join and make that hall" (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 74). Built out of the cooperative efforts of Simmons' community, Moving Star Hall praise house provided an important, central space for community events, religious practices, and charitable services on Johns Island. A small, one story frame building, the weatherboarded structure rests on short concrete blocks. A covered porch on the front welcomes members to the one room structure. Inside the bare space is lit by four windows on either side of the room and heated by a single wood-burning stove. Rows of backless benches orient members towards a simple table. Today, Moving Star Hall looks much as it did at the time of its construction. The pillars supporting the roof have been replaced, some of the weatherboarding has been replaced, the slat flooring has been replaced with plywood, but by and large the structure retains its vernacular origins. Entered into the National Register of Historic Places in 1982, Moving Star Hall persists as a symbol of the tradition of resistance and cooperative spirit on Johns Island.

As it stands, Moving Star Hall is the last remaining praise house on Johns Island. Though there are several other praise houses preserved as heritage and memorial sites across the other islands, the presence and integration of praise houses in Island life has largely given way to the presence of larger, more formal churches as the Island has been opened to development and transportation to and from the islands has been made easier.

Starting as far back as the late 1950s, when the Islands were connected to the mainland by bridges that facilitated a greater ease of access and flow of traffic, developers began re-imagining and appropriating island space to make way for new resort spaces serving the expanding, largely white middle class. By the end of the 1970s Moving Star Hall had faded from use, and today the praise house remains set back from River Road, now a major thoroughfare linking the mainland to the highly regulated and gated resort areas in the coastal areas of the Sea Islands.

Mrs. Janie Hunter

To underscore the degree to which the Moving Star Hall praise house and the Moving Star Association holds a vital space in the material and imagined life of the islanders lives we might begin with the testimony of a community member. Mrs. Janie Hunter recalls her seven-room house being destroyed in a fire and testifies to the sociability of the community in coming to her aid. In the aftermath, with her family safe, different friends on the island offer her and her family a place to stay in houses that were large enough to accommodate her family and prepared for living. Ultimately she chose to stay in her neighborhood, moving into a repurposed manure shed. Reflecting on the choice, she says "sitting by [herself] on Moving Star Hall…thinking what would be best," she concludes that she had no desire to go "anywhere far from the neighborhood." "I always want to be close to my meeting - Moving Star Hall," she says, before adding that “It’s a small place, but I rather have all my family together”(qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 61). For Mrs. Janie Hunter, space serves an important role in shaping her decision to keep her family close to the communal work and “family” of her praise house.

In a summative statement she discusses the communal support she received and expresses her thankfulness for the members of the neighborhood:

> and everybody was so nice to me, and that one important thing make me feel good. All my friends from here and everywhere come and give; those who don't have to give, come with a word of encouragement. I appreciate everything they did. My brothers, my sisters, my daughters, friends, what they don't have to give, they come and sit and talk and sing together encouragement, and this makes me understand this is the Lord will. (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 62)

In her comments about the decision to stay close to Moving Star Hall and the subsequent thanks for the community organizing in support of her family, Mrs. Janie Hunter suggests something that the testimony of others on the islands have made explicitly clear: as an institution, Moving Star Association offers something other than the alienating effects of abstract bureaucratic practices of traditional dominant institutions. Moving Star Association offers a human presence and humanizing effort to address the needs of a community riven with poverty by providing services that were oftentimes unavailable to islanders. Access to social institutions, like health care and insurance, was troubled by several factors: 1) isolation from the mainland that limited the number of doctors and agencies servicing the islands; 2) the troubled economic conditions of the island; and 3) the historic marginalization of institutions servicing African American populations more generally in the Jim Crow south.

Because of the isolation from the mainland and the prohibitive difficulty in traveling to the islands, Septima Clark notes that access to the limited public services

available to African Americans in nearby Charleston were either unknown to many of the islanders or were prohibitively expensive (Echo in My Soul 51). Yet, she provides a snapshot of islander sociability when she expounds on how islanders pooled resources for addressing needs that would go unanswered by the absence of these services in island life. In a brief comment that complements Mrs. Janie Hunter's story, Clark observed islanders' health care efforts in her time teaching on the islands: "When islanders got sick, friends ministered to them as best they could, sat up with them in their desperate illnesses, prepared them for burial and buried them when death overtook them" (Echo in My Soul 41). Mrs. Isabell Simmons remembers the praise house being built in 1913-1914, but the Association would not be chartered until a few years later in 1920. However, Clark arrived in the islands in 1916 and her comment is illuminating for echoing islanders' testimony about how they were engaged informally in the kinds of services that Moving Star Hall and Association would help codify and centralize.

Taken together, Clark's portrait of islanders already engaged in services that addressed the absence of social services and Mrs. Janie Hunter's narrative of the fire and her decision to stay near Moving Star Hall offer useful lenses for understanding how inventing dwelling places in the islands are central to islanders' practice of placemaking. As narratives, offering a "passage through" (de Certeau 129) the socially produced spaces of the island, the testimonies show 1) the community engaged in a mode of publicity through the practice of place making; and 2) the centrality Moving Star Hall and Association would hold in the practice of inventing material and imagined spaces to resist the white spatial praxis on the islands. The story of the fire and her desire to stay close to Moving Star Hall is instructive as it illustrates a particular mode of publicity tied to the

agentive possibilities of Moving Star Hall and Association. On the one hand, the community addressing the needs of the displaced family is a public act in which Hunter negotiates the offerings of a community ethos over more measured and quantifiable benefits. Her friend's offer of a house offers a material space and we might assume, a degree of comfort that might account for her loss of a seven room house. However, the decision to repurpose a manure shed for the family to be near Moving Star Hall suggests that home places are public spaces constituted by the material and imagined relationship of the family to the rhetorical dwelling places associated with Moving Star Hall and Association. Her decision is not simply to be near her praise house; rather it represents a decision to inhabit the ethos of the community and the agentive possibilities of the Association's sociable, black spatiality, as a tactic of embodied placemaking that builds on the legacy of discursive and material spaces. Her friends "sit and talk and sing together encouragement," discursively inventing the material dwelling space of home as an act of publicity.

For Mrs. Janie Hunter, and for others, Moving Star Hall and Association are "part of a process of social invention facilitating the connectedness of the local landscape to larger histories and the imagination of a better future" (Powell 71). Moving Star Hall and Association provided community members agency by invoking a shared investment in the everyday life of other members. By bringing islanders together in a new way that transcends the self, a collective “we," islanders worked towards a shared sense of a greater good in the invented public space of Moving Star Hall and Association.

To put Hunter's narrative in context with the placemaking traditions of the island, the formation of the James Island Agricultural Society in the 1870s offered a spatial

praxis that effectively maintained white control over the islands; while African American islanders were for all legal purposes freedmen, the social life, economies, and access to sanctioned public life and spaces remained largely in the control of white land owners, farmers, and merchants. In an oral history, Sam Gadsden remembers how the relations between emancipated African American farmers and the white farm boards retained the marks of slave times into the 20th century. African American farmers would sell their products to white merchants that had been known to be good and fair "massahs" during slavery. The force of the James Island Agricultural Society had historically been realized in marking the freed lands of the islands with an economic and institutional rhetoric of containment and control over the new identities of the freedmen, limiting the possibility for the contestation, production, and establishment of new identities as citizens of the nation.

African American tactics of resistance to white spatialities in the islands, however, existed in variously constituted "spaces of hope" as a mode of publicity throughout the era of slavery. As discussed above, the creation of discursive and material spaces in the traditions of storytelling and folk medical traditions offered a rhetorical legacy of resistance to white spatialities that originated in the institutional constraints of slavery and persisted in the post emancipation era. Given the distinctive character of Gullah culture, quite a bit of important work has been done on interpreting and understanding the culture of the islands. However, the emphasis on the cultural uniqueness of the Gullah people runs the risk of reducing our understanding of the traditions as distinct spatialities shaping the possibility of agentive subject positions responding to the historically dominant white spatialities shaping island life. Rather,

understanding the rhetorical work of the traditions as a black spatiality developing alongside, within, and/or in response to white spatialities frames the islands as “a site continuously reshaped by narratives already in motion” (Powell 132-133); "an ever-shifting social geometry of power and signification" (Massey Space, Place, and Gender 3) through which the islanders constitute and reconstitute the social, economic, and political relations of the islands. Attending to the traditions as spatial practices rather than cultural markers suggests that these traditions offer/represent a rhetorical legacy available to the islanders to be adapted and deployed to meet the evolving "lived experience" of space as a practice of citizenship.

Drawing together and formalizing these traditions, Moving Star Hall and Association become/established a productive embodied place making practice that addresses the rhetorical deployment of economic systems, like the maintenance of bodies/subjectivities through a system of tenancy farming that simultaneously provided the possibility of sovereignty, while effectively containing the work of realizing that sovereignty in first class citizenship. As Mrs. Jamie Hunter suggests, by drawing on the informal institutions and informal economies based on the ability of “friends from here and everywhere come and give” economic and material support and those that cannot make material or economic contributions giving “what they don’t have to give” through an economy of sociability, Moving Star Hall and Association effectively establish a rhetorical presence, a material and imagined space, on Johns Island that constitutes an active and ongoing engagement with the power of white farmers spatial praxis to limit and contain islanders' sovereignty and access to publicity.

Moving Star Association, Benevolent Society

The Moving Star Hall praise house has its roots in the foundation of a Johns Island benevolent society, the Moving Star Association. Moving Star Association was chartered in 1920, but its origin lies in the communal desire to build a space to centralize praise practices as well as create a forum to address the exigencies of the community itself. Mrs. Isabel Simmons remembers, “”We all throw money until we gets enough to buy the land. All pay seven dollars for the lumber” (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 74). As Browning has noted, many of the benevolent societies were not structurally very complex; nonetheless, these institutions were cooperative efforts to establish new economies in margin spaces to answer members’ needs that were not addressed by the economies of dominant institutions. Like many benevolent societies, Moving Star Association provided a few core services to members. From its inception up until its demise in the 1970s, all members would tend to the sick and elderly, provide financial and food services to economically troubled members, offer dignified burial services, provide membership and support for new institutions, and share in the worship services. As an independent institution of island life, the Association helped codify the cooperative spirit Mrs. Simmons speaks of and used it to structure a new economy servicing the island.

For example, if a member fell sick, two members of the association were tasked with tending to them until they were well; should the illness keep the member from working for any substantive period of time, the association covered their bills. If the members tasked with tending to the ailing individual failed in their duties, they were also fined a dollar. Association services were supported by membership dues based on what

each member or member's family were able to pay. In the early years, members paid ten cents a month. Later, though, membership dues increased, and members paid between twenty five cents and a dollar each month. When a member died, the family was given a set amount of money based on their monthly contributions; if they paid twenty-five cents a month, they would receive twenty five dollars; if they paid one dollar a month, they would receive one hundred dollars. "Just as much as you pay, that's as much you get out," said Mrs. Isabel Simmons (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 75). Tethering the cooperative spirit to an obligation to serve and the formation of a new economy, Moving Star Association is an early example of institution building on the islands. As such, Moving Star Association drew on the needs of individuals to organize services for the community. As the services and formation of the Association illustrate, the shared history, values, traditions, and knowledge – developed and maintained in the informal institutions of island life - provide the constitutive framework for inventing a new public/ethos and help articulate the exigencies that would be addressed in the Association's modes of publicity and practices of citizenship.

Through benevolent societies and fraternal lodges, African Americans exerted a constitutive force in shaping a cohesive identity through the production of new "black spatialities." Benevolent societies provided a rhetorical legacy used to develop responses to the changing conditions facing everyday life for African Americans. Institutions provided cogent sets of rules, meeting occasions, proceedings, and constitutions that drew on and formalized community practices, offering new modes of publicity to address community exigencies. Lipsitz notes that although oftentimes intensely localized (like Moving Star Association), these institutions also arranged for collaborative relationships

and provisions for membership and affiliation with or in other organizations, further constituting a communal “we” - a new ethos - out of the broader based, networked, alliances. For example, Moving Star Hall would provide an institutional setting and membership for newly formed organizations on the island to meet and deliberate over concerns related to first class citizenship, demonstrating a clear rhetorical legacy by providing "an important source of invention for future spokesmen, further causes” (Andrews 198). This is most evident in the foundation of The Progressive Club, discussed below.

A consideration of Moving Star Association, then, offers another insight to understanding the rhetorical legacy of islanders embodied placemaking, as illustrated by the material and metaphoric centrality of Moving Star Hall and Association in islanders’ testimonies. Moreover, islanders’ development of institutions not only provided useful ways of codifying practices of citizenship, but also assimilating and defining new conceptions of citizenship that responded to the historically and spatially constituted exigencies of African American communities. Thus, the rhetorical legacies of institutions were central to resisting the white spatial imaginaries of the nation and, as such, Maisha Fisher has written, warrant further reconsideration for the role they played in developing new subject positions, attitudes of "racial uplift," community pride, and centralizing the desires and hopes of the communities creating them. Formed from a marginal position, institutions in the African American community "constituted collective consciousness of values and ideologies sometimes carried in the minds and hearts of its participants in the absence of formal buildings or recognition from the dominant culture of power."(14). As a spatial practice, benevolent societies provided a material praxis [the means] for moving

from the imagined lives of African American citizens, "carried in the minds and hearts," to wrest some control over the forces shaping public, social, and intellectual life by providing a public space, a forum, and a formalized set of procedures in their constitutions to articulate and deliberate over shared goals.

In a discussion of 19th century literacy practices, Peterson elaborates on this by positioning African American institutions as central to developing the practices and attitudes that would drive liberatory efforts:

> [Institutions] have often provided subordinate groups with the means to power: they create organized consent among their members by means of specific cultural, social, and intellectual activities; they work to promote the welfare of the population as a whole over that of specific individuals or groups; they encourage the powerful planning of resistance strategies; they make public and thus more effective hitherto privately held sentiments. (qtd in Fisher 14)

In making "public" the shared exigencies of communities, the black spatialities of benevolent societies provide a "means to power" by drawing on the informal institutions of community traditions as a central means of responding to the social and economic forces shaping African American Life. The production of newly invented spaces offered agency in controlling social and economic forces of the community where African American presence has been denied in the praxis of Jim Crow Spatialities

On Johns Island we see a similar development of a rhetorical legacy that offers traces of independent institutional life. While the clearest record of benevolent societies on Johns Island in the early 20th century is the testimony of the islanders about Moving

Star Hall and Association, there are traces of interest in forming independent institutions at the same time as Moving Star Hall and Association were founded and built that are worth noting for foregrounding the citizenship practice of inventing spaces to provide rhetorical education and literacy practices and developing independent institutions that offered a "means to power" for select islanders.

Upon first arriving in the islands in 1916, Septima Clark initially observed that "Fraternal Organizations, that often mean so much to the Negro people, were unheard-of and there were no clubs or other groupings designed to improve the lot of their members"(Echo In My Soul 41). However, after spending time with the islanders she learned of a fraternal organization on the island, the Odd Fellows. Clark testifies to the group providing a forum for a rhetorical education in composing and presenting speeches to lodge members. "But this was the good thing about it," she writes, "in order to be functioning members the men had to know the rituals, had to make speeches to their fellow member, even had to keep books. And to do these things it was almost necessary to be able to read and write" (Echo in My Soul 51). Given the high rate of illiteracy on the island, members of the organization worked with Clark and other African American educators to compose and memorize speeches to be delivered at meetings. Clark would write down and read the speeches back to members, who would memorize them. Before long, the members of the group expressed a desire to read, write, and compose their own speeches, and Clark began teaching a basic writing program for members. Reflecting on these early efforts to address adult illiteracy on the island Clark notes, "the best thing about it was that they wanted to learn, that they were eager to improve themselves" (52). From what little is known of the Odd Fellows fraternal organization from Clark's

testimony, the effect and scope of the group in servicing the islanders is difficult to ascertain. In her biography of Clark, Katherine Charron adds to Clark's narrative: "The Odd Fellows also started thinking about how to improve their community and voiced their concerns to others" (Freedom's Teacher 77). The narrative of the group suggests that the islanders were invested in efforts to draw together islanders' sociability and desire to improve themselves with an institutional paradigm that provided a rhetorical education and a familiarity with the kind of formalized practices that were central to the placemaking practices of benevolent societies as they sought to elevate members status as citizens of the nation.

Clark's narrative of the Oddfellows efforts "to improve their community and [voice] their concerns to others" echoes other efforts on the island, most noticeably in the development of Moving Star Association in the mid 1910s. Joe Deas remembers the foundation of Moving Star Association: "In the old days people couldn't afford insurance so we make up that Moving Star Society from ten cents each from Sunday School. . . . The sick benefit. And death benefit" (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 75). Deas positions the origins of Moving Star Association as a specific response to a felt need. Given the island's isolation and pervasive poverty in the early 20th century, access to the services and resources of dominant institutions, in particular health and insurance services located a significant distance away in Charleston, were largely unavailable or economically infeasible to the Gullah communities. As a response to the conditions on the island, Moving Star Association provided an independent institution to marshal islanders' resources.

As a (socially) produced space, the invented space of the Moving Star Association

provided a new institutional framework and collective sense of agency. As the constitutions of Charleston benevolent societies illustrate, institutions provided a space for African Americans to give institutional force to the informal traditions constituting community values, beliefs, and desires. As a "means to power" Moving Star Hall Association provided definitional fortitude to the informal institutions of island life. No longer informal institutions, these are codified public services - a means of publicity for bringing to bear the community's resources in new ways to address islanders' needs: "The sick benefit. And death benefit." Turning community values and knowledge to praxis, Moving Star Association served a particularly rhetorical function. In the testimony above of Mrs. Janie Hunter we see that Moving Star Hall and Association served as both a material and metaphoric space, an embodied practice of communality reflecting a collective sense of islanders' shared experience of island spatialities.

In an echo of Janie Hunter's narrative, Alice Wine offers the fullest testimony to the effect Moving Star Association had in shaping a black spatiality on the island. In her testimony Wine provides a pointed narrative of the divide between white institutions' dehumanizing treatment of islanders and the humanizing, communally constituted praxis of Moving Star Association. Wine's testimony is worth quoting at length for highlighting the embodied practices of the Association:

> [Moving Hall] Society is better than insurance to me. That society is supposed to attend the sick and bury the dead. Everybody who in there pay dues. . . . Just as much as you pay, that's as much you get out. If you be sick, society service two person out to sit down with you all night, every night until you get better or worse. If you don't go and sit, you have to pay

> a dollar fine. If you sick and aren't able to pay your bills, they keep it up for you, live or dead; they elect money from the table and they keep you arrear. Insurance not going to do that.
>
> And then the insurance man going to give you your money – put it on the table. Now, how you going to bury? That money can't move to dig grave. But that society there, they treat you all right. They don't give you your money and leave you there. They give you your money and give you attention. . . . We got the pallbearers to take you from the undertaker and bring you to the church; take you from the church and carry you to the graveyard. They put you down there, and we got member to cover you up. See, that's done. (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 75)

Wine provides a stark portrait of the distance between the practices of white institutions and the service provided by the locally constituted independent institution of the Association. Dominant institutions employ a disembodied rhetoric of economics familiar to the islanders from the legacy of slavery and the evolution of white run farm boards and tenancy contracts. Lipsitz notes that a white spatial imaginary "functions as a central mechanism for skewing opportunities and life chances in the United States along racial lines"(13) by reducing space and the concomitant material, lived spaces of minorities to a "pure space" based on exchange value. Rather than met as sovereign human beings struggling with material conditions, dominant insurance institutions' response reduces islanders to objects, served from afar, with their needs left unmet: "That money can't move to dig grave."

By contrast, Wine figures the presence of a black spatiality constituted by the

Association and driven by an embodied ethical commitment to serve others. “At the same time,” that white spatial imaginaries reduce race to a use value, Lipsitz notes, “communities of color, especially black communities, have developed a counter-spatial imaginary based on sociability and augmented use value," a black spatiality (13). In serving the community, the Association “sick benefit” offers a network of agents contributing, to paraphrase Hunter’s earlier comments, what they can to address the everyday needs of the ill. As an independent institution, though, the Association also provides the infrastructure to adapt economic rhetorics to serving the social space of island communities. For impoverished islanders with few resources provided by tenancy contracts and few health services available, there was little recourse to account for the threat to islander sovereignty posed by time out of work due to illness. The development of an independent institution marshaled islander resources to respond to economic threats in a new way. The social and economic service provided by the Association’s sick benefit and death benefit offers an ethical response by attending to the material, embodied needs of the ill and the deceased. As we saw in Clark’s discussion of the wake services, Wine points out how the Association humanizes the ill and dignifies the deceased: “They give you your money and give you attention. […] We got the pallbearers to take you from the undertaker and bring you to the church; take you from the church and carry you to the graveyard. They put you down there, and we got member to cover you up.” Like in Clark’s discussion, Wine suggests that in attending to the material conditions of death, islanders are “placed” materially and symbolically in island space as dignified humans, not objects, through a collective practice of memorialization: “They put you down there, and we got member to cover you up.” As an independent institution, the Association

develops a new set of citizenship practices. By using economic rhetorics as an embodiable social practice, the Association develops a black spatiality responsive to white institutions constraining islander sovereignty.

Mr. Benjamin Bligen complements Wine's and Hunter's testimonies, noting the effect Moving Star Association and the movement for citizenship has had on the material and imagined life of the islanders. "More light is shining," he says, "Can see more. Likewise you can do more and think more, 'cause I believe that more light is shining now than was shining in the past. And so help me god, I so glad that I can see some light. And I know there's more light for me. There is a bright light somewhere and I'm going to find it" (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 48). Bligen's testimony offers a succinct way of conceptualizing the role Moving Star Association played in providing a space for islanders to develop an embodied placemaking as a rhetoric of citizenship. Bligen's snapshot of changing conditions on the island suggests that Moving Star Association has been instrumental in shaping islanders sense of agency: "you can do more and think more." Bligen "[knows] there's more light for me." His final words suggest a vision for the future, a world that can come to be, that has been made possible and, to a degree, realized in the embodied position afforded by the black spatiality of the Moving Star Association benevolent society.

"Shouting for a Better Day": Embodied Placemaking and Praise House Epideictic Rhetoric

Inside the material site of Moving Star Hall, residents of Johns Island sought and found in the epideictic practices of the praise house tradition a voice to respond to and

position themselves differently within the systemic whiteness of Jim Crow Spatialities. The foundation of Moving Star Hall and Association not only transformed the institutional resources available to islanders by inventing a new set of citizenship practices, but the communal establishment, funding, and building of the site also brought together islanders in a new way by creating a shared social space for islanders to regularly gather in a specific community space. Mrs. Isabel Simmons speaks to the transformation the Hall had in bringing islanders together in a shared space: "All join to make that Hall. They used to have prayer service in the house - only family then. Afterward, they began to have joint class from house to house. Then when we get the hall, we begin to have meeting there" (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 74). After emancipation, freed families tended to settle in discreet family units modeled on West African settlement patterns. Islanders were dispersed across the island, and the difficulty of traveling in the islands left many community members isolated from each other. As a result, individual families held prayer meetings in their own homes. Eventually islanders would take turns meeting in islanders' homes. Churches provided the primary occasion for islanders to travel and gather in significant numbers; however, the demands of work meant that traveling to church spaces during the week was not practical. Building Moving Star Hall provided the island community a locally situated space to meet together and "fellowship" face to face during the week. Simmons' narrative suggests that islanders had an express need to invent a consubstantial space for gathering, practicing their faith, and deliberating on everyday life**.** Moving Star Hall answered this need by holding praise meetings three times a week, on Tuesday, Thursday, and Sunday evening. During these meetings islanders would collectively participate in epideictically affirming their faith,

testifying to the strength of that faith in persisting in the struggles of everyday life, and creating the invented and material space to imagine the world differently, to see, as Bligen said, "more light is shining now than was shining in the past." Thus Moving Star Hall provided a practical solution for organizing dispersed islanders' social life, and as a rhetorical space for islanders to practice their faith and communicate face to face, Moving Star Hall provided a dwelling space for islanders to imagine a better future for their community.

The praise house tradition, as Mary Rivers Legree, notes offered a space of "hope" for, initially, slave populations who used the spaces to affirm their humanity outside of the purview of white populations. Subsequently in the post emancipation era freed African Americans adapted the praise house tradition. Legree usefully points out that the praise house served as more than a sanctuary: it facilitated particular kinds of discourse that were not generally available in other spaces, be it on the plantation or in the emancipated space where freedpeople settled. In praise houses slaves could speak differently, using their own tongue to assert their humanity; could speak about topics that could not be discussed elsewhere, such as making inquiries about family members, discuss who was sold to another plantation, or communicate news; could develop distinct practices of praise, such as the testifying and "shouting" that the Sea Islands Gullah communities are known for. As a rhetorical space in the post-emancipation south, the praise house served as a mediating space between the subject positions available in geographies of Jim Crow space and the spaces of the margin where African Americans could give voice to their concerns. Praise houses provided the rhetorical space for islanders to rhetorically respond to the spatial imaginary silencing African American

presence. In discussing rhetorical space, William T Mitchell writes "Information becomes useful and messages serve their purposes in particular places at particular times. Context matters"(3). On the one hand this seems like a simple restatement of Bitzer's conception of the rhetorical situation: "a natural context of persons, events, objects, relations, and an exigencies which strongly invites utterance" (5). Yet, by paying attention to the tightly interwoven web of communicative networks produced in and particular to different spaces, Mitchell weaves space into not only the possibility for discourse to be meaningful, but as a central component to the rhetorical situation, whether we conceive of the situation as including a particular speech occasion or are faced with the remarkably suasive force of the arrangement of peoples in a city[18]. In short, space matters for how we conceptualize the work of rhetoric because space determines the kinds of discourse that are characteristic of, appropriate to, and sanctioned by that space. For our purposes here, the epideictic practices developed in the rhetorical space of Moving Star Hall constituted a "space of hope" for the community.

Lorraine Code develops Mitchel's position by arguing that the rhetorical situation is more clearly conceived as rhetorical space. She writes that

> Rhetorical spaces, as I conceive of them here, are fictive but not fanciful

[18] "In fact," Mitchell writes, "cities operate as huge machines for sorting their populations and organizing opportunities for face- to-face encounter and exchange" (7). While Mitchell is discussing urban space his point is eminently applicable to rural space, as is clear from reading the maps of Johns Island. See Chapter Two above. Indeed, much of the work of cultural geography tends to focus on urban environments, leaving rural space grossly underdeveloped. Lefebvre, Soja, Harvey all discuss in various ways "the right to the city." Grosz similarly focuses on the city and architecture. For a discussion of how Lefebvre and others are useful for theorizing rural space, see Keith Halfacree "'Rural Space' Constructing a Three-fold Architecture." Nedra Reynolds seminal work in the field also tends to theorize urban spaces, though her discussion of students' fieldwork brings the rural into the discussion in a useful way. In *Yearning: race, gender, and cultural politics*, bell hooks provides a useful way of theorizing margin and rural spaces in her discussion of "Home Places" and "The Chitlin Circuit."

> or fixed locations, whose (tacit, rarely spoken) territorial imperatives structure and limit the kinds of utterances that can be voiced within them with the reasonable expectation of uptake and 'choral support': an expectation of being heard, understood, taken seriously. They're the sites where the very possibility of an utterance counting as ' true–or–false' or other discussion yielding insight is made manifest. (IX– X)

Roxanne Mountford offers a more precise and expansive definition when she argues "Rhetorical space is the geography of a communicative event, and like all landscapes, may include both the cultural and material arrangement, whether intended or fortuitous, of space" (163). A refined definition of rhetorical space accounts for the geography of the rhetorical situation, while acknowledging the presence of cultural frames for communicating and meaningfully constructing modes of discourse; more to the point, a refined understanding of rhetorical space that configures a nexus between culture, materiality, and lived life is useful for expanding our understanding of black spatial imaginaries and frames Moving Star Hall as a rhetorical space invented for communicating in a particular way in conditions where communication may not be readily available within the larger geography of a white spatial praxis.

Figured as a rhetorical space, Moving Star Hall provided the “territorial imperative” to shape not only islanders’ occasions for speaking, but also to “structure the kinds of utterances” that community members would employ in an epideictic rhetoric that would be central to islanders embodied placemaking as a rhetoric of citizenship. As the “geography of a communicative event” the rhetorical space of Moving Star Hall can be understood as a space mediating the everyday life of islanders’ experience of

marginalization on Johns Island and the “territorial imperatives” of a white spatiality that effectively silenced the community’s role in public life. By contrast, in the rhetorical space of the Hall, Islanders use epideictic rhetoric to respond and reimagine the silencing praxis of a white spatiality.

In *The Rhetoric*, Aristotle notes that epideictic rhetoric is principally concerned with issues of "praise or censure" of a person in the present moment of a ceremonial occasion (9.1.1358b). As a mode of discourse, epideictic rhetoric articulates the values a community aspires to embody. However, in much of the way that epideictic rhetoric has been taken up in the field, the focus on the present moment has largely emphasized the extra literary or aesthetic qualities of epideictic rhetoric as a measure of an orator’s skill at speaking - the quality and dexterity of the orator’s rhetorical practice (Sheard; see also, Clark *Rhetorical Landscapes* 18-27).

Recent work in the field, though, has suggested that epideictic rhetoric has a different character - that it is, a "vision of reality" (Sullivan 128). Sheard, has noted that in offering an image of the real (what is) and the ideal (what could be), epideictic rhetoric allows speaker and audience to envision new, possible or at least different worlds “that might accommodate us all” (791). Sullivan offers a more considered definition of epideictic rhetoric as “the experience of members of an audience who find that the speaker is saying exactly what needs to be said, who find that they are being caught up in a celebration [through the speaker’s words] of their vision of reality” (128). Sullivan poses epideictic rhetoric as an argument employing ethos and pathos to build consubstantiality (Burke) or communion (Perelman) in the produced space of speaker, audience, and the materiality enfolding the rhetorical situation, what Mountford identifies

as “the geography of a communicative event.” In the present moment, epideictic rhetoric provides the means to evaluate the past in order to offer a “vision of [how] reality” could be imagined. Understood in this way, epideictic rhetoric is not simply an affirmation of a community’s values, but a means to compel audiences to behave in such a way as to embody the values articulated on that occasion. Epideictic rhetoric is a call to action, but not an untroubled call to action for theorizing how epideictic rhetoric might provide an audience with the agency to act on that call to action. This is most clearly seen in the space inherent to a speaker and an audience, where a privileged orator speaks to a particular audience. Though communal values are taken as the subject of epideictic rhetoric, the community is spoken for and imagined through the ethos of a singular speaker, presumed to be an embodiment of the community beliefs and values.

Epideictic rhetoric as it has been re-theorized in the field still works from the assumption that a single rhetor speaks to a relatively homogenous audience. In delivering a “vision of reality” the rhetor provides a subject position for the audience to adapt and to become. As a “call to action” this troubles issues of agency. The speaker is granted the agency to provide a vision of how things might be, while the audience is compelled to adapt their behavior and actions to that vision. Praise house epideictic rhetoric troubles the split between speaker and audience and helps us to understand how epideictic rhetoric might provide a call to action that is communally constituted and distributes agency to all members of the rhetorical situation.

Praise house epideictic rhetoric re-envisions the speaker audience binary to distribute leadership roles amongst the assembled community members. During praise sessions islanders collectively participated by epideictically performing testimony,

delivering sermons, and joining in "shouting." Islanders testified by speaking of hardships they faced and affirming their faith as a provider of strength and an ethical stance from which to view the world. In delivering sermons, members would "take the book" and use the occasion to freely speak on a topic related to the selection chosen. Throughout the meeting islanders would "shout" in affirmation by singing, answering in a call and response manner, humming an accompaniment to the speaker, and rhythmically clapping in celebration of being taken by the spirit. While the praise sessions usually started with an introduction and someone, commonly a preacher or community elder, staring with a sermon, members shared in leading the session and freely took up the speaker position as they were taken by the moment. The rhetorical space of Moving Star Hall, it should be noted, differed substantively from that of the church attended by the islanders. Though both focus on faith practices and served as a community center for the islanders, the epideictic practices of the praise hall were distinct from and served a different function for islanders in developing an embodied practice that was transformative for islanders' sense of their "place" in the island. Speaking of the difference, Mrs. Janie Hunter testifies to the embodied "feel" of participating in Moving Star Hall praise sessions:

> You can feel yourself in that hall. You have a chance to explain yourself - anybody who want to. But in church on Sunday, we just have one preacher talk. And you might get a chance to raise a song or pick out one person to make a few remarks. But to that hall, everybody could have they way, tell your own story. That's the difference it makes. (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 79)

In praise house epideictic rhetoric each member of the congregation positions themselves as a citizen sanctioned to speak and in participating with the assembled whole, provide "choral support" for other members to act as equal citizens of the community[19].

As a practice of citizenship, the epideictic performance in the rhetorical space of the Hall collectively "invented" a consubstantial space around the shared values of religious faith and the material exigencies of life in the white spatialities of the islands. Esau Jenkins, testifies to the humanizing force of participating in the epideictic practices of the Moving Star Hall praise house:

> These people are trying to satisfy themselves, satisfy their soul. It's the only place they could be happy because life is so hard and sometimes there are any number of persons who do not know where the next meal is coming from. They can't talk back if they go on the farm regardless of how mean they were treated. Sometime their task they had was overburdening. Sometimes somebody watching them that they didn't have a chance even to stoop. They sometimes sad. But they're trying to get rid of it. If you could come and see them how they look when they singing and shouting, you can see they singing for a better day, shouting for a better day. And that's the thing that make them keep on shouting. (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 67)

Jenkins' comments are illuminating of the role the praise house and praise house practices played in mediating islanders' everyday life in the islands. As a rhetorical space, Moving Star Hall provided a safe space to revisit and critique the conditions of life on the island.

---

[19] This is not to say that gender relations were treated equally, though Moving Star Hall allowed for women and men to testify and "shout." However, at least one occasion a month was designated as being a time when women specifically led the session.

Jenkins comments suggest that shouting is an embodied practice. Where islanders could not "even stoop" for rest in the fields for fear of punishment, they could speak back to power and disarticulate white spatialities by "shouting for a better day." The transformation is not limited to imagining a better day; rather members embody a new subject position: "If you could come and *see how they look* when they singing and shouting" [emphasis added].

Esau's comments help to sketch out three spatial scales for framing islanders' practices of embodied placemaking in the epideictic practices of the praise house: the individual, the body politic, and the material/imagined geography of the island. In what follows I will argue that individuals mediate their experience of life in the island through praise practices to humanize that experience and to craft a rhetorical space to stand. I will then address how congregants constituted a body politic or "people" through the participatory performance of the praise sessions. Finally, I consider the rhetorical space of the church as itself constitutive for imagining and "placing" islanders in island geographies. Though I address these spatial scales in turn, each of these scales constitute the whole of an epideictic practice that islanders used to embody their place in the island and to articulate an ethical vision for "a better day." I conclude with a discussion of how praise house practices help to develop our understanding of epideictic rhetoric as an embodied practice of placemaking.

Individual Testimony as Mediating Island Spaces and Subjectivities

"They can't talk back if they go on the farm regardless of how mean they were treated. Sometime their task they had was overburdening. Sometimes somebody watching them that they didn't have a chance even to stoop"

In Islanders' individual testimony in the praise house, several spatial tropes recur that help to understand how praise house rhetoric provided the occasion for islanders to create a new space that mediates the experience of everyday life on the island by offering a new place to stand. In song and testimony Islanders describe their life in the island as a "rocky road." As a response to this, Islanders celebrate their faith for giving them a "rock" from which they can persist in their struggle. A final trope that recurs is the primacy of having a face to face encounter as an affirmation of islanders' embodied presence.

As a rhetorical practice, Rhea Lathan notes, testimony draws on collective experience to persuade and offer life giving/changing knowledge. In these instances, speakers testify to positioning themselves in an imagined geography on the spiritual trope of a rock in order to persist in those conditions and situations where they are denied presence. Benjamin Bligen asserts just such an invented space: "Jesus told us to dig deep and lay your foundation on a solid rock, that when the storm of life blow against you, you're gonna find your Father rock. If you dwell upon Him, everythin' will be all right. The world can't do you no harm" (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 53). Where the "rocky road" serves as a metaphor for imagining life in the material and imagined experience of everyday life on the island, the "rock" of faith invents a new space to respond to the experience of subjugation: "The world can't do you no harm."

Perhaps most central to the effort to place the islanders in new geographies and to claim the "rock" as a rhetorical stance is the affirmation of the humanness of their experience and being. For example, in a praise house session Joe Deas testifies: “My face could have been under the clay. But at this same particular hour I have a chance to rub shoulder to shoulder with you, I can speak language to language, I can look face to face. It is a great joy” (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 79). Deas celebrates life here, but the affirmation of that life is given presence by the embodied rhetorical position of meeting “face to face” and the possibility to “rub shoulder to shoulder” in the rhetorical space of the praise house and the epideictic practices employed there.

In defiance of the embodied image of an islander wearied by “overburdening” labor, islanders invoke a new, desired subject position in testimony and song. John Smalls begins a testimony by framing the participants as “Warriors”: “Good morning Warriors! How y'all feel? I'm feeling special alive.[…] are we yet alive to see each others face?”(qtd. in Carawan 80). Mrs. Bertha Smith takes up this theme in her own testimony: “Good morning, Warriors, I'm sitting down right now, I feel like singing and shouting, Jesus, But I got to be very careful” (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 83). “Placing” the body this way in the “vicarious” collective experience of testimony, islanders produce ways of being in island space that challenge the absenting praxis of dominant space and empowers islanders with new ways of being in island space; the “valuable life giving/changing knowledge” of testimony is a rhetorical claim to ethos and presence for the islanders, an embodied dwelling space in the geography of the island where “they didn’t even have a chance to stoop.”

Constituting a Communal Body

"If you could come and see them how they look when they singing and shouting, you can see they singing for a better day, shouting for a better day."

Outside of the praise house, many Gullah citizens' position in the island as tenant farmers meant that they had little recourse to give voice to their complaints or to "talk back" to the white farmers on whose land they labored. The praise house provided a space for islanders to not only mediate their own experience in island spaces and ontologically imagine themselves as "warriors" through faith based testimony, but to constitute a body politic out of the shared experience of life in a dehumanizing white space, where they "didn't even have a chance to stoop."

John Smalls describes a typical praise house session:

> That way we trying to do it now. Brother Deas takes the text…and the boys supposed to preach from that text he give you. You can go preach anywhere you want to preach, but you come right back to that same text.
>
> Any individual, soon as the man finish preach, if you wanted to raise a song, you raise it. And another way, anytime we call someone up to preach, if anybody want to sing for you, can sing you up there. Then one can sing you down. Anybody. They can't sing long as you're talking, wait 'til you finish talk. (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 78)

As Smalls describes it, a typical praise meeting opens with a preacher welcoming and framing the meeting, before designating a member to "take the text" and offer a bible reading. As the reading comes to an end the congregants take over and exchange speaker

roles by offering testimony, by "raising a song," and by offering prayers. Islanders invent spaces for members to take the speaker role when they “sing you up there.” The participants shout in accompaniment and offer affirmations to the speaker. As the service proceeds, participants accompany the performance with rhythmic handclapping, foot stomping, and vocalizing. Throughout the session islanders provide a space for the speaker to talk and be heard; before taking a turn they “wait ‘til you finish talk.”

The participatory nature of the meeting distributes speaking opportunities to all of the members. In distributing agency in this way, the epideictic practices of the praise house demonstrate a collective embodied practice of placemaking as islanders mediate the past in the present moment and testify to what might be (Sheard). Janie Hunter testifies to the effect of the Hall’s communal epideictic practices: “everybody could have they way, tell your own story. That’s the difference it makes.” Through sharing speaker positions, islanders produce a black spatiality in which islanders actively engage in constituting a collective “we.”

Shaking the Foundations and Placing Islanders in a Black Spatiality

While I have focused thus far on the islanders' individual and collective participation in the praise house meeting, I want to draw attention to the material space of the praise house as an active participant in the process of islanders embodied placemaking. Islanders' efforts to place themselves in the geography of the island is not only embodied in the congregants performance, but is also embodied in the material site of the praise hall. In Guy Carawan’s earlier observation (see Chapter Three) of a Christmas Eve Watch meeting he described the way that the material site participates in

the islanders' praise service. The “hall was rocking and swaying” (Carawan, Christmas Eve Watch 103) with the congregants as the space takes part in the call and response of the rhythmic stomping and ambient environment of congregants stretching out in song. The praise hall itself embodies an affective experience by providing “choral support” as congregants and the material site give voice to their experience and “shout for a better day.” The space comes alive and shapes an embodied experience. “You can feel yourself in that hall” Janie hunter testifies. As a rhetorical space, the Hall becomes not only embodied, but embodied in the participants’ practices. Its shaking foundations announce the presence of a communally constituted “we,” territorially marking a black spatiality where islanders are otherwise absented by the praxis of a white spatiality.

Taken as a whole experience the spatial scales discussed here illustrate a new way of theorizing epideictic rhetoric as a practice that not only calls the audience to action but facilitates islanders’ sense of agency.

Epideictic rhetoric as Embodied Placemaking

As I noted above, one of the longest standing hallmarks of how epideictic rhetoric has been received places the emphasis on the orator’s quality of speech, or the speaker’s skill at rhetorically honoring the subject occasioned by the exigency. Scholars have noted, the lack of occasion for the speech to shape future actions through deliberation or evaluate past actions by exerting the weight of a judgment has led to epideictic rhetoric’s reception as an aesthetic practice that troubles its place in the canon. Thus epideictic rhetoric has been dismissed as a largely stylistic practice, honoring the speaker as much as the occasion for articulating praise or blame. A close reading of Aristotle reflects the

shift in scholars' discussion of epideictic and gives a lie to the emphasis upon the purely aesthetic qualities of epideictic rhetoric. Epideictic, traditionally speaking is concerned with community values and urging a populace to right courses of action. Aristotle notes that epideictic treats matters of "virtue and vice, the noble and base, since these are the things worthy of praise or blame" (1.9.1366A). That is to say, that epideictic treats as noble "the distinctive qualities of a particular people, and the symbols of what it especially admires" (1.9.1367A). In articulating a vision of the values of the community, praise is "akin to urging a course of action" (9.1.1367B) and articulating "what you would urge a people to do" (9.1.1368A).

I want to say here that if we rejoin this practice of articulating a community's ethical position to the "aesthetic" practices in epideictic practice, we make visible the distinctive rhetorical traits of a particular community and open ways of understanding the placemaking practice of epideictic rhetoric as it articulates a spatial praxis born of the community's exigencies. After all, Aristotle's reminder that we need extol those virtues that a community esteems suggests that the rhetor not simply cajole his audience, but rather that s/he articulate "what you would urge a people *to do*" [emphasis added] by providing a desired subject position for the community to adapt or take up.

However, the traditional practice of epideictic rhetoric relies on and privileges a hierarchical ordering of the relations between speaker and audience. Though communal values are taken as the subject of epideictic rhetoric, the community is spoken *for* and imagined *through* the ethos of a singular speaker, an embodiment of the community beliefs and values (Aristotle reminds us that "If the audience esteems a given quality, we must say that our hero has the quality"). This emphasis on the individual speaker is, at

best fraught. Though constrained by the addressed community, the speaker's ethos sets the rhetor apart from the community, able to deliver estimations and displays of shared values. Still, the speaker is as much subject of the occasion as is the subject of praise or blame. Classically construed, epideictic rhetoric privileges an individual's skill set and worth as a performer, a position that privileges the individual over and above the exposition of community values. The emphasis on the performer's literary and aesthetic qualities reasserts the privilege in western culture of a sole individual possessed of the agency to determine the evaluation, articulation, and reception of community beliefs. In short, epideictic rhetoric classically asserts a clear binary between speaker and audience and does not necessarily distribute that agency to offer the means for taking up that agency; the audience is *subjected to* the vision articulated in the speech, rather than *agents in shaping new possibilities*. Considered in light of embodied practices, the traditional divide between speaker and audiences allows the speaker an embodied position within the community while simultaneously constituting and discursively colonizing a space in which audience members can realize themselves as objects of those values, effectively disembodying the audience's own subject positions to offer an idealized space to which they can aspire, but not necessarily achieve. The speaker is disseminator of idealized subject positions.

By contrast, the emphasis on communally constructed and participatory performance in the African American praise house tradition offers a clearer sense of how epideictic rhetoric is used by members to not only embody the particulars of their everyday life, but to distribute the agency needed to act on a call to action. Members contribute to a shared production of social space as members "take up the text" and

introduce shared, albeit individualized experiences in which the community can vicariously participate. The members are each able to draw on and reshape the production of new spatialities as they assume the speaker position. By "taking up the text" the individual draws on communally constructed and shared values to embody their own positions as subjects and to share the possibility for making new subject positions with the group. Benjamin Blingen says "I'm glad to be here to mingle my voice among my sisters and brothers" (53). Bligen reminds us that his testimony does not enframe islanders in a new subjectivity, but in "[mingling] his voice" with the testimony of others the members of the praise house collectively craft a vision of what might be. Rather than creating idealized subject positions, the multiple speakers draw on shared values – "everybody speak" - as resources for testifying to their experience and creating a place within community values in which the group can embody the human-ness of their experience in the rhetorical space of the praise house and carry that position as a critical standpoint into the material world outside of the praise house to respond to the call to action. Speakers assert their presence by testifying to positioning themselves on the spiritual trope of a rock in order to persist in those conditions and situations where they are denied presence; they attest to the primacy of a disposition or way of being in subjugated spaces. The rock is a material and imagined space embodied in the presence of the speaker, "the geography closest in." It is thus portable, an embodied mobile space to stand, affirmed in the praise house but providing a vantage point for acting in island spaces. Members of the praise house that do not directly participate in testimony similarly stand on the rock when they participate through dance and call and response, participatory performances that embody a new communal subjectivity within the

rhetorical space of the praise house.

A notable shift in our understanding of the emphasis placed on epideictic rhetorical *style* occurs when we understand the epideictic rhetorical situation composed of not a privileged speaker and receptive audience (even if that audience is active in receiving and affirming the values honored in the speech, as Sullivan suggests) but as a rhetorical situation in which the speaker and audience role is distributed amongst a participatory group, in which any member can take on the speaker's role and change the composite of the audience, like we see in the communally constituted practices of the praise house. Style becomes less the sole measure of effectiveness or skill in praise house epideictic rhetoric (although the islanders take quite a bit of pride in their rhetorical skills, as discussed in the tradition of storytelling). Instead, praise house epideictic rhetoric serves as a means of knowledge and value production, deliberation on and articulation of ethics, the creation of a performative subject position in the material world that has far reaching consequences for ideas of citizenship. As a rhetoric of citizenship, the embodied placemaking practices of the praise house offer a model of becoming in which islanders embody a new subjectivity ("warriors"), develop agency, and work to collectively construct and act on a "vision" of what might be as they "shout for a better day."

Conclusion

In order to understand the importance of Moving Star Association, we would do well to remember bell hooks admonishment that in any critical examination of the radical efforts of resistance, race needs to be understood through multiple, intersecting lenses, including, alongside the racial and rhetorical, the economic, the spiritual and the

everyday material lives of African Americans in the space of the Jim Crow South (*Yearning*, "Post Modern Blackness"). In Moving Star Association islanders took up the praise house tradition in order to develop a "black spatiality" figured through these multiple intersecting lenses as they have shaped the everyday life of the participants. Here, I have argued that the development of an independent institution in the Moving Star Association benevolent society provided an early example of institution building; in considering the ways in which the formation of new economies addressed the everyday material lives of African Americans by providing a humanizing frame to health and death benefits, we can help illuminate the rhetorical legacy that serves as "an important source of invention for future spokesman, further causes" (Andrews 198). Moving Star Association provided an embodiable model for how islanders could organize and serve their community; by drawing on the islanders' discursive and material traditions the Association modeled an embodiable praxis of participatory citizenship. However, Moving Star Association was but one aspect of Moving Star Hall that provided a site and framed citizenship practices for islanders to develop new habits of citizenship.

Studying the rhetorical practices developed in Moving Star Hall expands the concern with multiple lenses by attending to the praise house epideictic practices used in the spiritual practices of the meetings held in Moving Star Hall. As a rhetorical space, Moving Star Hall brought to presence islander culture, discursive practices, materiality and everyday life as a new black spatiality by sanctioning islanders' individual and collective voice in negotiating their position as second class citizens on the island. The communal spatial praxis of praise house epideictic practices - "the geography of a communicative event" - helps address a troubling divide in rhetorical theory concerning

the role of epideictic rhetoric in shaping community values and initiating a call to action for audience members to imagine - and realize - the ideals of how a community can and should imagine itself. Praise house epideictic practices position each member in a position to participate, shape, and communally construct an ethical vision of the community. As such, praise house epideictic practices provide islanders a rhetorical space to embody - bring to presence as agents - a response to the absenting praxis of white spatiality - "the territorial imperatives" sanctioning who can speak, how, and where. As an independent institutional space, Moving Star Hall provided a "place" for islanders' embodied discursive and cultural traditions to shape "how [their] public lives are organized and conducted…*by* [*the community]*" [emphasis added] (Porter, et al. 620).

In the embodied rhetorical practices of the praise house, islanders' collectively articulated new subject positions, developed an ethical response to island spatialities, organized new economies, and produced a habituated "place" that would constitute new "habits of citizenship." As a central site in islanders' imaginary, Moving Star Hall would provide the material space for islanders to organize and act on these habits of citizenship in developing new, affiliated organizations and "public" spaces to organize, mobilize, and direct islanders' desire. Of particular note, Moving Star Hall provided a site for the Progressive Club, organized by Esau Jenkins in 1948, to meet and deliberate over citizenship concerns before the club had a site of its own. In the next chapter I take up how islanders adapted these new "habits of citizenship" in the production of a new rhetorical space, the Citizenship School.

Chapter Six

Rhetorical Space: The Citizenship Schools and The Progressive Club

If your *aim is to change society, you have to think in terms of which small groups have the potential to multiply themselves and fundamentally change society* – Myles Horton (*The Long Haul* 57)

In the mid 1950s, Esau Jenkins bought a bus to drive workers from Johns Island to work on the mainland in Charleston. One of his passengers, Alice Wine, familiar with Jenkins' activism in the community, told Esau that she wanted to learn how to read so that she could register to vote. Jenkins agreed to teach her and his other passengers to read during the trip into Charleston. During the passage, Jenkins used excerpts of the state constitution to discuss the laws about registering to vote, to teach them to read, and to quiz them on vocabulary from the text. In some short time, Jenkins escorted Alice Wine to successfully register to vote.

I want to pause on this narrative for a minute because the passage between an isolated, impoverished island community and the white economic space of Charleston offers a fitting trope for conceptualizing the relationship I would like to discuss here between citizenship, space, publicity, and rhetorical presence. The trope of this movement between margin and center, island and city, positions the possibilities and constraints – "the territorial imperatives" (Code ix-x) - attendant to rhetorical space squarely at the center of learners' desire to transform their social, economic, and civic life. It suggests, in quite literal terms, that the invention of new rhetorical spaces is a means of moving between different communities and spaces.

In a few short years after Wine's narrative, Jenkins, with the help of Septima Clark and the Highlander Folk School, opened the first Citizenship School on Johns Island in January 1957. Taught by Bernice Robinson, a local beautician, the first classes were held in the windowless back room of The Progressive Club, an independent institution of island life, so as to shelter the learners from the gaze of the island's white population. In the years following this, Citizenship schools were opened on a number of the other sea islands, and after coming under the auspices of the SCLC spread to eleven other states across the south, where millions of African Americans registered to vote, created cooperatives to gain control over economic interests, addressed the social and health issues of their communities, and gave birth to new political groups. Included in the curricular materials used in the schools are statements from the Highlander Folk School about education and citizenship as well as a statement about the goals of the program. The citizenship schools' statement of purpose illuminates the far ranging goals of joining citizenship education to community awareness and political activism. It says:

> The immediate program is literacy. It enables students to pass literacy tests for voting. But there is involved in the mechanics of learning to read and write an all-round education in community development, which includes housing, recreation, health, and improved home life. Specific subjects are emphasized as safe driving, social security, cooperatives, the income tax, and an understanding of tax supported resources such as water testing for wells and aid for handicapped children. (Citizenship School Workbook 1)

While the other statements are interesting for how they profess a love for America, discuss the centrality of first class citizenship for all to any vibrant democracy, and

narrate a vision of a just America achieved by navigating "an ocean of hate," I want to mark this more explicit statement about the role a rhetorical education in civic life would play in shaping broad community initiatives.

A look at the rhetorical education developed in Citizenship Schools, illustrates the way that citizenship was conceptualized as a process whereby African Americans could carve out a rhetorical space and radically transform notions of the public sphere. The legacy of African American rhetorical education has always involved a critical engagement with dominant publics and a moral mandate to effect some degree of social transformation in an interanimating relationship between the individual and the community[20]. I argue that citizenship education as it was conceived and practiced in the Citizenship School programs throughout African American communities in the south during the civil rights era continued this tradition. The emphasis on social, economic, and political transformation in these campaigns offered a directive to participants to create new occasions, spaces, and means for acting rhetorically and re/framing the very idea of citizenship.

Recent work by Composition and Rhetoric scholars on the Citizenship Schools has developed this discussion through an examination of the role of islander traditions and language, the rhetorical goals of the schools, islanders' literacy practices, and the effect the Citizenship Schools had on transforming public space for African Americans in the nation. David Levine has argued that the Citizenship Schools benefitted from the rich

[20] See James D. Anderson *The Education of Blacks in the South 1863-1935*, Stephen Schneider *You Can't Padlock an Idea* (118-123), Logan *Liberating Language*, Jacqueline Royster *Traces of a* Stream, Elsa Barkley Brown "Negotiating and Transforming the Public Sphere: African American Political Life in the Transition from Slavery to Freedom," Janet Duitsman Cornelius *When I can Read My Title Clear*, and Carla L. Peterson *"Doers of the Word"*.

cultural legacy embodied in the Gullah language and the participatory nature of islander traditions, as we have seen in the praise house epideictic traditions of Moving Star Hall: "Through the incorporation of song and prayer, discussion of common problems and a curriculum that drew upon daily experience, the Citizenship School classes melded the acquisition of new skills and forms of struggle with older traditions of cooperation and solidarity that were embedded in the lives of students" (408). Rhea Estelle Lathan has similarly argued for the role of islander traditions of testimony in developing a model of "gospel literacy," (Writing a Wrong) and has recently extended this tradition of testimony to theorize Robinson's pedagogical approach and success in the Citizenship School classes (Testimony as Sponsor). In a reading of the various iterations of the "Citizenship Booklet" Stephen Schneider has most recently argued that the Citizenship School program of rhetorical education provided "local collective action frames" that connected the everyday life of students with a broader movement for civil rights to provide "the identities and agencies needed to pursue political and economic change" (13). Citizenship Schools provided "a direct experience of democratic citizenship" in being "defined by the political economic goals of the communities they worked with and sought at all points to articulate literacy education to those goals in meaningful ways" (139). Building on Arnove and Graff's work on literacy campaigns, Susan Kates has made the connection between literacy, citizenship, and rhetorical action developed in the schools clear, noting "in the context of the Citizenship Schools, literacy operates as a badge of citizenship" that "comes with a particular responsibility" to serve the community (496). She argues that the Citizenship School program "succeeded in creating a population of voters who might have failed to pass the literacy test and remained in political isolation instead of

becoming part of the civil rights movement" (498). In an acknowledgement of the role that material spaces played in shaping the effectiveness of the Citizenship School program, Schneider has argued "Citizenship Schools were not simply educational institutions; they were anchored directly to the community, being located in community buildings […] they came to function as spatial embodiments of civil rights frames in their own rights" (140). Though only briefly discussed, Schneider's attention to the spaces of the Citizenship Schools is particularly apt for the study at hand.

More Broadly, Myles Horton's, and consequently Highlander's model of education for empowerment has resonated in the fields of rhetoric, critical pedagogy, and literacy and composition studies. While the scope of Horton's influence is beyond the purview of this project, I want to highlight some of the ways that Horton's theories of education and attention to community exigencies have been taken up. Ira Shor was one of the first to call attention to the affinity between Horton's work and Paulo Freire's pedagogy for critical pedagogy, noting that "both men insisted in the relationship of play and joy to critical thought and social change" (qtd. in Jacobs xi). Jacobs notes that Horton's appeal for critical pedagogy stemmed from emphasizing "the whole person, emotionally and physically, as well as intellectually" in any educational program that sought to empower the learner (xii). R. Chelsa Sharp echoes Jacobs' and Shor's observations in discussing the use of cultural forms in Highlander's programs to involve the whole person and to introduce alternative discursive models like plays and songs in educational curricula, a point most evident in the introduction of music programming to the Citizenship School curriculum as a tool to build solidarity and develop confidence in learners ability to move from "where they are" to where they "ought to be." Jacobs points

out that "Horton's pedagogical theories were inextricably linked to his insistence on equality, social justice, and a radically re-visioned concept of democracy" (xiii). Myles himself, Schneider points out, never saw the Citizenship Schools as focused solely on literacy, but were, rather, "first and foremost, political campaigns" (The Sea Island Citizenship Schools 156). Horton's work has had a demonstrable influence on the public turn in composition and rhetoric. The emphasis on social justice and education has made Horton particularly appealing for composition pedagogy and literacy studies, as the work by Levine, Kates, Lathan, and Schneider discussed earlier illustrates. Most noticeably, Horton's approach to community based education can be seen shaping ongoing discussions in the work of Goldblatt, Branch, and Feigenbaum (and, I would argue, provides a useful corollary for the work of Grabill and Mathieu). Kirk Branch has taken up Horton's goal of the "ought to be" in theorizing the ways that models of education in the extracurriculum help elaborate the role, possibilities, and constraints of community based literacy initiatives. Community based literacy education, Branch argues "always invoke a future world that out to be" (8), and necessarily is an incomplete and potentially unachievable process. Working from Highlander's model of education Branch advocates for literacy initiatives that "work in the service of covert, situationally grounded, and always constrained action" (189). Like Branch, Feigenbaum finds the example of Horton's engagement with institutions through community based literacy initiatives to offer a fruitful position to respond to and, perhaps, as Grabill has suggested, rewrite institutions: "I believe the discipline of rhetoric and composition is uniquely located within the academy to lead the way in producing these institutional changes" (Community Action 283). For the present discussion, I find a useful echo in the emphasis

on the whole individual, cultural forms, community, and institutions in the work of these scholars for calling attention to the role of rhetorical space in developing islanders' rhetoric of citizenship in working towards the goal of first class citizenship. As Schneider observed, Citizenship Schools were not abstract educational programs but were firmly anchored in the material, discursive everyday life of the islanders.

The Citizenship School program, thus, usefully expands the scope of how islanders' embodied placemaking served as a rhetoric of citizenship. Rouse notes that rhetorics of citizenship facilitate including the often marginalized discourses generated in and addressing the needs of local communities as community members work to imagine "their role as citizens of their immediate communities" (116). The informal and independent institutions of island life discussed thus far demonstrate islanders' practices of citizenship and efforts to mediate the experience of subjugation through the development of a black spatiality providing the resources needed to address the needs of their immediate community. Like the praise house and benevolent society traditions embodied in Moving Star Hall and Association, Citizenship Schools arose out of the expressed needs and desires of the community. However, Rouse also argues that "rhetorics of citizenship work toward the common good of the country" as marginalized citizenry respond to, negotiate, and contest ideas of citizenship. The Citizenship School, as Schneider points out, not only served as a material, embodiable site joining local communities to a larger movement, but produced the social space for islanders' "experience of democratic citizenship" as participants imagined and came to embody new citizenship roles in the nation. The rhetorical space of the Citizenship School classroom thus serves as an important case study of how islanders brought the resources

of a black spatiality developed within the community to bear on the habits of citizenship governing local and national publics and "[worked] toward the common good of the country" as islanders imagined and embodied new roles and participatory practices of first class citizens.

In what follows, I suggest that the "all-round education in community development" developed by the Citizenship Schools and "direct experience of democratic citizenship" embodied in the space of the schools served as a practice of embodied placemaking used to bring previously silenced or "absent" communities to rhetorical "presence." To make this case, I focus on the creation of a new rhetorical space for the first Citizenship School, established on Johns Island in 1957. I first discuss the origins of the Citizenship School, and contextualize this in the work of the Highlander Folk School and Esau Jenkins. I then turn to the development of a collaborative relationship between Highlander and the islanders that would be instrumental for developing a program that evolved out of and addressed islanders' desire for citizenship education, before turning to the process of conceptualizing a spatial praxis realized in a new rhetorical space for adult learners to develop habits of citizenship. I conclude the chapter by offering an argument for expanding our sense of the rhetorical space of the Citizenship School by positioning it in the affiliated site and institution of the Progressive Club, where the Citizenship School was held. I argue that the affiliated institution provided the material and discursive space for islanders to put into practice the habits of citizenship developed in the Citizenship School, and so needs to be considered for how rhetorical education could produce a new embodiable space for islanders to act as first class citizens. Taken together, the two institutions provide a clear lens for understanding islanders' invention of rhetorical

spaces as an embodied practice of placemaking in the development of new habits of citizenship that "work toward the common good of the country."

Embodying the "Ought to Be" in the Rhetorical Space of the Citizenship School

To begin, we need trouble any conception that the rhetorical education developed in the Citizenship School program had an end goal in mind. As is clear in the statement of purpose, the Citizenship Schools were never *solely* about voting. Rather, rhetorical education was a means of reconstructing and reimagining the social through the interanimated needs, desires, and exigencies of individuals and communities. To this end, pedagogies were built out of the participants expressed desires and needs for education. Participants said they wanted to "order from catalogues, to count money, to read letters from their families who lived off the island, to read the bible, to fill out money orders, to read the newspaper, to sew and crochet, and to register to vote" (Olendorff 71-72). Here, islanders articulate goals for a practical rhetorical education that brings together economic domains, personal and private domains, aesthetic domains, and public domains. Broadly speaking, the participants – both learners and teachers – collaboratively articulated a program of citizenship education that would help them realize their goals of transforming the means and modes of navigating personal, communal, and civic life in their immediate communities and the broader American imaginary. Myles Horton of the Highlander Folk School wrote that the success of the Citizenship School program stemmed from "[keeping] our eyes on the *ought to be*" of full citizenship (Tjerandsen 142) as a way to address the material realities of the "is," the current state of islanders' subjugated position in island space as second class citizens. For Horton, developing a

rhetorical space where Citizenship School participants could imagine and embody the "ought to be" in islanders' everyday life would be central to conceptualizing a community of leaders, a sense of communality, an ethical commitment to others, and a dignified life. By having teachers respectfully meet learners as full humans deserving of the rights of full citizenship and imagining how they *ought to be*, "the specifics in the *is* circle-begin to move together in a direction of what *ought to be*" (Tjerandsen 143). Citizenship education was conceived, practiced, and distributed as a process of change that would not only trouble dominant rhetorics of right, law, and justice that had historically favored White citizenry, but would effect new "habits of citizenship" islanders could use in contesting and negotiating who has the right to speak and act in the public spaces of civic life.

The accomplishment of these ideals for citizenship education hinged not only on conceptualizing an ideal of participant citizenship, but on the creation of a rhetorical space where islanders could not only develop the practical skills needed for civic life, but where islanders could work to imagine themselves as first class citizens in a socially produced, material space. The invention of a new rhetorical space in the Citizenship School provided the institutional space and practices to develop an embodiable idea of the "ought to be."

From its inception, the Citizenship Schools blurred the distinction between citizenship as a discrete set of practices (voting, for example) and citizenship as a practice of acting, mode of publicity, and imagining oneself differently. As an institution, the Citizenship School embodied the vision of the "ought to be" in providing a rhetorical space where learners could shape the kinds of citizenship practices desired and imagined

as central to navigating the social, economic, and political spaces of island life.

Inventing a Space for Citizenship Education

Tracing the Origins of an Idea

The idea of developing a rhetorical space that would be realized in the Citizenship Schools is commonly narrated as having taken root in August 1954 at a Highlander Workshop on the United Nations attended by Bernice Robinson, Septima Clark and Esau Jenkins[21]. At the UN workshop, Esau Jenkins noted the appeal of the UN's statement on human rights, before raising the question to the participants of how Highlander could serve his community in addressing the immediate needs facing African Americans on Johns Island. While an appealing origin narrative for the Citizenship Schools, it does little to provide a portrait of the rhetorical work surrounding Jenkins' arrival at Highlander[22], and in this the narrative risks 1) eliding the spatial praxes shaping the movement for citizenship on Johns Island and in Charleston; and 2) eliding the collaborative ethos at work in island and city spaces by positioning Esau Jenkins as the individual responsible for initiating the discussion of the Citizenship Schools. Their presence at the "Workshop on World Problems, The United Nations and You" helps illustrate the ways in which community leaders had long been active in working to effect change for African American communities on Johns Island and Charleston and the efforts activists made in developing new models for organizing to effect change. Clark's,

---

[21] Schneider's perspective is typical of this origin narrative, "The concept of Citizenship schools - institutions designed to help African Americans secure the vote through reading and writing instruction - first arrived at Highlander in '954 with South Carolinians Septima Clark and Esau Jenkins, who saw the need for robust literacy programs as a means of supporting voter registration efforts" (117).

[22] Susan Kates reminder that "these three individuals were certainly activists in their own right before they ever attended seminars at the folk school" (483) is particularly apt in reframing the origin narrative.

Robinson's and Jenkins' attendance at the workshop can be traced to earlier activities and other activists in Charleston and Johns Island, and offers a glimpse into local efforts at organizing to address the inequalities of the Jim Crow South.

In 1953, Anna Kelly, the executive secretary of the African American Charleston YWCA attended a workshop at Highlander on school desegregation. Kelly was a co-worker of Septima Clark, and together the two had worked on a number of programs serving African American communities in Charleston. Clark had worked with Kelly to force integration of a tuberculosis program and had helped finance diphtheria immunizations for children in Charleston. With Kelly's assistance, Clark, who had long held relations with Johns Island worked to expand the funding to include the children of Johns Island, where 68 children alone died in 1953. While she had not lived on the island for some time, Clark had maintained her relationship with the islands through service initiatives and offered a spatial perspective that helped bring to light the connections between the islands and Charleston. Because of the numbers of workers entering Charleston as domestics and factory workers, island health problems posed challenges to Charleston communities. Once it became clear that Charleston was at risk of having the disease spread through domestics coming in from Johns Island the county health authority helped establish temporary clinics at a school on the island (Tjerandsen 150). Given Clark's long experience working with both communities, Kelly convinced Clark to attend a workshop with Highlander in 1954; Clark in turn convinced Esau Jenkins, along with Bernice Robinson, to attend the workshop with her to explore options for developing programs and providing services for the community on Johns Island.

While the Highlander UN workshop offers an appealing foundational moment for

the Citizenship Schools, the spatial praxis that would evolve out of the workshop is better understood not as an origin, but as an outcome of a spatial praxis already being developed by islanders and the collaborative work of activists in the island and city communities, as illustrated by the collaborative work done by Kelly and Clark. To understand the rhetorical legacy that would result in the founding of the Citizenship Schools, we can look beyond this zero moment at the traces of a spatial praxis developed by the principal players in the narrative: the Highlander Folk School and Esau Jenkins.

Highlander's Efforts at Desegregation

By the time that Jenkins, Clark, and Robinson attended the Highlander workshop, Highlander had already set in motion programs to address the potential outcomes of *Brown vs. Board* that would contribute significant rhetorical approaches to re-conceiving southern space. Highlander had already gained a reputation and some notoriety as an integrated space in which African American and white students could come together, discuss problems, eat and sleep in the same space, and work towards addressing the exigencies of their own communities from multiple perspectives. By 1953, Highlander's teachers had helped craft open spaces for the United Packinghouse Workers of America (UPWA) education program to help end racial segregation in their locals. As the Supreme Court began to consider *Brown*, and with no certainty of the outcome, Highlander's executive council decided it was time "to extend its activities into wider fields of full democratization" and submitted a proposal that Highlander should focus on the issue of school desegregation. Following on this, the council decided that the staff should hold "two experimental workshops during the summer of 1953" that would bring together

"representatives of labor, church, interracial, and civic groups to provide leadership during the transition from a segregated to an integrated public school system in the South" (Glen 155). In 1953 Highlander held a workshop on "The Supreme Court Decision and Public Schools" that produced a clear and flexible rhetoric for achieving the difficult goal of integration, "The South's Number One Problem," by creating a new spatiality that would radically reimagine and transform the spatial praxis of Jim Crow practices.

The report on the workshop suggests a deep awareness of the need to provide the materials, group affiliations, and rhetorical spaces necessary to producing the new material, imagined, and experienced social space necessary to move into an integrated system. At the workshop Anna Kelly reported on taking the first steps in Charleston to "prepare favorable climates and attitudes" for the Supreme Court Decision by drawing together the local YWCA branch, the Ministerial Union, the NAACP, and the Race Relations Committee (Highlander Folk School Report on Highlander Workshop). During the workshop, Kelly and other attendees drew up a report calling for the centrality of "[integrating] public school facilities as part of any desegregation plan"; produced *The High Costs of Segregation,* a filmstrip that pointed out "the ill effects of segregation on housing and health as well as schools, and produced a list of media treating similar topics; and a guide and checklist outlining "how a campaign could grow from a small interracial core of influential people to a coordinated effort involving various organizations committed to school integration" (Glen 156). By the time of the UN workshop, Highlander had already envisioned the spatial challenges facing a desegregated south and contributed substantial training, discursive materials, and

resources central to conceiving new spaces for social action and cultivating "wider fields of full democratization" that would bring together African Americans and whites in public spaces.

Esau Jenkins and Citizenship on Johns Island

Reading Jenkins efforts to develop islanders' citizenship practices provides a useful lens to see traces of a community actively engaged in crafting and responding to new rhetorical dwelling places. Before Jenkins attended Highlander, he had long been actively engaged in community organizing on Johns Island. As Clark's narrative of Jenkins speaking engagement in Charleston (discussed in Chapter Two) suggests, Jenkins' skill at moving between Island and city communities draws on embodied placemaking as a rhetoric of citizenship. Just as he established a new ethos amongst Charlestonians by using Gullah language and narrative to disarticulate the primitive trope written upon islander bodies by Charlestonians and bring to presence island exigencies then, Jenkins ethos was well established on the island for his work addressing the exigencies of the island. Well known, well respected, and highly visible in serving the community, Jenkins employed his "place" on the island to develop an embodied rhetoric of how islanders might perform citizenship and invented new spaces for islanders to improve their own positions. Jenkins worked tirelessly in the existing institutional spaces of the schools, church, and legal societies; he also founded or would go on to found new civic organizations dedicated to addressing political, legal, and economic issues faced by islanders and Charlestonians. At the time of the workshop, he was president of the PTA, superintendent of the Methodist Sunday School, an assistant

pastor, president of the Citizens Club (established to encourage people to register to vote), chairman of the Progressive Club (founded initially to provide aid to African Americans who were arrested and in need of financial support for legal aid, the Progressive Club held its regular meetings in Moving Star Hall), and a board member of the Charleston NAACP (Zilphia Horton Field Trip Report; Glen 189). While working to effect change within key institutional spaces of his community, Jenkins also sought out opportunities to change the imagined relation islanders had with dominant institutions.

Shortly after his visit to Highlander, Jenkins would run for a position on the school board, and though he did not get elected, his campaign helped illustrate to the islanders that through registering to vote they could take active steps to gaining positions needed to effect change on the islands. Speaking with Myles Horton of his anticipated campaign, Jenkins said that he wanted to run "not that there is any hope of getting elected, but I want to prove that a Negro can run for office and not get killed" (qtd. in Tjerandsen 152). As a mode of publicity Jenkins' campaign reflects a legacy of islanders using embodied placemaking as a rhetoric of citizenship. Jenkins notes that only 300 islanders were registered to vote at the time of his election, about one tenth of the Gullah population on the island. Lacking the political presence (a body of voters) needed to win the election, Jenkins used his ethos amongst the islanders to provide a lesson in rhetorical education. Speaking of the campaign in 1965, Jenkins testified to his use of civic space in persuading islanders of how they might change the institutions of civic life: "l wanted the Negroes to know that it is their privilege to go into any office they're qualified to handle" (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 152). While Jenkins interest lie in changing islander imaginary, his candidacy and support amongst registered African American voters

(nearly all of the 300 registered African American voters voted for him and Jenkins managed to come in third, beating a fourth, white candidate) elicited a change in how the state managed access to civic space. Fearing a breach in the white hold on the school board, the chairman of the county council changed the position of school trustee from an elected position to an appointive position (Glen 190; Carawan and Carawan 152). Despite this change in civic practices, the appearance of Jenkins name on the discursive space of the ballot illustrated a new rhetorical space for islanders to give voice to the exigencies of a black spatiality:

> My name was placed in alphabetical order and *they saw it*. And when one of the guys went in and saw my name, he went and told the rest, say, "Man, Esau Jenkins' name on that voting machine," says, "You better go on down there and vote." And that year we had about ninety-nine percent of the Negroes who registered vote. Encourage them ever since to vote. [emphasis added] (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 152)

By making himself visible and “placing" himself in the discursive and material space of a local public, where his name could be “seen" Jenkins carved out a new dwelling space in the island’s white spatiality and initiated a call to action in his island community that helped mobilize islanders’ desire to work for change in the islands.

Outside of civic participation, through his own initiative Jenkins worked to transform the economic rhetorics central to a white spatiality constraining islanders efforts for sovereignty and presence. Jenkins owned property in Charleston, had established a successful truck farming operation, developed his math skills to more equitably trade with white farmers on the island (who bought islanders’ agricultural

goods at a cheaper price than offered to white islanders), and subsequently learned Greek to more directly work with Greek farmers in Charleston and eliminate the white middlemen on the island. One of the most storied and oft cited initiatives Jenkins took was to buy buses to transport islanders to Charleston to work.

Though he was denied a place in the dominant public of the island in his bid for school board trustee, Jenkins' bus program provided another occasion to invent a new site for islanders to rhetorically imagine themselves and would provide an early model for success in developing a program of rhetorical education for the islanders in the Low Country. During the UN workshop Jenkins discussed the buses as a means for providing islanders a space to resist Jim Crow practices and to affirm their dignity by negotiating the constraints on islander presence in public spaces. When the bridges connecting the islands directly to Charleston were opened, African American islanders were subject to the same stringent busing regulations experienced throughout the south. Islanders had to take a seat in the back of the bus, stand for the duration of the trip when the buses were crowded with white workers, or were removed from the crowded buses to make way for white workers. However, owning the buses Jenkins could work outside of Jim Crow regulations and create an open space that equalized the position held by the races. “White folks as well as colored folks ride in my busses - without discrimination,” Jenkins said. "First ones get the seats, the rest stand up - both Negro and white” (qtd. in Zilphia Horton Field Report). The buses provided an embodied experience different from what many islanders experienced in the public spaces of everyday life.

It was on these buses that Jenkins had begun an early program for citizenship education as he transported islanders some 30-40 miles to and from the islands and

Charleston to work as domestics and factory workers. In this constrained, mobile space Jenkins employed his ethos as a leader on the island to teach passengers key passages from the state constitution. During the ride, he circulated copies of the South Carolina constitution and voting laws. Using these materials islanders learned to read or, more commonly, memorize key passages to help in passing the registration tests. However, while he had some successes (as noted in the story of Alice Wine that opened the chapter), the buses did not provide the islanders with the skills needed to read and write, nor did it provide a larger vision of citizenship practices that made a clear connection between islanders' education and serving as leaders in their community (Tjerandsen; Clark Echo). As these examples illustrate Jenkins, like Clark, arrived at the workshop experienced in crafting new rhetorical dwelling places in the material and imagined spaces of the island's white spatialities, but with a desire to develop new programs that would address islanders' need for civic education[23] and the skills that would facilitate participating in civic life.

Creating a Space for Highlander on the Island

Jenkins' participation in the UN Workshop would prove to be pivotal in shaping Highlander's role in the Islands. After listening to the presentation on Human Rights and

[23] While I am focusing here on Jenkins, Clark, and the foundation of the CS program on Johns Island, they were by no means the only people from the Charleston and Sea Islands area to attend Highlander. Bernice Robinson, her brother and niece as well as Septima Clark's niece attended Highlander workshops. Notable Charlestonians like Joe Brown and his family, Herbert Fielding and his sons, as well as Islander activist Bill Saunders and "lots of people from the islands" attended Highlander workshops. Though Charlestonians' attitudes about the Islands were troubling at times (See Clark's discussion of Charlestonians' attitudes towards Islanders in Chapter Two), a broad cross section of Charleston and Island communities came together at Highlander to establish and build on existing ways of organizing their communities for change and developing models of publicity for participating in the publics of the Low Country. See William Smyth, "Segregation in Charleston in the 1950s: A Decade in Transition" for a further discussion of the network of activism developing in Charleston and the Sea Islands and the role that Highlander played in supporting voting initiatives in Charleston elections in the late 50s.

the United nations, Jenkins said,

> he thought it was fine to talk about the world but that he had problems at home. His problem was to get help on teaching the people on his island to read well enough to pass the voter registration requirement exam that was given by white registrars who were very unsympathetic to blacks voting and used the restriction of literacy as a means of keeping blacks from voting. (Freire and Horton 67-68)

In his remarks to the workshop participants, Jenkins testifies to a central problem facing the island that would resonate with Highlander's desire to take a more active role in the nascent Civil Rights movement: the need for a space to experiment with new programs to develop local leadership and to develop initiatives that provided a full education in civic life. Clark recalls how Alice Wine was unsatisfied with using her memory to register to vote and expressed a desire to develop the skills and knowledge needed to more fully participate in civic life. Wine "had a marvelous ability to memorize" and had succeeded in registering to vote primarily by memorizing whole sections of the state constitution. Afterwards though, she asked Jenkins "if there was any kind of school where she could learn to read and write" (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 201). Jenkins would find an attentive ear in Myles Horton, who had made trips to Charleston to try to raise interest in attending the new workshops focusing on Civil rights. "Now, through Esau, he had a way to reach people" Clark recalls (201).

Clark's comment becomes clear in a series of letters showing Jenkins and Myles and Zilphia Horton[24] lay the foundation of a working relationship to develop a rhetorical

[24] Both Zilphia and Myles Horton played a role in the early relationship developed between Highlander and Johns Island. To avoid confusion and for the sake of clarity in the text, When referring to Zilphia Horton I

space on Johns Island that would address islanders' desire to change their status in the island and Low Country publics. Of particular note in these early exchanges is the immediate impact Highlander had on shaping efforts in the islands, the effort to "reveal" the island to an outside audience, and the centrality of outsiders collaboratively negotiating a presence on the island under the umbrella of Jenkins' and Clark's ethos. In early correspondence with Horton upon his return to the islands, Jenkins narrates how he has begun implementing some of the resources gathered in the UN Workshop and started building interest on the island:

> I have received the summary of discussions and projects which developed out [*sic*] 'Workshop on World Problems, The United Nations and You.' I Showed it to many Pearsons [*sic*] of whom felt the way I felt; that the job was well done; and your school is doing something, that just as soon as the United States encourages more of this tipe [*sic*] of Schools, we will have less trouble teaching the rest of the world that our way of life is the world's best. (Letter to Myles Horton)

In addition to sharing the ideas developed in the UN workshop and building interest in the work Highlander is engaged in, Jenkins identifies steps he has taken to begin using Highlander's resources to develop a critical perspective and discussion of conditions in the islands. Building on the perspective developed at Highlander, Jenkins narrates how he has begun developing support in the PTA to show several films made by Highlander and used at the UN workshop to foster a critical perspective on the workshop attendees own communities at his High School to raise awareness about rights issues. He hopes to show

---

refer her solely by her first name. Since Myles played a more visible role in the narrative I discuss, I refer to him alternately as Myles Horton, Myles, or Horton. Any use of Horton refers to Myles Horton.

"Of Human Rights," "World Without End," "Fisherman of Quintay," and "The Children." Jenkins also writes of his plans to develop spaces built on his experience with Highlander, Jenkins takes the occasion to inform Horton of current programs on the island that show islanders already engaged in producing new spaces to cross racial divides on the island and in Charleston. Jenkins tells of "three weeks of fellowship at our Church on Johns Island" with young men and white women from Charleston. The "young people of both races went back to school now, but they ask me to have our Center for this kind of fellowship again after schools are closed, because they enjoyed it" (Letter to Myles Horton).

In his response, Horton tells of how "Everyone here at Highlander was delighted to learn of the rapid and sound programs you are making on Johns Island." Speaking of the Church fellowship, Horton notes that the example of "young people of both races getting together is an inspiration to us all." From Jenkins' letter, Horton is able to envision a productive space where Highlander could align its goals for addressing race with islanders' efforts to find ways to transform island relations and island space: "In a real sense you are helping develop a little Highlander School on your island" (Letter to Esau Jenkins). In these early letters we are offered an insight to Jenkins and the Hortons working together to begin conceiving and imagining new rhetorical spaces on the island.

Shared Ethos

In addition to developing a working relationship with Horton through the circulation of letters discussing the ideas and goals of a collaboration with Highlander, the letters also show a sensitivity to how the Hortons, as representatives of an outside

institution, might negotiate the troubling dichotomy between islanders and outsiders. To address islanders' suspicion of outsiders Clark and Jenkins offered their support and encouragement to Myles and Zilphia Horton to come and visit the islands. "Esau could be trusted on the island," Clark writes, "and because he could be trusted, he could introduce us to numbers of others who would trust us" (Ready from Within 49). While Jenkins and Clark had provided information about Johns Island during the UN workshop and in their letters, they, and Horton, were wary of developing a program from afar, as it risked providing pat solutions that were not responsive to the needs and desires of the islanders and risked islanders responding negatively to citizenship initiatives developed without an understanding of island conditions and exigencies. To address these concerns, Highlander operated under the umbrella of Jenkins' and Clark's ethos amongst the islanders to build the trust that would be central to creating a space on the island for Highlander.

The first visit to the islands by a Highlander staff member occurred when Zilphia Horton was invited and visited the island in the Fall of 1954 to investigate the potential for Jenkins to assume a leadership role in developing a program responsive to the conditions of the islands. Though details of her visit are thin, in a report on her visit to Charleston and Johns Island, she suggests that her visit was deeply rhetorical in providing the opportunity to see Johns Island in a revelatory light: "As I start to write of my recent trip to South Carolina to attend the testimonial dinner for Judge J. Waties Waring, I realize that it's really a story about Esau Jenkins. […] a man with a seventh grade education" (Field Trip Report). She goes on to identify Jenkins as an ideal candidate for developing a leadership role and provides evidence citing Jenkins' ethos amongst the islanders, explaining to the Highlander staff that Jenkins is active in several notable

offices on the island, has established several organizations to register voters and help with legal problems, and has established himself as a successful businessman (Field Trip Report). Once she had received Jenkins' invitation, she replies that she "had an added incentive to go to Charleston…I was to be the guest of the Esau Jenkins family on Johns Island" (Field Trip Report). In a letter to Esau thanking him for his time, Zilphia alludes to the time spent on Johns Island in such a way that suggests she had spent time with not only the Jenkins family, but had laid the groundwork for developing a working relationship on the island by interacting and learning from other members of the community as well. She writes: "It is impossible to put into words how much my visit with your family on Johns Island meant to me. It was a heartwarming experience to see the response of the John's Island people to your most recent political experience." Moreover she suggests how important it was to be welcomed by the family: "Please tell Mrs. Jenkins and all the children how very much I appreciate their making me feel at home. I have talked so much about my visit, that all the highlander folks feel they have paid you a visit and are ready to make another one" (Letter to Esau Jenkins). Esau responds to her letter that he "was very glad…to know that you felt that you were treated as one of the family" (Letter to Zilphia Horton).

Their exchange suggests not only the desire for further work in the islands - Highlander staff members "are ready to make another [visit]."; Zilphia's attention to the affective environment in which she was received "as family" also suggests a gratefulness for Jenkins sponsorship of her presence in the community. For Highlander to develop working relations on Johns Island, staff members would need to find a positive space in islander imaginary, a rhetorical dwelling space within the community. In being welcomed

as “family” Zilphia has identified a rhetorical position from which Highlander can enter island space, not as outsiders, but as collaborators sponsored by Jenkins’ ethos on the island. Her enthused discussion of her visit at Highlander also suggests that she has left the island with a portable sense of place that she can use to create a rhetorical space for Highlander staff members to imagine a place for their role in the island: "I have talked so much about my visit, that all the highlander folks feel they have paid you a visit and are ready to make another one.” In the report written upon her return to Highlander, Zilphia clarifies that “The purpose of this trip was to further investigate Esau's possibilities as a potential trainee for democratic leadership under the ESF [Emil Schwarzhaupt Foundation] grant, to learn more about Johns Island as a possible demonstration community and to establish friendly contacts." In a summative comment that would open the door to further work on Johns Island Zilphia concludes her evaluation of island space noting "Johns Island had good possibilities as a demonstration community" for developing an adult education program to address citizenship needs and develop leadership in the community (Tjerandsen 152). Throughout the exchange we see not only the foundation of developing a physical relationship and presence for Highlander in the island, but in the sensitivity to Zilphia’s presence on the islands, we also see what would be a central component of developing the program: the shared ethos Jenkins and his family provided for opening a space for Zilphia to interact with the islanders.

Listening to the Community

The groundwork laid in the letter exchange and Zilphia’s report about the island would provide the foundation for Highlander developing an embodiable space on Johns

Island. However, learning from recent failures Highlander had experienced in developing community leadership, Myles Horton would develop a practice of rhetorical listening that shaped the relationship Highlander would take in the islands and provided the community voice needed to conceptualize a rhetorical space that served the express needs of Johns Island community.

Myles first visit to the island in December of 1954 came, as with Zilphia, at Jenkins' invitation and would be only the first in a long series of visits to the island supported by the grant from the Emile Schwarzhaupt Foundation. In all, Myles would spend several months on the island listening to islanders, getting to know the community and learning of the conditions that might be addressed in an adult education program. The Emil Schwarzhaupt Foundation provided a three-year grant for Highlander to continue developing programs for Civil Rights. This grant would prove to be instrumental in Highlander's role in the Civil Rights Movement because it freed Highlander from a results driven model guided by a strict timeframe, as was common in many grants (Ling 410-411), and allowed for Highlander to experiment with developing community leadership and, importantly, fail, as had been the case in their work in Altoona, Alabama and Kodak Tennessee. Speaking with Carl Tjerandsen of ESF Horton recalled that:

> I asked you in 1953, `Can we experiment with the money and try out some things? There are lots of ideas about the community I've rejected. Maybe I was wrong. Could I try them now?' And you agreed we could. You were the first foundation willing to give us money for an undefined and

> unproven program. It was the most valuable grant Highlander received[25]. (Tjerandsen 144).

By the time Highlander began working with Johns Island, the school had recently experienced problems with developing community leadership in Altoona, Alabama and Kodak, Tennessee. Highlander's failures in Altoona and Kodak would give Horton the pause needed to modify his approach and to build initiatives that worked from within communities where Highlander would take an advisory role, as was the case on Johns Island, evidenced by Zilphia's comment in her report about exploring the possibility of working with Jenkins to develop leadership within Johns Island communities.

Speaking of the failures in Altoona and Kodak, Myles Horton points out that the general failures stemmed from a conceptual apparatus that illustrates the need for a sensitivity to the spatial issues particular to rhetorically motivating participants of the program:

> In our haste to get community projects underway at the beginning of the program we did not sufficiently examine the community issues. We pushed staff people into leadership positions before they were ready.... In Alabama, we were unable to develop the leadership rapidly enough to rise above the factionalism that had made community organization difficult. (Tjerandsen 146)

In these failures Horton identified two problems that point to problems with developing leadership within communities. In Altoona, Highlander rushed to instill outsiders as primary leaders in organizing the community. As a result, the community itself was left

[25] To offer a broader portrait of ESF's supporting giving Highlander the time to experiment, the three year grant would be renewed in 1956.

out of decisive moments of leadership development. Rather than empowering local leadership, motives for participants to act were curtailed by Highlander's perceived outsider expertise. In Kodak Highlander applied a "whole community" approach that failed to address the factionalism evident between communities and community members (Tjerandsen 144). "Whole community" approaches limit the actions that can be taken by confining decisions to issues that the "whole community" can agree on, and so offers only relatively modest, "safe" issues around which different factions could agree. "Whole community" approaches offer only an abstract space that elides the experience of lived life through the appeal to an overly broad consensus and so cannot adequately address the particulars of developing initiatives for community leadership. From Altoona and Kodak, Highlander learned a few lessons that would be instrumental to their success in working with Johns Island: 1) initiatives had to originate from within the community; 2) that Highlander staff could not take on leadership roles as their direction may lose or ignore the motivating factor for people to organize on their own initiative and take up accountability for acting; and 3) that the approach cannot try to lump together too many communities in a "whole community" approach, lest factionalism cause the program to break down and lose the appeal for community members. For Highlander to be effective in assisting Johns Islanders in developing education initiatives to further their pursuit for First Class Citizenship, the program had to build on islanders' own concerns, staff members had to operate in the background in an advisory role, and the program had to flexibly respond to the particular demands of local space. Like Zilphia, Myles benefitted from working within the shelter of Clark's and Jenkins' established ethos on the island, and in turn would use this shared space to craft his own rhetorical dwelling space

with the islanders that would allow the adult education program to develop with these primary lessons from the failures in Altoona and Kodak in mind.

The open ended nature of ESF's grant allowed for Horton to spend time with Jenkins, Clark and the Johns Island community to develop an awareness of the social, political, and economic issues motivating islanders' desire for citizenship that would be central to imagining a spatial program for establishing a rhetorical space where islanders not only learned practical skills like how to read and write, but provided a general education in social, health, economic, and political literacies critical to islanders developing an embodied placemaking as a rhetoric of citizenship. Moreover, his time spent on the islands offered him a rhetorical education in listening as a way of crafting shared dwelling spaces for islanders and Highlander staff to collaborate.

In each of the failures discussed by Horton, communities were silenced in the effort to develop leadership - initially by the presence of an outsider who was not sensitive to community members desires and subsequently in the "whole community" approach that silenced participants' points of difference as a productive source for imagining ways of acting. In Horton's memoirs, interviews, and notes, he returns to the trope of listening to islanders talk about their experience of everyday life in the white space of the islands. He attributes the initial success in developing programs with Johns Island communities to his time spent on the island and in conversation with islanders, learning to listen to community members. Horton's observation that "we try to give people a sense of their own dignity by listening to what they're saying or even what they're thinking" (Horton Interview 492-493) suggests that listening positions speakers in a privileged position to articulate their ideas where their concerns might otherwise not

have been heard. This privileged position allows for "people" to embody a dignified position as subjects, rather than the dehumanizing position of objects marginalized by practices that silence difference. We saw just such an example of this when Jenkins spoke out about the conditions on the island at the UN Conference, effectively redirecting the discussion from a discussion of UN rights to local rights and needs. The workshop space provided not only the opportunity to bring island concerns to presence in an alternative institutional space to an audience of mixed race, social, and class positions, but for Jenkins concerns to be heard in such a way that would initiate a new kind of work in developing rhetorical spaces to address those concerns. Listening, Horton suggests, invents a new space for participants and staff members to work together across their differences and to develop new knowledge out of islanders' embodied experience.

Much of Horton's position on spending time in communities and listening as a means for silenced citizens to embody a new "dignified" position from which their knowledge and beliefs can be heard prefigures the way that rhetorical listening has been theorized in the field. Krista Ratcliffe posits rhetorical listening as "a trope for interpretative invention and as a code of cross-cultural conduct. . .[which] signifies a stance of openness that a person may choose to assume in relation to any person, text, or culture" (1). Ratcliffe offers rhetorical listening as an intervention to how we theorize identification, in particular to how Burke's theory of identification has been taken up as a trope for forging relationships by identifying similarities. Burke has offered the trope of identification as a useful way of invoking a consubstantial space for constituting and establishing membership with or in groups. However, Ratcliffe points out that the emphasis on similarities risks silencing the productive point of encountering differences

through a process of disidentification, those spaces of encounter where an identification "has already been made and denied in the unconscious" (Fuss qtd. in Ratcliffe 62); disidentifications offer the problematic means of forging identifications against the disidentified, rendering difference perpetually other by denying the embodiable presence of the experience of difference.

By contrast, a metonymic view of identification attends to those spaces where disidentifications shut down and silence productive ways of engaging differences. Rhetorical listening offers the ethical choice to attend to the "margin between," as a non-identification: "a place of pause, a place of reflection, a place that invites people to admit gaps exist" (73) and privilege the discourse of others. For Ratcliffe, "rhetorical listening in the place of non-identification may precede new identifications; in other cases it enables us to revisit former identifications and disidentifications" (73). For Ratcliffe, the gap encountered in a space of non-identification may take the form of "a person, place, thing, or idea" (73). In developing her theory, Ratcliffe deploys primarily spatial, embodiable tropes. Her primary tropes of a "stance of openness…in relation to" a "margin between" as "a place of pause, a place of reflection" are complemented by a discussion of the problematic dichotomy of inside and outside epistemologies; rhetorical listening occurs "in an uncomfortable spot" as a way of ethically navigating "the border of knowing and not knowing" (104-105). I would argue that these are more than just tropes that she deploys; they highlight the material as well as discursive ways that differences are produced, reproduced, and employed to manage access to the ability to speak, be heard, and to act to resolve the cultural logics marginalizing difference.

As a spatial praxis, the embodied place of rhetorical listening compels attending

to the material and discursive spaces where differences meet in the "margin between" and offers stratagems for conceptualizing and inventing new spaces for acting across differences. Nowhere would this become clearer than when Highlander began working with Johns Island. Frank Adams notes that Johns Island was not only divided by race, a visible way of managing space, but that social space "was further divided by tongue—the whites spoke Charlestonese, a Southern dialect peculiar even to other native-born Southerners, while the Blacks spoke mostly Gullah" (511). Amongst the initial difficulties Highlander faced in making an identification with islanders was, to quote Adams, to "make the tongue work" (511). As a means of marking difference, language served as a polarizing facet of island life and bore connotations of primitivism that would further silence and mark islanders' bodies as second class citizens. Yet, within Gullah communities, the Gullah "tongue" served as a vehicle for centuries of embodied experience, knowledge, and traditions used in crafting consubstantial space and developing practices of citizenship (see Chapter Three above). "To make the tongue work," suggests that Highlander was conscious of the role that these traditions offered as a resource for reshaping the habits of citizenship governing islanders' access to public space. In an acknowledgement of language as a space of power, and as a primary point of non-identification and difference, Horton attests to his own discomforting efforts to take a "stance of openness": "They spoke Gullah and I had to get my ears accustomed to understanding them" (Horton and Freire 68-69). Listening as Horton describes it privileges the embodied local discourse, desires, values and practices over Highlander's outside perspective or presuppositions about the islands. In doing so, Horton positions himself, and consequently Highlander, bodily (his ears had to get "accustomed to

understanding them") in the "margin between" as a productive space to empower islanders' motives in inventing rhetorical spaces that address the social, political, and economic needs of the islanders. Myles's time spent listening to islanders proved a rich source of invention for understanding not only the conditions that islanders wanted to address in an adult education program, but for coming to understand the shared motive and investment islanders had in organizing new citizenship initiatives.

In his first visit to the island, Horton's use of a rhetoric of listening revealed the degree to which islanders were already engaged as agents in shaping the movement for first class citizenship. Myles first visit to the island coincided with the monthly meeting of the Citizens Club, an organization putatively founded by Jenkins to help with voter registration. However, Horton learned in no short time that the Citizens Club provided a rhetorical space for bringing together a variety of social, economic, and political concerns that shaped islanders' idea of citizenship: "the monthly meetings of the Citizens Club provide a general adult education program. Everything is discussed, although the focal point is citizenship and registration: farm problems, school problems, health and world affairs" (qtd. in Tjerandsen 153). When Horton returned three weeks later he was struck by the way that the discussion of the concerns islanders identified in the meeting continued to circulate outside the space of the Citizens Club: "Judging from the conversations I overheard, these problems are discussed long after the meetings are held...It had been, almost three weeks since the last meeting and people were still discussing things that had been talked about at the last meeting" (Tjerandsen 153). Already, in his early visits, Horton had the opportunity to listen in to the sense of urgency and activity that Jenkins had written of in his first letter upon his return from

Highlander. The social space of the monthly meeting of the Citizens Club provided a rhetorical education in citizenship that islanders carried forward into the discussions of everyday life. Citizenship as conceived by islanders in the discussion Horton listened to far exceeded the ability to register and vote, and the attention to social, economic, political, and rights discourses would be instrumental in shaping the course of the adult education program developed in the Citizenship programs. By carrying on the discussions about citizenship beyond the meeting space islanders, as Horton observed, were discursively engaged in developing an idea of citizenship that would transform islanders' "habits of citizenship" (Allen). For Horton, overhearing and taking part in the conversations affirmed that the motivation for changing island conditions originated with the community's desires, and would reaffirm Highlander's belief that Johns Island offered an ideal space for experimenting with the new models of democracy and leadership development the ESF grant allowed Highlander the time to develop in collaboration with communities that asked for assistance.

Horton's time on the island provided a clear occasion to, in Ratcliffe's terms, employ a non-identification to develop a new identification with the islanders. Horton spent weeks at a time living and working with the islanders. During this time he "would talk to the people at work, fishing, and growing rice" (Horton and Freire 68). Listening, living, talking, and working with the islanders further illuminated for Horton the ways that social, economic and political efforts for sovereignty were deeply constrained and intertwined within a white spatiality that kept Gullah communities in "the shadow of the plantation" (Clark qtd. in Tjerandsen 155). Islanders, he observed in discussions about establishing the adult education program, had as little sovereignty in their economic

life as they did in their political life. Despite many islanders owning their own farms, "they were dependent on working for somebody else for a living" (Horton and Freire 68). Education on the island had long been haunted by this very problematic. As Clark observed of her time teaching on Johns Island (see Chapter Three above), children's attendance was contingent on farm cycles. The contracts islanders had with white farmers commonly obligated children to assist with planting and harvesting or would require children to stay at home to oversee younger siblings. At the time of Horton's visit little had changed in how the economic rhetorics organizing island space constrained opportunities for Gullah communities. His observation that islanders were dependent "on working for somebody else for a living" offers a rhetorical response to perceptions that the islanders were primitive, lazy, and complacent with the status quo. Rather, he suggests, island space might be better imagined by how the reliance on an economic system that kept islanders firmly ensnared in the legacy of a plantation space and economy perpetuated the spatial praxis that absented Gullah communities from island space. Listening to islanders offers a course correction in understanding not only how islanders imagined their relations in island space but to how attending to the discussions of everyday life might reveal a "dignified" subject silenced behind the tropes of primitivism scripted on the collective body of the islanders. Listening to islanders' discussion of citizenship concerns after the Citizens Club meeting and developing an embodied, first hand, experiential knowledge of island life in the spaces of labor and home life opened a new space to develop a new identification with the islanders that respected the rhetorical practices and "deep knowledge" of the community.

In discussion with Paulo Freire years later Horton testifies to the necessity of

"placing" himself in the non-identification that came from his time spent talking and listening to the islanders:

> The only way these pockets can be found is to get outside the traditional sort of things that everybody else is doing and *identify with these people-in terms of their deep knowledge* – that limited reforms don't help. I had to spend a long time down in Johns Island before people would really confide in me and talk to me so I could get a feel of where they were. [emphasis added] (Horton and Freire 95)

Horton's time spent developing his own ethos with the islanders further reflects the concern central to Highlander's mission: not to provide solutions but to aid in empowering community members to address the problems they themselves have identified and articulated. Speaking of the fraught relationship to power held by oppressed communities, Horton articulates a clear pedagogical approach that works to empower communities from the inside: "Highlander's our base, but if you try to do something and need some help, we'll respond to your request for help. We won't go into anybody's community or organization as an expert, but we will come in and try to help you with your problem" (Horton and Freire 68). As an outsider, Horton was conscious of the hesitation and cautious stance islanders had to outsiders, who were perceived to lack a clear understanding of the traditions and language practices that constituted membership in island Gullah communities. As a white outsider, Horton's presence as a representative of Highlander also bore the threat of silencing community practices. To develop solutions with the islanders with little attention to the "deep knowledge" held by the community would risk reproducing the very power relations that subjugated islanders to

white institutions. Listening to islanders articulate “where they were” helped identify the community concerns Horton, Clark, and Jenkins needed to conceptualize a rhetorical space that attended to the embodied position of “where they ought to be” as first class citizens.

Conceptualizing the Rhetorical Space of the Citizenship School

Early in his discussions with Jenkins and other islanders, Horton discovered that the key issue facing education on the island was not the availability of educational opportunities on the island, nor the lack of interest in developing new citizenship practices, but rather the troubled and troubling rhetorics of education that islanders were all too familiar with. "It didn't take long to learn that there was money available for literacy education in South Carolina,” Horton observed. "In fact, they couldn't spend the money they had. There was federal money and state money, there were literacy teachers on the payroll who hadn't had a student for years, so it wasn't a matter of money for teachers” (Horton Long 100). The problem lie in the experience of education as a disembodied, humiliating spatial practice that transformed classrooms into agents of dominant space and reproduced the disembodied experience of life in white spatialities of the island. From listening to the islanders "it was easy to find out that all the past efforts at trying to teach the Johns Islanders to read and write were demeaning programs carried on by rather dominating, opinionated teachers who made the students feel so inferior that they didn’t want to have anything to do with them” (Horton Long 100). Classrooms on the island, as Clark discussed in her autobiography, were fraught sites for children’s education in which the material experience of subjugation was reproduced in the

embodied experience of school spaces. For adults on the island, education initiatives were even more problematic as adults were expected to learn from materials designed for third graders and were forced to squeeze into furniture designed for young children. Rather than being a space of hope for adults to develop a rhetorical education in civic life, the classroom served as another embodied experience echoing the larger spatial praxis of the islands. Adults were subject to children's taunts when they "laughed and called them 'granddaddy longlegs'" (Horton and Freire 69). Adults, to say the least, were "out of place" and the available classrooms reinforced earlier memories of alienation in schoolhouses on Johns Islands led by white teachers. In this narrative, Horton notes, "was a good clue as to what *not* to do" (69).

Listening to the islanders Horton observes that education initiatives on the island had failed, in many ways, because "workers were not treating these people with any kind of respect" (Horton and Freire 69). "We were looking for the opposite approach, one that would be based on respect and make people feel as comfortable as possible in a new and difficult learning situation" (Horton Long 100). For an adult education program to be taken up effectively by the islanders, new initiatives needed not only to provide an alternative space and materials for instruction but also provide a new way of being in the classroom that allowed learners and teachers to meet "face-to-face" as equals[26]. Out of these observations, Jenkins, Clark, and Horton worked to develop a pedagogical approach based on respect that attended to the embodied experience, knowledge, and desire for first class citizenship adult learners brought to the classroom and which would invent a new spatial praxis for education that served the immediate need of acquiring the practical

[26] See Chapter Five for a discussion of islanders' use of meeting face-to-face as a practice of recognizing islanders as humans on equal terrain.

skills of reading and writing as well as the need to develop new ways for learners to imagine themselves as actors - leaders - in shaping the course of their lives in island spaces[27]. Imagining the immediate exigencies of developing a program uniting the "practical, political, and economic" (Charron 248), they collaboratively identified a set of spatial praxes that would lay the foundation for a productive rhetorical space that would disarticulate the rhetorics of education that equated islanders with primitive and uncivilized subjectivities. These are as follows: the Citizenship Schools would have to meet in a space outside of traditional schoolhouses to be freed of the legacy of shame associated with traditional sites; would have to employ a non-traditional teacher to meet learners "where they were" and respond to their defined goals; and would have to identify an African American member of their own community that knew and respected community traditions practices, and epistemologies. "These conditions for learning were the first things that we agreed on," Horton remembers (Horton and Freire 70). After a period of trial and error, these spatial practices would become commonplace in the Citizenship School Program as it spread to other islands, and eventually, with the support of SCLC, across the South[28].

The decision to hold classes in out-of-school sites was central to the spatial praxis

---

[27] See Lawrence MacKenzie, "Pedagogy of Respect: Teaching as an Ally of Working-Class College Students" for a broader theorization of Horton's discussion of respect.

[28] Clark recalls: "Don't ever think that everything went right. It didn't. Many times there were failures. But we had to mull over those failures and work until we could get them ironed out. The only reason why I thought the Citizenship School Program was right was because when people went down to register and vote they were able to register and vote. […] as I saw people work in these communities, and decide to attempt some of the things that were recommended, then succeed in doing things like being able to get checks signed at banks and getting recognized in the community among their own people and in their churches, then I knew that that experiment worked out. […] You just try and see if it's coming"(Clark Ready 126). There is little record of which experiments worked and which did not; however, letters between Clark, Jenkins, Robinson, and Horton show an ongoing effort to develop the rhetorical spaces needed to meet islanders' desire for an education in the practical, political, and economic domains of civic life. See WHS MSS 265 Box 67 Folder 3 and 5.

used in inventing a productive site for islanders to re-imagine themselves as first class citizens. Using a community space free from the memory of alienation in earlier classrooms would allow learners to enter the classroom as human beings and provide the discursive freedom to develop an adult education program around the economic, social, and political practices of citizenship. Horton noted that for adult learners "the schools were a 'granddaddy-longlegs' memory" (70). While referencing the immediate event of the children taunting discomforted adult learners "out of place" in desks designed for children, Horton alludes to a larger network of systemic racism that stripped learners of respect: the impoverished conditions of the schoolhouses on Johns Island, a pedagogy of shame delivered by white teachers, the paucity of resources available in the schoolhouse, the overcrowded classrooms, and the recycled textbooks used for educating African Americans on the island. As Septima Clark recounted in her autobiography (discussed in Chapter Three above), education on the island in 1916 was deeply troubled by the material conditions and embodied experience of the schoolhouses on the island. Of particular note are the conditions she points out that students suffered through uneven heating, had to gather firewood, had their class attendance disrupted by the farming season, and sat uncomfortably on ill-fitting benches. In a letter requesting assistance in writing a grant proposal to establish programs on the island to the Department of Manpower, Automation, and Training Esau Jenkins notes how after 50 years conditions on the island have changed very little and that the impoverished conditions on the island meant that many students would fail to make progress because they had to be taken out of school for 2-3 days a week to provide childcare for their younger siblings. Students would "come too old and too large for the low grades and younger children tease them

about this and they become ashamed and quit school" (Letter to the Department of Manpower). When Horton uses "granddaddy longlegs memory" he provides a useful synecdoche for framing the problems for developing first class citizenship in the very memory sites that historically problematized islanders imagining themselves as participating citizens of the nation. As a foundation for empowering learners, the group decided non-traditional spaces connected to the community would break a lengthy legacy of shame reproduced in the memory site of the classroom or schoolhouse and allow for learners to enter this new space as humans whose desire for first class citizenship not only commanded respect but would facilitate islanders imagining themselves in new ways.

Clark, Jenkins, and Horton were similarly aware that establishing a new space or adapting existent sites to an adult learning program faced a variety of constraints that would problematize providing an education in the practical, economic, and political practices of citizenship to empower learners in their communities. Efforts to find a site to establish a class for adult learners reveals just how deeply white spatialities shaped and limited opportunities for establishing liberatory programs. Existent spaces carried not only the weight of a legacy of shame, but were similarly troubled by the relationship that institutional spaces of the island had with the dominant economics of a white spatiality, a relationship that shaped islanders' imaginary by the perception of threat and risk involved in supporting programs for the African American communities on the island. In November, 1956 Jenkins (through the Progressive Club) tried to establish an adult education program on Johns Island. Initially, Jenkins tried to work with the school system and subsequently the church. After reaching out to the school superintendent his

request to establish an adult education program was denied, in no small part because the superintendent risked losing his job for supporting the islanders' education initiatives. Similarly when he reached out to the church center, the minister was wary of working with Jenkins' request because "The minister's wife was teaching in the public school system and was probably afraid she would lose her job if the center were so used" (Tjerandsen 160). When Jenkins realized the troubles that existing sites would bring to an adult education program, he offered another solution for the problem: the adult education program would be held in the newly acquired building housing the Progressive Club.

The acquisition of the building was itself ensnared within the economic and race relations on the island. In late 1956 Jenkins had been engaged in trying to find a building to house the Progressive Club and expand its operations by providing a co-op that would provide more financial security for Johns Island farmers and a market to redirect the money going to the white farmers that bought their goods back into serving the community. He put a bid in on the old Mt Zion Elementary School site, but the site was sold for $1,000 to a white man, who subsequently made a profit on the site when he offered to sell it to Jenkins for $1,500. With the help of a no interest loan from Highlander Folk School, Jenkins finally was able to buy the schoolhouse and decided that it would be the ideal site for the adult education classes. At each turn in this narrative, Jenkins encountered economic constraints that played a central role in the production of white spatialities on the island. The role of economics in institutional and community spaces (Schools and the church) alike shaped the kinds of programs which could be developed on the island, constrained who could be served by institutions of island life, and territorially managed access to the spaces of island life. When Jenkins enlisted the

members of the Progressive Club to contribute funds, materials, and renovate the school house into a co-op, community members developed a new spatiality based on communality, exchange, and shared investment used to transform the islanders material and imagined relations on the island.

The constraints developed in a white spatiality though exceed the economic threats faced by the superintendent and minister. The white spatialities of the island placed a significant constraint on the discursive possibilities available to educators to work with communities to empower adult learners in becoming actors in political life. Speaking of these efforts to acquire a site to house an adult education program in a Highlander workshop session in 1957, Esau Jenkins said “I believe it was providential that we didn't get those other schools because our teaching would have been limited to certain things, and certain things we couldn't have said, such as teach them how to become better citizens, how to take part in voting, civics and government, and what not, because of being afraid of somebody going to run us out of the building” (Tjerandsen 160-161). As a site for developing an education in the practical, political, and economic practices of citizenship, the newly acquired building housing the Progressive Club provided the optimal space for islanders to develop an adult education program that served the needs of island communities. In this new space, learners would be met “face-to-face" on their own terms as they negotiated, developed, and took up the practices islanders viewed necessary to bringing the exigencies of their community space to presence in the islands.

While the newly acquired space of the Progressive Club would provide a site for learners’ to enter as dignified citizens free of the negative association with earlier

schooling and would provide the discursive freedom for a critical discussion of citizenship, Jenkins, Clark, and Horton were highly aware of the embodied presence of the teacher in shaping adults' experience. To develop a program "that would respect people," the group turned to identifying "what kind of people would be good teachers in a school that showed respect" (Horton and Freire 69-70) Early in their discussion they decided on two related tenets: 1) that the teacher should be untrained; and 2) the teacher should be African American, preferably somebody invested in and familiar to or from the community. Were the school to meet its goal of developing first class citizens the class would need a teacher that created the environment for islanders to see themselves in a new way, to imagine themselves as agents able to act in the space of the island. Horton observed that "you couldn't carry on an educational program with the kinds of people we were interested in working with until you could *forget many of the things learned in college and start listening to the people themselves*. I was trying to apply this 'learning from the people' idea to the residents of the Sea Islands" [emphasis added] (Long Haul 100). What was needed was a teacher that could create the environment for learners to imagine themselves as they "ought to be" - dignified citizens active in shaping the course of their lives in the space of the island and the Low Country more broadly.

Of particular concern in their discussion was that a certified teacher might be hindered by their training and that this training would complicate creating an environment of respect because they would not listen to the islanders to develop a space in response to the particular demands of the students. "We wanted to find a person who was not a licensed teacher," Clark recalls, "one who would not be considered high falutin, who would not act condescending to adults" (Ready from Within 48). With Clark,

Horton identified two problems with employing somebody trained or certified as a teacher: “Trained teachers would have to be thinking in terms of what they had learned, methodology, and they would identify illiterate adults with illiterate children. They would have a tendency to want to teach the same subject matter in the same way that they taught children” (Horton and Freire 70). Trained teachers posed a problem in that they brought to the classroom a set of assumptions and methods of teaching that were designed for much younger aged students, and as a consequence would risk reproducing a pedagogy of shame rather than developing a pedagogy and environment from "listening to the people themselves." Trained teachers also risked bringing to the classroom materials that did not address the particular motivating factor adults in the island had for participating in the Citizenship School - to gain sovereignty in economic, social and political matters shaping their lives.

This concern would be born out in the first meeting of the Citizenship classes when Bernice Robinson initially tried to use materials designed for third graders. After seeing the way that the materials treated the class participants as uneducated children she quickly discarded the material for practical materials of the islanders own choosing - money orders, catalog order forms and other materials that prepared islanders to enter island space as “dignified” citizens. By contrast, an untrained teacher, familiar with the community needs, desires, and values would benefit learners by meeting learners as an equal and creating the social space for learners to pursue the “ought to be” of first class citizenship. Unencumbered by the expectations and pedagogy developed in a teacher training program, the untrained teacher could listen more fully and "start where the man is. But at the same time he is thought of always in terms of *what he can become*. And

because the teacher thinks of him that way, this man can think of himself that way too" (Horton qtd. in Tjerandsen 142-143). Trained teachers compromised the possibility of learners becoming agents in their own right by drawing on methods and materials that risked infantilizing the learners. A community member whose stake in the process was shared by learners offered the possibility of developing a pedagogy of becoming from the beginning by meeting adult learners as equals and creating a learning environment that attended to learners imagining themselves as they felt they "ought to be."

As a final and related tenet, it was decided that if the teacher were to be engaged in working with students to embody the "ought to be" of first class citizenship the teacher needed to similarly embody their experience and the possibility of making that transformation: the teacher should be an African American, preferably someone familiar to or from the community. Jenkins, Clark, and Horton were highly conscious of the embodied figure of the teacher. Clark pointed out that "People on the island didn't want to trust black people coming from the city. They just thought that you were so high-falutin that you were going to try to make fun of them" (Ready from Within 49). In 1972 Clark would reflect on the importance of minimizing a white presence in the classroom during the early days of the program: "Knowing that the students of the school were still living in the shadow of the plantation, the teachers had suggested to Myles Horton that white visitors be kept to a minimum for the first three years. By the end of that time, we felt that the fear of losing jobs and other harassments would be out of their minds" (qtd. in Tjerandsen 155). Clark's comments help illustrate the affective dimension of the embodied position of the teacher. White bodies gave figure to the legacy of marginalization in island space, not only the educational experience learners had with a

pedagogy of shame, but with the experience of second class citizenship more broadly in being dependent on the island's white economies for a living and subject to a white political power: islanders "were still living in the shadow of the plantation." Furthermore, Horton points out, "there was the tendency of white people everywhere to dominate black people." In a final comment, Horton observes, both of these problems could be addressed with a singular solution: "You could eliminate that problem very simply by not having any white people teaching" (Horton and Freire 70). Horton and Clark found the ideal teacher in Bernice Robinson, Clark's cousin.

By her own accounts, Bernice Robinson was surprised and resistant to being asked to be the first teacher of the Citizenship School. Robinson had worked out of her home as a beautician in Charleston, had been active in Charleston's NAACP chapter for several years, and, with Clark, had worked with Johns Island communities since 1948. In 1954 she had attended the UN workshop at Highlander with Clark and Jenkins, during which she pledged to do anything that she could to help Highlander (Statement). However, as she was quick to point out, she had no experience as a teacher.

As a beautician, though, Robinson held a privileged place in the community: she was economically self-sufficient and consequently had no fears of repercussions from whites for her involvement. Moreover, her position as a beautician put her in a privileged position of listening and communicating with her customers about their everyday life[29].

---

[29] For a discussion of the long and distinguished position of barbers and barbershops in the African American community for developing African American Hush Harbor rhetorical practices see Nunley. Less discussed is the role of beauticians in providing a space "away from the disciplining gaze of whiteness" (Nunley Keepin' 3) for developing trust and producing knowledge; rhetorically deliberating over political, economic, and social issues; and providing a safe space for women to enter as dignified subjects, rather than objects of a dehumanizing Jim Crow discourse. Robinson is not the only example from the Charleston area. Once progress had been shown on Johns Island, another beautician in Charleston arranged for Robinson to teach a class in her shop to raise awareness about voter registration as a way to address the unpaved roads in her neighborhood (Tjerandsen 170). See Tiffany Gill's *Beauty Shop Politics: African*

Horton saw Robinson's position as a strategic opportunity: "Compared to white beauticians, black beauticians had status in their community. They had a higher-than-average education and because they owned their own businesses, didn't depend upon whites for their incomes. We needed to build around black people who could stand up against white opposition, so black beauticians were very important" (Long Haul 102). Given her familiarity in the islands, and since she had worked with Highlander "and knew the Highlander's philosophy of 'helping people to help themselves'" Clark and Horton felt she was ideally suited to teaching the Citizenship School on Johns Island (Robinson Statement). Robinson, however, had a different opinion: "You know, I never been no teacher and I'm not going to be a teacher. I told you up there at Highlander that I would help you all in any way that I could, and I would even help a teacher with the school, but I ain't no teacher!" (qtd. in Wigginton 249). Soon, though, Robinson accepted the task and became the first teacher of the Citizenship School, a task that she took on with some enthusiasm: "these people wanted to learn and I was going to find a way to teach them if I had to move mountains to do it" (Statement). Robinson's ability to listen, willingness to experiment ("find a way"), and familiarity to the community would bear out the fruits of the spatial praxis Clark, Jenkins, and Horton found necessary to developing a rhetorical space that would address the needs of the island community.

In the first meeting of the school, Robinson began the class by disrupting the traditional hierarchy between teacher and student. "I'm not really going to be your teacher" Robinson told the learners at the first meeting; "We're going to work together and teach each other" (Robinson, Unpublished Interview with Olendorf). In a letter from

---

American Women's Activism in the Beauty Industry and Blain Roberts' *Pageants, Parlors, and Pretty Women: Race and Beauty in the Twentieth Century South*].

January 26th 1957, just shortly after the first school began meeting, Horton wrote to Bernice that he was excited about the "unusual progress" she was making with adult students. Offering his estimation of that success, Horton wrote: "My guess is that your love and understanding for people plus tying the purpose of learning to understanding and living up to the Declaration of Human Rights and the responsibilities of citizenship is the key to your teaching ability." Robinson's rearticulation of the roles of the teacher and students flattened the traditionally hierarchical space of the classroom that learners were accustomed to and wary of from traditional schooling practices. By contrast, her willingness to position the students as agents in the process of education produced an embodiable space in the classroom, where learners could meet face-to-face and collectively shape the kinds of curricular materials they felt central to acting as citizens in island space and beyond.

Placing Citizenship in the Site of the Progressive Club

The spatial praxis developed by Clark, Horton, and Jenkins to create a rhetorical space focuses primarily on the where, what and how of an imagined and then produced classroom space and new educational institution. I noted above that the Progressive Club provided an optimal site for the practice of this new spatiality, but the site housing the Citizenship School classes on Johns Island bears further consideration for illuminating the way that the Citizenship School developed new habits of citizenship and for how the site, as a new institution of island life marked a significant change in islanders gaining some sovereignty and coming to presence in the economic and social spaces of the island. As I noted in Chapter Five, islanders had a fraught relationship with dominant

institutions, and the development of informal and independent institutions represented a significant response to the institutions managing island life for providing a voice and praxis with which to mediate the experience of subjugation on the island. The Citizenship School was another embodied practice of placemaking islanders used to respond to the white spatiality of the island; however, discussions of the first Citizenship School generally overshadow the affiliation of the program with and placement in the site of the Progressive Club. As an institution, the Progressive Club provided an embodiable model of praxis, of citizenship in action for islanders to organize, manage, and imagine their lives as sovereign first class citizens.

From its inception, the Progressive Club employed an institutional rhetoric to serve as a mediating thirdspace between islanders' experience of legal, economic, and political subjugation in island spaces and the white spatiality of the island responsible for "how [their] public lives are organized and conducted (both for us and by us)" (Porter, et al. 620). The progressive club was founded initially in 1949 as a way to mobilize sentiments on the island and provide the means to organize the citizens of Johns Island, provide legal resources, and encourage citizens to register for the vote. Before Jenkins acquired the schoolhouse that would house the Progressive Club, meetings of the group were held in Moving Star Hall on Sunday evenings. Like Moving Star Hall, the Progressive Club was born of islanders' response to forces shaping and limiting opportunities and resources for islanders in the white space of the islands. As such, its model of citizenship practices provided an embodiable praxis that expanded and placed islanders in island geography.

Jenkins motivations for founding the Progressive Club originated in islanders'

rhetorical response to two shootings of African Americans on Johns Island by white islanders. Esau's first narrative of the shootings tells of the general sense of powerlessness African Americans faced in responding to white violence exacted upon the bodies of the islanders and reflects the material effects of a historical legacy of denying islander bodies a presence in the social and institutional spaces of the island. In 1938, an African American man accidentally ran over a white man's dog. Afterwards, the white man chased down the driver and shot him. After hiring a white lawyer from Charleston, the case was never tried in the court. In telling the narrative, Esau adds, "Well, that's something that I felt like people who have good will and think about decency and human dignity should do something about" (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 145). In the early 1940s, another man, Sammy Grant, was shot by Mr. Malone, a recent white emigrant to Johns Island, over a dispute Sammy had with Malone's wife about whether "he put his dog on her dog" (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 145). In the aftermath of the shooting, Esau hired a lawyer, but the court case was similarly left to linger with no action in the court. In each instance, Esau sets against the institutional support for white violence a general rhetorical assertion of the right for islanders' bodies to be recognized as dignified humans.

Reflecting on the shootings, Esau commented that "These are the things, then, that motivated me to organize in 1949 a progressive movement, that we could help the people to be better citizens, give them a chance to get a better education, and know how to reason and look out for themselves, and take more part in political action" (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 146). In finding a site to house the Progressive Club in 1956, these tactical responses to dominant institutions found a material place from which islanders

would further develop a black spatiality.

Though the Progressive Club provided the space for the Citizenship School, the club site was also central to shaping islanders citizenship practices in a material way. The Progressive Club operated as a co-op for local farmers to sell their goods to the community, shaping a new economic presence for the islanders and providing islanders a new economic sovereignty and sense of independence. Housing a legal office to provide financial aid to islanders experiencing legal troubles, the club provided the education, financial support, and services needed for islanders to navigate a legal system that reinforced their position as second class citizens. The club provided a sanctuary from the white gaze in which islanders could safely deliberate over community exigencies and bring in political speakers to talk about issues related to the movement for first class citizenship. Like Moving Star Hall it provided a material site for island tradition of song and celebration, and more commonly provided another site for islanders to informally congregate and fellowship in face to face meetings. As an institution providing a range of services and occasions for gathering, the space of the progressive Club modeled and enacted the kind of citizenship embodied in the rhetorical education of the Citizenship School. Porter et al. point out that "as rhetorical systems of decision making" institutions "exercise power through the design of space (both material and discursive)" (621). The discursive work and material presence of the Progressive Club in the community not only provided the site for the Citizenship Club, but as an affiliated institution it made the work of citizenship visible as a praxis in the black spatiality of the island. As an institutional space, the Progressive Club provided a new dwelling space for islanders' sense of themselves as citizens, and for that reason its importance as an agent of island change

needs to be included in the narrative of the Citizenship Schools. Harvey notes that as "produced spaces" the rhetorics of institutional space begs the question of who is producing it and how (qtd. in Porter et al. 622). From its foundation, the progressive Club was financed by members' donations, much like Moving Star Association. In developing a mutual aid organization, islanders employed an institutional rhetoric to respond to the absence of services available to islanders and "produced" a new site for citizenship practices that would provide the material space and status for islanders working for citizenship in the Citizenship School.

Conclusion

In the discussions about the Citizenship Schools above, Horton pointed out that the problem facing islanders developing new habits of citizenship on the island was not education initiatives, but initiatives that have as goals to treat islanders with respect, to develop a curriculum and space out of islanders' expressed needs, and to focus on "the ought to be" in providing a whole education that imagined learners as first class citizens. In short, the problem lay in the available programs provided by a statist institution that was, to say the least, complicit in the very problems islanders imagined education in the Citizenship Schools addressing: state sponsored initiatives closely tied to the institutional imperatives of the state trouble these goals. Horton notes that the educational institutions of the state discursively alienate and materially infantilize islanders, they employ material more suited for children than adult learners, and they maintain the "is" of islanders' second class citizenship by troubling the relationship between education and praxis. The Citizenship Schools provided an embodied response to these concerns in identifying,

conceptualizing, and developing a new space freed of the memory of alienation and presence of white teachers that troubled islanders imagining themselves as they felt they "ought to be."

In developing the rhetorical space of the Citizenship School, Jenkins, Clark, and Horton housed the program within an institution islanders used to address the legal, economic, and material inequities challenging islanders' public life: in January of 1957, the first Citizenship School met in the back rooms of the newly acquired building of the Progressive Club. Importantly, though, the Citizenship School's affiliation with the Progressive Club provided islanders a first hand lesson in how the education in practical, social, economic and political citizenship practices could be realized in a material way. As islanders took part in the Citizenship Schools, they also put their education to work in the Progressive Club co-op; they worked to register new voters and spread awareness of the program in the community and to surrounding islands; and in providing a space for islanders to congregate in face to face meetings, produced a new dwelling place that would be central to shaping islanders material and discursive presence in the islands.

The vision Clark, Horton, and Jenkins had for how the Citizenship school might transform islanders relation to the social, economic, and political spaces of the island suggests that the goals of the Citizenship School were not simply economic, not simply about civic rights, not simply about the material, and not solely about training leaders in the community. While these are, to be sure, goals of their initiatives, Jenkins offers a broader awareness that for a transformation to take place in the islands, the transformation must be embodied in islanders' sense of themselves as they move for presence in island spaces. The invention of the Citizenship School and Progressive Club

provided the embodiable and embodied space islanders would use to mark their presence as first class citizens in the island. In a letter about the foundation of the Progressive Club and the development of the Citizenship Schools dated September 24, 1966, Jenkins writes of the affective experience of the work done in the islands, and in doing so, calls attention to how the ideals and goals of the institutions are embodied in everyday life: "My job is enjoyable to me." After narrating the foundation of the Progressive Club, its goals, the development of the Citizenship Schools, and the expansion of the Progressive Club's building and services to the community, Jenkins concludes his discussion of how the institution answered islanders' need for an embodied presence with a final rejoinder: "This was done and all of the above goals for the Johns Island people were reached and as a result the group is now smiling. This makes me happy also" (Letter about His Work). Together, the conceptualization of a rhetorical space and the placement of that space within an important institution of island life provided islanders with not only a "full education in citizenship," but in a spatial praxis that they saw, participated in, and used as a practice of embodied placemaking to develop a rhetoric citizenship.

I began this chapter with the narrative of Alice Wine learning to register to vote as a result of the education provided in Esau Jenkins' bus, and it seems fitting to return to her narrative. After participating in the first Citizenship School, Alice Wine put her new skills to work. She quit her job as a domestic worker in Charleston to take a position as the treasurer of the Progressive Club. The citizenship practices developed in the Citizenship School enabled her to place herself in a distinguished position within the islanders' economy. "We growing and growing," she testifies. "I think this is the best place on Johns Island" (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 155-156).

Figure 3 Alice Wine at the counter of the Progressive Club co-op. Photo by Robert Yellin. Courtesy of Avery Research Center for African American History and Culture.

Chapter Seven

Conclusion

But it's in their relation to the land that their culture is made most manifest. - Vertamae Grosvenor, 2003

Recently the rhetorical legacy of the islanders' traditions of embodied placemaking as a rhetoric of citizenship has found a new "place" in the cultural memory of the nation. On Sunday, June 1, 2014 members of the Charleston and Sea Islands communities came together at the future site of the International African American

Figure 4 Esau Jenkins, posing with his bus. "Love is progress, hate is expensive" is emblazoned across the tailgate in bold letters. Photo by Robert Yellin. Courtesy of Avery Research Center for African American History and Culture.

Museum in Charleston to formally "send off" a portion of Esau Jenkins' bus. The tailgate of the bus with Jenkins' motto "Love is progress, Hate is expensive" emblazoned across it will find its new home in the Smithsonian Institute's National Museum of African American History and Culture, opening to the public in 2016. During the event, Esau Jenkins' role in shaping the movement for citizenship on Johns Island was celebrated and memorialized in speeches by activists that worked with Jenkins. The Mt. Zion Spiritual Singers performed songs from the Lowcountry African American Gullah tradition. A collection of photographs and articles provided another narrative about Jenkins life and his work in the region. The epideictic occasion has signaled a new moment for Johns Island. As part of the new Smithsonian museum, the narrative of Johns Island will be symbolically and materially placed in a larger narrative of the African American history of the nation.

Figure 5 The Progressive Club, seen from River Rd. in August 2014. Photo by author.

Across the bay, on Johns Island the remnants of the Progressive Club sit behind a barbed wire fence on River Rd., decimated by Hurricane Hugo in 1989. After Jenkins

death in 1972 many of the services of the Progressive Club were ceased, though it continued to serve as a grocery store until 1975. After that the building was leased by community members and continued to serve as a grocery store servicing the island community until the hurricane took off the roof. Without insurance, and denied funds by FEMA, the community members could not rebuild the space. Though a fund-raising campaign is ongoing, little has come of the effort to restore this site to its position in the community. On the side of the road, a historical marker placed next to the club in 2013 provides a brief narrative of the site's historical importance in providing services to the community and serving as the site of the first Citizenship School. Affixed to a tree outside of the fence, a weathered wooden board announces "Historic Site Progressive Club" and in italics below that "A community service Est. 1948" The bottom of the sign calls attention to the fundraising initiative: "Phase 1: Drive" and offers contact information for further inquiries. The cinder block construction remains and has preserved the footprint of the club's "place" on the island. Jenkins' family home still sits next door to the club. Behind the club lies a private community reflecting Johns Island's growing role as a suburb of Charleston. On the front of the club, next to what was the entrance, "Progressive Club" is still visible in a fading green script to anyone who pulls onto the shoulder of River Rd.

Bringing together the materiality, discursive practices, history, and island spaces of Johns Island, these competing narratives offer a poignant way of revisiting the rhetorical legacy of embodied placemaking on Johns Island. They compel us to consider Vertamae Grosvenor's point that "it's in their relation to the land that their culture is made most manifest" (Gullah Culture). Throughout my work on the island this

fundamental point has informed my approach to studying Johns Island. In the first section of this project, I have focused exclusively on how the ways that island space was imagined in rhetorical artifacts (maps and Clark's walking tour of the island) framed and reframed ideas of citizenship, islanders place in the island, and the public. Taken together, these ways of imagining space usefully demonstrate the ways that the production of space, while tending towards homogeneity through abstractions of space, also offers the materials and practices needed for an embodied response to imagine and produce space in new ways (Lefebvre). In looking at Kinsey's and Burden's maps of island space we see a coherent narrative imagining of the island as a fixed, white space enframed by the historical dominance of a minority white population and the attendant values, beliefs, and economic systems used to reproduce the island as a particularly raced geography in which white islanders are brought to presence while simultaneously absenting the co-constitutive presence and role of the Gullah islanders in shaping the realandimagiend "place" of the island. As spatial imaginings abstracted from the lived space of the islands, the maps offer a homogenous view from above of the island's populations. Septima Clark offered another way of imagining the islands in a cunning rhetoric that troubled these abstractions by placing her readers on the ground in a tentative, oblique narrative of islanders' everyday life that reframed dominant tropes of primitivism about the islanders and revealed their traditions, sociability, language and ways of knowing as embodied practices of citizenship. In doing so, Clark rhetorically positions her readers in her own thirdspace position to offer an invitation to rethink the who, what, and where of what constitutes citizenship as a way to reimagine and bring to presence in a national public the communities silenced by a Jim Crow spatiality. Taking

our lead from the way that island spatialities have been recently memorialized and currently exist on the island, we might revisit the narratives of these artifacts though and wonder how these contemporary, competing narratives testifying to the work of the island communities and to the shifting material conditions of the island reflect a new spatiality that troubles the very selfsame concerns that islanders worked against in developing a black spatiality.

How, we might wonder, do rhetorical legacies so deeply constituted by the islanders' relationship to the land change, respond to, or disappear as a new spatial praxis changes the island from an isolated rural space to a suburb of the city and tourist destination as technology, golf courses, resort areas, and gated communities fundamentally transform the way that island space is experienced, who lives there, and what economies constrain the "realandimagined" experience of island space. Turning my attention to the islanders' discursive traditions, shared history and knowledge, and material sites in the second section of this project I have focused on the practices of embodied placemaking evident in the community of Johns Island to trace the rhetorical legacy that led from the constitutive role of embodied Gullah traditions and practices to the development of institutional practices, the embodied and embodiable spaces that "placed" islanders in the white spatiality of the island. Throughout, my emphasis has been on framing these embodied practices as central to the production of a black spatiality that reflected, provided, and developed islanders' ideas and practices of citizenship as islanders worked to assert, define, and bring to presence their community as citizens, as agents working to shape, define, and address the common concerns of their local community through the practices, services, resources, and sites used to develop

ways of rhetorically dwelling in island space as first class citizens. That is, I have argued that islanders drew on their traditions, shared concerns, epistemologies, sociable occasions for gathering, discursive practices, and position in island space as a practice of embodied placemaking that would be used as a rhetoric of citizenship to bring the community to presence in the social, political, and economic spaces of the island. I have also suggested that the islanders' rhetorical legacy provided a model for transforming the nations "habits of citizenship" (Allen) by shaping the movement for citizenship in, initially, the Lowcountry, and subsequently the nation as the model of the Citizenship School literacy program would spread throughout the south under the institutional aegis of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. These practices stemmed from a mutually constitutive relationship between the islanders and the "place" of the island. Whether it was the discursive colonizing of public spaces, the material relations to island geography of folk medicine, the placemaking practices of praise house epideictic rhetoric, or the development of institutions that provided material sites for islanders to re-imagine their "place" in island space, the embodied relationship islanders had with island space was central to "a sense of the Sea Islanders' conception of themselves" as citizens "and their place in the world" (Twining 91).

However, I am ever mindful of Doreen Massey's argument that space is neither closed, nor fixed, but, a site of evolving, variable relationships characterizing a multiplicity of narrative trajectories, and as such, always engaged in a process of becoming (For Space 9). If we are to consider Massey's observation that the spatial is an "ever-shifting social geometry of power and signification" (Space, Place, and Gender 3) we need consider how the changing production of island space shapes, complicates, risks

erasing, and offers new challenges to the ways that "it's in their relation to the land that their culture is made most manifest." While the memorialization of Jenkins has neatly lodged the islands in a national narrative, the local narrative suggests something quite different in providing a material testimony to a change in not only the space of the islands, but in the islanders' relationship to and presence in the "ever-shifting social geometry of power and signification" of the spatial.

In each of these contemporary examples, the island's legacy is framed in seemingly incommensurable narratives for understanding the island. The epideictic ceremony celebrating an artifact of Jenkins' work draws together and affirms the presence of the very traditions and practices that Jenkins' work evolved out of. Speakers at the event, including islanders William Saunders (discussed in chapter Three) and Gerald Mackey, framed Jenkins and the island in multiple testimonies to progress, the work of citizenship, and the struggles the islanders faced in the 20th century. As a historical narrative the speeches re-produce the island's history for a broad audience, and, as befits its sponsorship by the Preservation Society of Charleston, places Jenkins work in the local communities of Charleston in a historical narrative of nation building[30]. The Mt. Zion Spiritual Singers provide an accompaniment in song to frame the testimony of the speakers, placing the island, Jenkins, and the ceremony in the context of the praise house traditions of "shouting for a better day." Moreover, in singing songs that have been passed on over successive generations, the tradition of singing brings to presence those figures of the community's past. Supplemental narratives frame Jenkins work in the documents and images on display. Drawing on these traditions, the embodied

[30] In Millicent Brown's speech, she employs the epideictic occasion to offer a call to action to her audience to attend to the buildings and the builders of the community, like Jenkins, by studying historical materials to reinterpret the voices of the past in service to a history "based on truth."

placemaking of the islanders' struggle over citizenship finds a new presence for the community (through the symbols of Jenkins and the artifact of the bus) in shaping how we understand "the city, the state, the nation that we have become" (Brown, Speech).

As a lesson in material and spatial rhetorics, the ceremony and choice of Jenkins bus as a symbolic artifact of the work done on Johns Island is telling. The embodied placemaking traditions becomes embodied in a new material site and "places" that embodied legacy in a new rhetorical memory space, The Smithsonian's National Museum of African American History and Culture. In this sense the tradition is alive in serving as a rhetorical legacy providing "an important source of invention for future spokesmen, further causes" (Andrews 198). We might wonder, though, how the "placing" of a living tradition, where "it's in their relation to the land that their culture is made most manifest," in a memory site complicates how we understand that living tradition when it is removed from the land; how its "place" in a national narrative of progress troubles or fixes the inventive practices of a locally constituted black spatiality or elides the rhetorical motives for producing that spatial praxis.

The site of the Progressive Club further troubles this. Like Jenkins bus, the site has been rhetorically framed by the narrative of the historic marker– both testifying to its role in the island and at the same time, as a historical narrative, abstracting that testimony from the "valuable life giving/changing knowledge" (Lathan) of islanders' embodied presence.

Looking at the stark remains of the Progressive Club as a material embodiment of the struggles for citizenship on Johns Island, an all too easy reading is that the realandimagined spaces of a resistant embodied placemaking have passed into history.

Alice Wine's testimony suggests something like this much earlier when she commented on the new role of churches in taking the place of praise house traditions: "We don't have class meeting in the hall anymore. I miss it. We don't have it now because all these young preachers have everything to the church. What are a few people going to do in a big old church like that? If the people turn out, it never be too large" (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan 224). Wine's testimony reflects a shift in island space, particularly in how islanders gather, fellowship, and come to voice by "shouting for a better day" in religious sites. As another islander observed, "You can't really shout on a cement floor covered with carpet" (qtd. in Carawan and Carawan xv). For both islanders, the change in material sites threatened the loss of the distinct voice, sociability, and resistant traditions developed in the realandimagined space of praise house epideictic practices. Similarly, constrained by statist economies (insurance, FEMA), the role Progressive Club played in materially "placing" islanders in the white spatiality of the island, even in the diminished number of services it provided after 1975, would seem to reflect another troubling absence of islander presence as island space is reimagined in the 21st century.

However, the islanders' embodied placemaking practices developed out of just such a changing spatiality, whether it be in the development of Gullah traditions in the meeting of African and American traditions during the antebellum era, the threat to islander sovereignty with the rise of the James Island Agricultural board, the invention of independent institutions, or in responding to the absenting praxis of Jim Crow. The weathered sign announcing the fund-raising campaign suggests another narrative frame to this discussion by testifying to a directed, community effort to respond to the production of space on the island driven by new economies, technology and infrastructure. As a

community effort the fund-raising campaign echoes earlier mutual aid economies developed by the islanders, as we have seen in the examples of Moving Star Association and the Progressive Club. These cinder block walls, faded and decaying embody islanders' efforts to invent new spaces on the island.

The incommensurability of these narratives needs no easy reconciliation. They can instead testify to the resiliency of a tradition of embodied placemaking in Gullah culture, as a realandimagined space in everyday life, to engage the material and imagined spaces enframing islanders. Emory Campbell, the former executive director of Penn Center on Helena Island observed, "I think the Gullah culture could-- function very well within our capitalistic culture of today" (Gullah Culture). If we are to understand embodied placemaking as a mutually constitutive relationship between the material and metaphoric spaces of place, communities, cultural traditions, and the body that broadens our understanding of practices of citizenship, and offers the possibility for theorizing how these embodied practices respond to the production of space by carving out new dwelling spaces for marginalized communities to develop a rhetoric of citizenship, then we might further consider how Gullah culture, traditions, language, materials, bodies, and sites persist, are narrated, and presenced in the realandimagined spaces of islanders' everyday life today. We might consider those material sites where Gullah people and traditions engage in conversations with the past, the traditions of basket weaving for example. Where the "geography closest in" – the body and individual– negotiates contemporary spaces through the guidance of the deceased[31]. Where the assimilation of Gullah culture to tourist venues provides (admittedly troubled) presence to Gullah traditions and the

[31] See LeRhonda S. Manigault-Bryant's *Talking to the Dead: Religion, Music, and Lived Memory among Gullah/Geechee Women*.

agency this practice gives to Gullah as a habitable identity. In doing so, we will see, quite clearly, that the rhetorical legacy of islanders embodied placemaking persists as Gullah islanders respond to the shifting sense of their position in the geography and social space of the island.

Works Cited

Adams, Frank. "Highlander Folk School: Getting Information Going Back and Teaching It." *Harvard Education Review*: 42.4 (1972). 497-520. PDF File.

Allen, Danielle S. *Talking to Strangers: Anxieties of Citizenship since Brown v. Board of Education*. Chicago: U of Chicago, 2004. Print.

Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971. 170-186. Print.

Anderson, James D. *The Education of Blacks in the South 1863-1935*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press, 1988. Print.

Andrews, James R. "The Passionate Negation: The Chartist Movement in Rhetorical Perspective." *The Quarterly Journal of Speech* 59.2 (1973): 196-208. PDF File.

Aristotle and Hugh Lawson-Tancred. *The Art of Rhetoric*. London: Penguin, 1991. Print.

Asen, Rob. "A Discourse Theory of Citizenship." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 90.2 (2004). 189-211. PDF File.

Barber, Benjamin R. *A Place For Us: How to Make Society Civil and Democracy Strong*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1998. Print

Bartlett, Lesley and Dorothy Holland. "Theorizing the Space of Literacy Practices." *Ways of Knowing Journal* 2.1 (2002). 10-22. PDF File.

Bonstelle, Carolyn Ackerly, and Geordie Buxton. *James Island*. Charleston, SC: Arcadia Publishers, 2008. Print.

Brouwer, Daniel C. and Robert Asen. *Public Modalities: Rhetoric, Culture, Media, and the Shape of Public Life*. Tuscaloosa: U of Alabama, 2010. Print.

Brown, Elsa Barkley. "Negotiating and Transforming the Public Sphere: African American Political Life in the Transition from Slavery to Freedom". *Public Culture* 7 (1994). 107-146. PDF File.

Brown, Millicent. Speech Title unknown. "Love is Progress, Hate is Expensive": The Esau Jenkins Bus Send-off to the Smithsonian Museum Charleston, SC. 1 June, 2014. Online Video Clip. *Youtube*. Youtube June 23, 2014 by Corie Hipp. Web 10 May 2015. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6ZpY9Q8SgMI>.

Browning, James B. "The Beginnings of Insurance Enterprise among Negroes." *The Journal of Negro History* 22.4 (1937): 417-432. PDF File.

Burden, Kinsey. *Plan of John's Island, drawn by Kinsey Burton, c. 1819[sic]*. Maps Drawer 10, no. 2. Charleston Library Society, Charleston, South Carolina. 6 August 2014.

Burke, Kenneth. *Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: U of California, 1969. Print.

de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life.* Trans. Steven Rendall. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984. Print.

Campbell, Emory. "Gullah Culture: Transcript." *Now with Bill Moyers*. Web 10 May 2015.

Carawan, Guy. "Christmas Eve Watch on Johns Island." *Sea Islands Roots: African Presence in the Carolinas and Georgia*. Edited by Mary Arnold Twining and Keith E. Baird. Trenton, NJ: African World Press, 1991.103-105. Print.

Carawan, Guy and Candie Carawan. *Ain't You Got a Right to the Tree of Life: The People of Johns Island South Carolina - Their Faces, Their Words, and Their Songs*. Athen: University of Georgia Press, 1989. Print.

Charland, Maurice. "Constitutive Rhetoric: the Case of the Peuple Québécois." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 73.2 (1987): 133-150. PDF File.

Charron, Katherine Mellen. *Freedom's Teacher : the Life of Septima Clark.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2009. Print. PDF File.

Cintron, Ralph. *Angel's Town: Chero Ways, Gang Life, and the Rhetorics of The Everyday*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1997. Print.

Citizenship School Workbook. Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Highlander Research and Education Center: Sea Islands. MSS 265. Box 2, Folder 25 & 26. State Historical Society of Wisconsin Archives Division, University of Wisconsin-Madison. 13 August 2012.

Clark, Gregory. *Rhetorical Landscapes in America: Variations on a Theme from Kenneth Burke*. Columbia: U of South Carolina P, 2004. Print

Clark, Mary (copyist). *Map of Johns Island, South Carolina ca. 1935*. (32/113) South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston, South Carolina. 7 August 2014.

Clark, Septima and Leggett. Blythe. *Echo in my Soul*. New York: Dutton, 1962. Print.

Clark, Septima and Cynthia Stokes. *Ready From Within: Septima Clark and the Civil Rights Movement*. Navarro, CA: Wild Trees, 1986. Print.

Code, Lorraine. *Rhetorical Spaces: Essays on Gendered Locations*. New York:

Routledge, 1995. Print.

Cornelius, Janet Duitsman. *When I can Read My Title Clear: Literacy, Slavery, and Religion in the Antebellum South*. Columbia, South Carolina: U of SC Press, 1991. Print.

Csordas, Thomas. "Embodiment and Cultural Phenomenology". *Perspectives on Embodiment*. Eds Gail Weiss and Honi Ferb Haber. New York: Routledge, 1999. Print.

Dolmage, Jay. "Breathe upon Us an Even Flame: Hephaestus, History, and the Body of Rhetoric." *Rhetoric Review* 25.2 (2006). 119-140. PDF File.

Enoch, Jessica. *Refiguring Rhetorical education: Women Teaching African American, Native American, and Chicano/a Students, 1865-1911*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008. Print.

Feigenbaum, Paul. *Collaborative Imagination: Earning Activism Through Literacy Education*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2014. Print.

—. *Community Action: A Framework for Egalitarian, Reciprocal Community Engagement in the Field of Rhetoric and Composition*. Diss. University of Michigan, 2008. PDF File.

Fields, Mamie Garvin. *Lemon Swamp and Other Places: a Carolina Memoir.* New York: The Free Press, 2003. Print.

Fisher, Maisha. *Black Literate Lives*. New York: Routledge, 2009. Print.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed: 30th Anniversary Edition*. New York: Continuum, 2000. Print

Gadsden, Sam. *An Oral History of Edisto Island: Sam Gadsen tells the Story*. Goshen Indiana: Goshen College. 1975. Print.

Gill, Tiffany. *Beauty Shop Politics: African American Women's Activism in the Beauty Industry.* Urbana: U of Illinois, 2010. Print.

Glen, John M. *Highlander: No Ordinary School*. Knoxville, TN: U of Tennessee, 1996. Print.

Grosvenor, Vertamae. "Gullah Culture: Transcript." *Now with Bill Moyers*. Web 10 May 2015.

Grosz, Elizabeth. *Architecture from the Outside: Essays on Virtual and Real Space*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001. Print.

—. *Space, Time, and Perversions: essays on the Politics of Bodies*. New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.

Halfacree, Keith. "'Rural Space': Constructing a Three-fold Architecture." *Handbook of Rural Studies*. Eds. Paul Cloke, Terry Marsden, and Patrick H. Mooney. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2006. 44-62.

Harris, Patrick. *Institutional Ethos*. Diss. San Diego State University, 2013. PDF File.

Harvey, David. *Justice, Nature and the Geography of Difference*. Maine: Blackwell Publishing, 1996. Print.

---."Space as a Keyword." Marx and Philosophy Conference. Institute of Education. London. 29 May 2004. PDF File.

Hawhee, Debra. *Bodily Arts: Rhetoric and Athletics in Ancient Greece*. Austin: U of Texas P, 2004. Print.

Haynie, Connie Walpole. *Johns Island*. Charleston, SC: Arcadia Pub., 2007. Print.

Highlander Folk School. "Report on Highlander Workshop: The Supreme Court Decisions and the Public Schools." Highlander Research and Education Center: Sea Islands. MSS 265. Box 67, Folder 3. State Historical Society of Wisconsin Archives Division, University of Wisconsin-Madison. 13 August 2012.

hooks, bell. *Yearning: Race, Gender, and Cultural Politics*. Boston: South End Press, 1990. Print.

Horton, Myles. "An Interview with Myles Horton: 'It's a Miracle - I still Don't Believe It'." *The Phi Delta Kappan* 47.9 (1966): 490-497. PDF File.

—. "Letter to Bernice Robinson Jan. 26, 1957." Bernice Robinson Papers. Box 3, Folder 1. Avery Research Center, Charleston, SC. 2 August 2012.

—. "Letter To Esau Jenkins September 23, 1954." Highlander Research and Education Center: Sea Islands. MSS 265. Box 67, Folder 3. State Historical Society of Wisconsin Archives Division, University of Wisconsin-Madison. 13 August 2012.

Horton, Myles and Paulo Freire. *We Make the Road by Walking: Conversations On Education and Social Change.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1990. Print.

Horton, Myles, Judith Kohl, and Herbert R Kohl. *The Long Haul: an Autobiography.* New York: Doubleday, 1990. Print.

Horton, Zilphia. “Letter to Esau Jenkins November 18, 1954.” Highlander Research and Education Center: Sea Islands. MSS 265. Box 67, Folder 3. State Historical Society of Wisconsin Archives Division, University of Wisconsin-Madison. 13 August 2012.

—. “Field Trip Report.” WHS Box 67 Folder 3. Highlander Research and Education Center: Sea Islands. MSS 265. Box 67, Folder 3. State Historical Society of Wisconsin Archives Division, University of Wisconsin-Madison. 13 August 2012.

Hyde, Michael. “Introduction: Rhetorically We Dwell.” *The Ethos of Rhetoric*. Ed. Michael Hyde. Columbia, SC: U of South Carolina, 2004. xii-xxviii. Print.

Jacobs, Dale. “Introduction”. *The Myles Horton Reader: Education for Social Change*. Ed. Dale Jacobs. Knoxville: U of Tennessee Press, 2003. xi-xxviii. Print.

Jenkins, Esau. “Letter about his Work in the Progressive Club and Citizenship School, Sept. 24, 1966.” Esau Jenkins Papers. Box 3 Folder 1. Avery Research Center, Charleston, SC. 2 August 2012.

—. “Letter to Myles Horton. September 20th, 1954.” Highlander Research and Education Center: Sea Islands. MSS 265. Box 67, Folder 3. State Historical Society of Wisconsin Archives Division, University of Wisconsin-Madison. 13 August 2012.

—. “Letter to Zilphia Horton November 24th, 1954.” Highlander Research and Education Center: Sea Islands. MSS 265. Box 67, Folder 3. State Historical Society of Wisconsin Archives Division, University of Wisconsin-Madison. 13 August 2012.

—. “Letter to the Department of Manpower, Automation, and Training.” Esau Jenkins Papers. Box 3 Folder 1. Avery Research Center, Charleston, SC. 2 August 2012.

Johnson, Nan. *Gender and Rhetorical Space in American Life, 1866-1910*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2002. Print.

Jones-Jackson, Patricia. *When Roots Die: Endangered Traditions on the Sea Islands*. Athens, Georgia: University of Georgia Press. 1987. Print.

Kates, Susan. “Literacy, Voting Rights, and the Citizenship Schools in the South 1957-70.” *College Composition and Communication* 57.3 (Feb. 2006). 479-502. PDF File.

Kopelson, Karen. "Rhetoric on the Edge of Cunning: Or, the Performance of Neutrality (Re)Considered as a Composition Pedagogy for Student Resistance." *College*

Composition and Communication 55.1(Sept 2003). 115-146. PDF File.

Lathan, Rhea Estelle. "Testimony as a Sponsor of Literacy: Bernice Robinson and the South Carolina Sea Island Citizenship Program's Literacy Activism." Literacy, Economy, and Power: Writing and Research after Literacy in American Lives. Eds. John Duffy et. al. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2014. Print.

—. *Writing a Wrong: A Case of African American Adult Literacy Action on the South Carolina Sea Islands 1957-1962*. Diss. University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2006. PDF File.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackswell, 1991. Print.

Legree, Mary Rivers. "Praise Houses." *Gullah Community*. Online Video Clip. Web 12 March 2013. < http://gullahcommunity.org/our-community/praise-house/>

Lester, Neal A. *Understanding Zora Neale Hurston's Their Eyes Were Watching God: A Student Casebook to Issues, Sources, and Historical Documents*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press. 1999. Print.

Levine, David. "The Birth of the Citizenship Schools: Entwining the Struggles for Literacy and Freedom." *History of Education Quarterly* 44.3 (2004). 388-414. PDF File.

Ling, Peter. "Local Leadership in the Early Civil Rights Movement: The South Carolina Citizenship Education Program of Highlander Folk School." *Journal of American Studies* 29.3 (1995): 399-422. PDF File.

Lipsitz, George. "The Racialization of Space and the Spacialization of Race: Theorizing the Hidden Architecture of Landscape." *Landscape Journal* 26.2 (2007). 10-23. PDF File.

Logan, Shirley Wilson. *Liberating Language: Sites of Rhetorical Education in Nineteenth-Century Black* America. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008. Print.

---. " Black Speakers, White Representations: Frances Ellen Watkins Harper and the Construction of a Public Persona." *African American Rhetoric{s}: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Ed. by Elaine Richardson and Ronald L. Jackson. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004. Print.

Lorimer Leonard, Rebecca. "Multilingual Writing as Rhetorical Attunement." *College English* 76.3 (2014): 227–247. PDF File.

Lyons, Scott Richard. "Rhetorical Sovereignty: What Do American Indians Want from

Writing." *College Composition and Communication* 51.3 (Feb. 2004). 447-468. PDF File.

MacKenzie, Lawrence. "A Pedagogy of Respect: Teaching as an Ally of Working-Class College Students". *Coming to Class: Pedagogy and the Social Class of Teachers*. Eds. John McMillan, Alan Shepard, and Gary Tate. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 1998. 94-116. PDF File.

Mao, LuMing. *Reading Chinese Fortune Cookie The Making of Chinese American Rhetoric*. Logan, UT: Utah State University Press, 2006. Print.

Manigault-Bryant, LeRhonda S. *Talking to the Dead: Religion, Music, and Lived Memory among Gullah/Geechee Women*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2014. Print

Massey, Doreen B. *For Space.* London: SAGE, 2005. Print.

---. *Space, Place and Gender*. Minneapolis: U Minnesota P, 1994. Print.

Morris, Brian. "What We Talk About When We Talk About Walking in the City." *Cultural Studies* 18.5 (Sept. 2004). 675-697. PDF File.

Mountford, Roxanne. *The Gendered Pulpit: Preaching in American Protestant Spaces*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2003. Print.

Mitchell, William J. *City of Bits: Space, Place, and the Infobahn*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996. Print.

Nunley, Vorris. "From the Harbor to Da Academic Hood: Hush Harbors and an African American Rhetorical Tradition." *African American Rhetoric(s): Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004. Ed. Elaine Richardson and Ronald Jackson 221-241. Print.

—. *Keepin' It Hushed: The Barbershop and African American Hush Harbor Rhetoric*. Detroit: Wayne State UP. 2010. Print.

Olendorf, Sandra Brenneman. "Highlander Folk School and the South Carolina Sea Island Citizenship Schools: Implications for the Social Studies." Diss. University of Kentucky, 1987. PDF File.

Omi, Michael and Howard Winant. *Racial Formation in the United States: From the 1960s to the 1990s*. New York: Routledge, 1994. Print.

Perelman, Chaïm, and Lucie Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969. Print.

Peterson, Carla L. *"Doers of the Word": African American Women Speakers & Writers*

in the North (1830-1880). Rutgers: Oxford UP, 1995. Print.

Porter, James E., Patricia Sullivan, Stuart Blythe, Jeffrey T. Grabill, and Libby Miles. "Institutional Critique: A Rhetorical Methodology for Change". *College Composition and Communication* 51.4 (June 2000). 610-642. PDF File.

Powell, Douglas Reichart. *Critical Regionalism: Connecting Politics and Culture in the American Landscape*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina, 2007. Print.

Preservation Consultants Inc. *James Island and Johns Island Historical and Architectural Survey*. Charleston: South Carolina Department of Archives and History. 1989. PDF File.

Ratcliffe, Krista. *Rhetorical listening: Identification, Gender, Whiteness*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2006. Print.

Reynolds, Nedra. *Geographies of Writing: Inhabiting Places and Encountering Difference*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 2004. Print.

Rickert, Thomas. *Ambient Rhetoric: The Attunements of Rhetorical Being*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh, 2013. Print.

Roberts, Blain. *Pageants, Parlors, and Pretty Women: Race and Beauty in the Twentieth Century South*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina, 2014. Print.

Robinson, Bernice. Statement of Her Role in the Citizenship Schools. Bernice Robinson Papers. Box 3, Folder 8. Avery Research Center, Charleston, SC. 2 August 2012.

---. Unpublished Interview by Sandra Oldendorf. 15 January 1986. Highlander Education and Research Center Archives. New Market, Tennessee.

Rosaldo, Renato. "Cultural Citizenship in San Jose California". *PoLAR* 17.2 (November 1994). 57-63. PDF File.

Rosaldo, Renato. "Cultural Citizenship, Inequality, and Multiculturalism." *Latino Cultural Citizenships*. Eds. William V. Flores and Rina Benmayor. Boston: Beacon Press, 1997. Print.

Rouse, P. Joy "Margaret Fuller: A Rhetoric of Citizenship in Nineteenth-Century America." *Oratorical Culture in Nineteenth-Century America: Transformations in the Theory and Practice of Rhetoric*. Ed. Gregory Clark and S. Michael Halloran. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1993. Print.

Royster, Jacquelyn Jones. *Traces of a Stream: Literacy and Social Change Among African American Women*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh, 2000. Print.

Sandoval, Chela. *Methodology of the Oppressed*. Minneapolis, MN: U of Minnesota, 2000. Print.

Saunders, William. "Growing Up on John's Island: Sea Islands Then and Now". *Sea Island Roots: African Presence in the Carolinas and Georgia*. Ed. by Mary Arnold Twining and Keith E. Baird. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 1991. Print.

---. "Sea Islands Then and Now." *Journal of Black Studies Special Edition: Sea Island Culture* 10.4 (1980). 481-492. PDF File.

Schneider, Stephen. "The Sea Island Citizenship Schools: Literacy, Community Organization and the Civil Rights Movement". *College English* 70.2 (Nov 2007). 144-167. PDF File.

---. *You Can't Padlock an Idea: Rhetorical Education at the Highlander Folk School, 1932-1961*. Columbia: U of SC Press, 2014. Print.

Scott, James C. *Domination and the Arts of Resistance: Hidden Transcripts*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1990. Print.

—. *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1985. Print.

Selzer, Jack. "Habeas Corpus: An Introduction". *Rhetorical Bodies*. Ed. Jack Selzer and Sharon Crowley. Madison, WI: U of Wisconsin Press, 1999. Print.

Sen, Arijit and Lisa Silverman. "Introduction: Embodied Placemaking: An Important Category of Critical Analysis." *Making Place: Space and Embodiment in the City*. Eds. Arijit Sen and Lisa Silverman. Bloomington, IND.: Indiana UP, 2014. Print.

Sennett, Richard. *The Fall of Public Man*. New York: Penguin Books, 1977. Print.

Sharp, R. Chelsa. "Cultural Forms at Highlander". *Journal of Appalachian Studies Association: Special Issue: Diversity in Appalachian Images and Realities* 5 (1993). 42-49. PDF File.

Sheard, Cynthia Miecznikowski. "The Public Value of Epideictic Rhetoric." *College English* 58.7 (1996): 765-794. PDF File.

Sibley, David. *Geographies of Exclusion*. New York: Routledge, 1995. Print.

Smitherman, Geneva. *Talkin and Testifyin: The Language of Black America*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1977. Print.

Smyth, William D. "Segregation in Charleston in the 1950s: A Decade of Transition." *The South Carolina Historical Magazine* 92.2. (April 1991). 99-123. PDF File.

Soja, Edward. *Thirdspace*. Massachusetts: Blackwell, 1996. Print.

Stewart, Lynn. "Louisiana Subjects: Power, Space, and the Slave Body." *Cultural Geographies* 2.3 (1995): 227-245. PDF File.

Sullivan, Dale. "The Ethos of Epideictic Encounter." *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 26.2 (1993): 113-133. PDF File.

Tjerandsen, Carl. *Education for Citizenship: a Foundation's Experience.* Santa Cruz, Calif.: Emil Schwarzhaupt Foundation, 1980. Print.

Trott, Wendy Carmen. *An Afrocentric Analysis of the Transition and Transformation of African medicine (Root Medicine) as Spiritual Practice among Gullah People of Lowcountry South Carolina*. Diss. Temple University, 2003. PDF File.

Twining, Mary Arnold. Sea Island Roots: African Presence in the Carolinas and Georgia. Africa World Press: 1991. Print.

Wigginton, Eliot ed., *Refuse to Stand Silently By: An Oral History of Grass Roots Social Activism in America, 1921-64.* New York: Anchor Books, 1992. Print.

Wood, Denis and John Fels. *The Power of Maps*. New York: Guilford, 1992. Print.

Wright, Elizabethada. "Rhetorical Spaces in Memorial Places: The Cemetery as a Rhetorical Memory Place/Space." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 35.4 (2005). 51-81. PDF File.

Yellin, Robert. "Alice Wine at Progressive Club." 1965. Guy and Candie Carawan Collection. Avery Research Center, Charleston, SC. 5 August 2014.

---. "Esau Jenkins and His Bus." 1965. Guy and Candie Carawan Collection. Avery Research Center, Charleston, SC. 5 August 2014.

Young, Morris. *Minor Re/visions: Asian American Literacy Narratives as a Rhetoric of Citizenship*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2004.

Young, Morris, and Connie Kendall. "The Consequences of Rhetoric and Literacy: Power, Persuasion, and Pedagogical Implications." *The SAGE Handbook of Rhetorical Studies*. Ed. Andrea A. Lunsford, Kirt H. Wilson, and Rosa A. Eberly. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc., 2009. 334-52. Print.