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E. Statement of Historic Contexts

Discuss each historic context listed in Section B.

The nomination for the Historic Resources of Lancaster County includes two historic districts (containing approximately 78 resources) and six individual properties within the county boundaries of Lancaster County, South Carolina, which are of historical and/or architectural significance to the county and its communities. Dating from c. 1849 to c. 1940, these resources, along with the Lancaster Downtown Historic District and the eleven individual properties previously listed in the National Register, serve as visible reminders of the county's history. Located in the extreme north-central portion of the state and bordered on two sides by North Carolina, Lancaster County developed as a predominantly agricultural area and was one of the significant early settlements in the South Carolina backcountry.

Additional Information

Three place names in present-day Lancaster County - Catawba, Waxhaws, and Indian Lands - come from the two major Indian tribes which inhabited the area before and for some time after its permanent white settlement. The Catawbas had created a confederacy, governed by a king, by about 1700 and had some degree of social, cultural, and political affiliation with the Cherokees, Waxhaws, and other tribes. They had extensive trade relationships with white traders, first from Virginia and later from Charleston, and often served as the mediators between the traders and other tribes. Though the Catawbas were never as numerous as the Cherokees or Creeks, by the middle of the eighteenth century the colonial South Carolina government considered them to represent a nation rather than a tribe. Both the South Carolinians and the British cultivated their goodwill, with the result that the Catawbas sided with them in their disputes with the French and other tribes. Smallpox epidemics and various inter-tribal war weakened the Catawbas to the extent that they had only two hundred members by 1800. Many of them moved to present-day York County or to North Carolina, where reservations were established and where some of their descendants live today. The Waxhaws were a small tribe closely associated with the Catawbas.(1)

The earliest white inhabitants of present-day Lancaster County were Scots-Irish Presbyterians from Pennsylvania, who named the area after Lancaster County, Pennsylvania. They arrived in the northern portion of the county, in the area now known as the Waxhaws, about 1745. Among the inducements to settlement in South Carolina were the promise of new land and a desire to avoid the frequent disputes with Indians which had occurred in Pennsylvania. One of the earliest institutions established by the first Scots-Irish settlers was Waxhaw Presbyterian Church, which was founded in 1755; the church cemetery was listed in the National Register in 1975. By the 1760s the colonial government actively encouraged white settlement along the North Carolina-South Carolina border. With the Catawbas weakened by disease and war, and lessened in influence, it was hoped that new inhabitants would help protect the frontier.(2)

There were no established towns in present-day Lancaster County before the American Revolution, and most of the rural settlements were in the areas closest to North Carolina. From the beginning there were disputes between North and South Carolina over their respective boundaries in the area, and land grants were made by both colonies. Camden District, one of the seven judicial districts created in 1769, included this area. Lancaster County was created in this district in 1785, and included most
of present-day Kershaw County, which was created in 1791. When the judicial districts were abolished in 1800 the county became Lancaster District. Its northern boundary, however, was not firmly established until the North Carolina-South Carolina boundary dispute was resolved in 1813. An 1813 cornerstone marking the boundary between Lancaster County, South Carolina and Union County, North Carolina was listed in the National Register in 1984. In 1868 districts were replaced by counties as the major political subdivision in South Carolina, and the district became Lancaster County once more.(3)

Some of the vicious fighting which characterized the American Revolution in the backcountry South occurred in this area. One of the most significant actions took place in the northeast section, near the present-day community of Tradesville. After the surrender of the major American army in the South at Charleston in May 1780, the Revolution in South Carolina became a civil war. One reason for the Patriots' lasting bitterness was the fight which has become known as "Buford's Massacre." On 29 May 1780 a force of Loyalist cavalry under Colonel Banastre Tarleton met a slightly larger force of Virginians, primarily infantry, under Colonel Abraham Buford. Buford was retreating toward North Carolina, and when Tarleton demanded his surrender he refused. The Loyalists formed into line and charged, routing the Virginians. Buford's men apparently tried to surrender but were overrun by Tarleton's cavalry, who inflicted heavy casualties; over 250 Americans were killed or wounded, and most of the rest were captured. Claims were made that the Loyalists bayoneted helpless Americans after they had displayed the white flag, but the various accounts conflict on this point. Nevertheless, the action gave Tarleton the nickname "Bloody Tarleton" and "Buford's Massacre" became a rallying symbol for many Patriots. "The local inhabitants were at first appalled and then infuriated," one military historian has noted. "Tarleton's quarter' became a watchword, as the British would grimly discover at Kings Mountain and Cowpens."(4) Another significant, if small, action in the area was the Battle of Hanging Rock, on 6 August 1780. Colonel Thomas Sumter, commanding a force of North and South Carolina militia, attacked and surprised a British/Loyalist outpost near Hanging Rock, in the south-central section. Although he inflicted moderate casualties and captured many prisoners and supplies, Sumter's victory was incomplete, as many of his men stopped to loot the British camp. Hanging Rock was, however, another of the many significant harassments of the British delivered by partisan leaders in South Carolina from 1780 to 1782. The battlefield was listed in the National Register in 1974.(5)

When Lancaster County was created in 1795, a temporary courthouse was established at a central location near Hanging Rock. When Kershaw County was created in 1791, a new county seat for Lancaster County was established
near a small settlement called Barnettsville. In 1798 a post office, Lancaster Court House, was established there, and the town itself was renamed Lancasterville in 1802. Lancaster would be the only incorporated town in the county until after the Civil War.(6)

By 1826 Robert Mills described Lancaster as "regularly laid out, five streets running each way at right angles. . . . The village contains about 30 dwelling houses and stores, and 260 inhabitants. The public buildings are a court-house and jail, and a handsome brick academy. . . . The legislature, at the last session, made appropriations for building a new court-house, which will prove a great ornament to the place."(7) Mills designed the jail, built in 1821-22 and designated a National Historic Landmark in 1971. It has often been speculated that he also designed the third and present courthouse, built in 1826-27 and also designated a National Historic Landmark in 1971. Although his other public architecture in the state seems to have influenced it, there is no evidence to prove a Mills design.(8)

Before 1860 the area economy, as in so much of the South Carolina upcountry, was tied to agriculture - more specifically, to cotton. "Cotton is the chief article cultivated," Mills observed in 1826, "though corn, wheat, rye, and oats, are grown; only however for home consumption." Many local farmers and planters shipped wagonloads of cotton to Camden or Charleston.(9) The rise in the economic importance of upcountry cotton, combined with an increasing reliance on slave labor, changed the society of Lancaster District from 1800 to 1860. Many of the county's extant historic resources date from this early period of significant growth. The total population of the district, and the percentage of slaves in it, increased steadily from 1800 to 1830. In 1800 the total was some 6000, of which some 1000, or about 16 percent, were slaves. By 1830 the total had risen to 10,300, of which some 4100, or about 40 percent, were slaves. Slaves, however, never constituted a majority of the population as they did in many lowcountry areas. The total population of the district, and the percentage of slaves in it, grew much more slowly from 1830 to 1860. The total population increased to 11,800, of which some 5700, or about 48 percent, were slaves, by 1860. Lancaster's population followed much the same trend.(10)

Though Lancaster District was far removed from the battlefields of the Civil War the final days of the campaign in the Carolinas brought Federal forces into the district and through Lancaster itself. A few days after the capture and burning of Columbia in February 1865, Brigadier General Judson Kilpatrick, commanding Major General William T. Sherman's cavalry, rode to Lancaster with some 4000 troops. His movement was an attempt to make the scattered Confederate forces in South Carolina believe that Sherman's next objective was Charlotte instead of Raleigh. Kilpatrick arrived in the town on 24 February and remained there until the 28th, when
he notified Sherman, "I have eaten out the country about Lancaster, and here it is mighty poor. It won't pay to halt long at one place."(11)

Several farms and plantations in the district were visited by Kilpatrick's cavalry or elements of other units, looking for food or valuables, and some were looted or burned. The brief Federal passage through the area and occupation of Lancaster, however, was relatively lenient when compared to the destruction in such towns as Columbia and Winnsboro. Before they left Lancaster Kilpatrick's cavalrymen did attempt to burn the courthouse and the jail. Citizens were able to extinguish the fires before extensive damage was done to either building, though some public papers were lost.(12)

Emancipation and its resulting disruption was the most significant result of the war in the defeated South, and Lancaster County was no exception. The long process of rebuilding the area would be made more difficult by two major developments - the end of the cotton-based plantation system and the influx of thousands of newly-freed blacks into an economy and a society which had little room for competition. Many of the larger plantations and farms were gone, and many blacks bought or rented land from their former masters. Some of the plantations were operated as units, with blacks working for wages, which could mean a share of the crop, or services, or cash, or some combination of the three. Most of the plantations rapidly switched to cash payments. Though the cotton plantation system was gone, cotton was still the preferred crop, particularly in the South Carolina upcountry. In many instances farmers began to specialize and excluded those subsistence crops which had been common before 1860; they based their success or failure solely on cotton. Small farmers in the postwar era increased cotton production; South Carolina produced 45 percent more in 1880 than it had in 1860.

Lancaster County farmers, like many others in the upcountry, grew more cotton, of better quality, and commanding better prices than the lowcountry produced after the Civil War, just as they had done before the war.(13)

One factor which led to the economic growth of the county and the establishment of incorporated towns was the successful introduction of railroads in the 1880s. Antebellum and immediate postwar attempts to furnish Lancaster and the rest of the county with rail transportation failed, and it was not until 1883 that the Charlotte, Columbia, and Augusta Railroad completed its line from Chester to Lancaster. The section running from Lancaster to Lenoir, North Carolina was sold to a group of Lancaster businessmen who renamed it the Lancaster and Chester Railroad in 1894. The town of Kershaw, in the southeast section, was originally known as Welsh's Station and was established in 1887 by James V. Welsh. Welsh persuaded the Charleston, Cincinnati, and Chicago Railroad to build a depot about halfway between Camden and Lancaster. He
later named the town, incorporated in 1888, in honor of Major General Joseph B. Kershaw, a prominent Confederate general from Camden. Heath Springs, in the south-central section, was the site of a small antebellum inn near a mineral spring. It was not incorporated, however, until after the railroad made its appearance. Benjamin D. Heath purchased the spring and established Heath Spring or Heath's Spring in 1888. The town was incorporated in 1890 and its name was later changed to Heath Springs to honor the business and industrial contributions of Heath and Leroy Springs, who were partners. The Charleston, Cincinnati, and Chicago Railroad's lines were taken over by the Southern Railway in 1900. Van Wyck, in the extreme northwest section, was established in 1887 along the Seaboard Railroad.\(^{(14)}\)

Lancaster County's growth and development were further stimulated by the dramatic growth of the South Carolina textile industry in the 1890s. That industry's expansion after Reconstruction, particularly in the piedmont (including Lancaster and nineteen other counties), corresponded almost exactly with the decline of agriculture's preeminent place in the state economy. David L. Carlton, in his study Mill and Town in South Carolina 1880-1920, notes, "between the beginning of the cotton manufacturing boom in the 1880s and the approximate end of the Progressive era in 1920 the Palmetto State became the third largest textile producing state in the Union." Rural residents migrated to mill villages, which were self-contained communities providing not only housing but stores, schools, and churches. Some towns, such as Newry, Buffalo, and Vauculse, were originally mill villages; others, such as Greenville, Spartanburg, Union, and Lancaster, grew significantly in size, population, and wealth as a direct result of textile mills.\(^{(15)}\)

The Lancaster Cotton Mill was established by a group of area businessmen and industrialists in 1895 with Leroy Springs as its president. Springs was the most prominent figure in Lancaster County business and industry for over fifty years and became a textile entrepreneur of regional and national stature by the time of his death in 1931. His house in Lancaster was listed in the National Register in 1986. Springs established both Leroy Springs and Company, a cotton shipping company, and the Bank of Lancaster in the 1880s, and was the chief partner in purchasing and renaming the Lancaster and Chester Railroad in 1894. The new textile mill, which soon became the flagship of Springs' business (later Springs Mills), was founded in response to the county farmers' and merchants' demands for an industry to boost the sagging economy. The mill, which began production in 1896, was expanded along with the mill village in 1901-03, and the new building was nicknamed "the Million Dollar Mill." In 1907 the mill boasted almost 75,000 spindles - which made it the third largest mill in the state in number of spindles - and some 1600 looms. It employed 1050 operatives, the village housed a population of 3000, and its
annual products were worth $1.8 million. Other significant expansions followed at several intervals, most notably in 1914, 1923, and through the 1930s and 1940s.(16)

Springs also helped to establish the Kershaw Cotton Mill in 1912, and was elected president; John T. Stevens became vice-president. The mill began operation in 1913, but struggled after World War I and the boll weevil caused cotton prices to drop. Though the 1920s were difficult, the mill regained some of its productivity by the mid-1930s.(17)

The face of Lancaster County had changed by the turn of the twentieth century, in large part due to the first few years of operation at the Lancaster Cotton Mills. George W. Malone, in a guide to the county published in 1900, described Lancaster. "Just one decade and a-half ago," he wrote, "this was a small, unattractive, lonesome-looking village, with muddy streets, bad roads, old, dilapidated, mossy-looking storehouses and uninviting prospects on every side. . . . The growth of this delightful and flourishing town has been rapid, progressive and astounding. . . . The rushing, hustling, pertinacious and persistent citizens of this growing and thriving town are now redoubling and united their energies to construct a million dollar cotton factory."(18) Kershaw was "a pretty and prosperous town of about fifteen hundred inhabitants, and only about twelve years old, with the most inviting environments, inducements, and advantages," which was a remarkable assessment only three years after a fire destroyed most of the town.(19) Heath Springs, according to Malone, was "the prettiest little town we have struck yet."(20)

There were other industries which had an impact on Lancaster County early in the twentieth century, such as the cottonseed and cotton oil industry, gold mining, and brickmaking. John T. Stevens, a frequent business partner of Leroy Springs, founded the Kershaw Oil Mill in 1902 and the Lancaster Cotton Oil Company in 1907.(21) The Lancaster Cotton Oil Company is included in this multiple property submission. Stevens' house in Kershaw is a contributing property in the Matson Street Historic District, also included in this multiple property submission. The Haile Gold Mine, established in 1829 near present-day Kershaw, was for many years the most productive gold mine in South Carolina and one of the most productive mines east of the Mississippi River. Its peak production was between 1898 and 1908. After a boiler explosion in 1908 gold was no longer mined but such minerals as pyrite, sulphide ore, and mica have been extracted there since that time.(22) The Ashe Brick Company, established in the Van Wyck community in 1906, is still in operation.(23)

The forty-year period from 1880 to 1920 was perhaps the most significant era of growth and development in Lancaster County's history, and many of the county's extant historic resources date from this period. The county's population increased from some 17,000 to some 29,000.(24)
A brief resurgence in cotton production and prices, coupled with the introduction of railroads into the area, occurred in the 1880s, and such towns as Kershaw, Heath Springs, and Van Wyck were established. The decade of the 1890s saw the establishment of a major textile mill, followed closely after the turn of the twentieth century by other industries, so that by 1910 the county was more prosperous than it had ever been. Overreliance on a single-crop economy, however, produced too much cotton, with the result that prices plummeted. A "cotton panic" in 1914, combined with a depression during World War I and the coming of the boll weevil, brought an end to the boom years by 1920.

Virtually the only growth in the county in the 1920s and 1930s was as a result of the textile industry, with the various upgradings and expansions of Lancaster Cotton Mills, first under Leroy Springs and after his death under his son Elliott White Springs. The county's population, in the twenty-year period from 1920 to 1940, decreased in the first ten years and only slightly improved from 1930 to 1940. (25) Lancaster County, on the eve of World War II, was an area just beginning to adjust to the changing agricultural landscape and economy of the region.
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Historic Resources of Lancaster County, S.C., c. 1745 – c. 1940

Robert Barnwell Allison House, Lancaster
Heath Springs Depot, Heath Springs
Thomas Walker Huey House
Adam Ivy House
Lancaster Cotton Oil Company, Lancaster
Matson Street Historic District, Kershaw
East Richland Street-East Church Street Historic District, Kershaw
William Harrison Sapp House

Properties Within the County Limits of Lancaster County, S.C., Already Listed in the National Register of Historic Places and Contributing in Whole or In Part to the Historic Resources of Lancaster County, S.C., c. 1745 – c. 1940 Multiple Property Submission

Lancaster County Courthouse (NHL) 24 February 1971
Lancaster County Jail (NHL) 19 August 1971
Battle of Hanging Rock Historic Site 31 December 1974
Waxhaw Presbyterian Church Cemetery 11 September 1975
Lancaster Presbyterian Church 16 December 1977
Kilburnie 24 April 1979
Mount Carmel A.M.E. Zion Campground 10 May 1979
Dr. William Columbus Cauthen House 28 June 1982
Lancaster Downtown Historic District 8 August 1984
North Carolina-South Carolina Cornerstone 20 December 1985
Ieroy Springs House 20 March 1986
Wade-Beckham House 17 June 1988
These additional properties are being nominated as part of the Historic Resources of Lancaster County, S.C., multiple property submission:

Buford's Massacre Site
Clinton A.M.E. Zion Church, Kershaw
Craig House
Cureton House
Kershaw Depot, Kershaw
Massey-Doby-Nisbet House
Stewart-Sapp House
Unity Baptist Church, Kershaw
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Section F. Associated Property Types

I. Name of Property Type: Residences

II. Description

Residences in Lancaster County range in date from the late eighteenth century to the twentieth century. The majority of these buildings are one or two story, wood frame construction with clapboard siding on brick pier foundations. The roof type varies with the age and architectural style with the predominance form being lateral gable. Details express a variety of architectural styles including Greek Revival, Eastlake, Carpenter's Gothic, Craftsman, Colonial Revival, and Classical Revival.

A common residential type found in Lancaster County during the mid-nineteenth century was a vernacular Greek Revival, double pile house with a central hall. These houses were two-story, five-bay, lateral-gabled roof, clapboard-sided with a one-story shed-roof porch with simple wood posts. The central bay consisted of a double door with sidelights and transom-lights on the first story and a tripartite window on the second story. Later nineteenth and early twentieth century residences are representative of their eclectic architectural types.

III. Significance

These properties are significant for their association with the settlement of Lancaster County and the residential development of the county's communities, particularly from the late nineteenth to the early twentieth century. These are representative of the diverse architectural styles and types found in Lancaster County. These resources should be listed under the ARCHITECTURE area of significance, Criterion C.

IV. Registration Requirements

Properties to be listed should retain the integrity of their original materials and design and should convey their historic character and function. Typical alterations may include some changes to windows or doors and secondary additions which do not adversely affect the visual integrity.
I. Name of Property Type: Buildings Associated with Transportation

II. Description

The most common type of building associated with transportation in Lancaster County is the railroad depot. These are representative of the general type of small depot found in the rural South and constructed in the early twentieth century. These are typically one-story rectangular, wood frame buildings covered with clapboard and/or novelty shingle siding. They have distinctive large hip roofs with flared eaves and deep overhangs supported by brackets and knee braces. The buildings were generally divided into passenger and cargo sections expressed by the fenestration and openings.

III. Significance

These are important as an expression of the growing accessibility of smaller communities to larger metropolitan areas and transportation centers and representative of typical railroad construction. Resources of this type should be listed under Criterion C with ARCHITECTURE as their area of significance.

IV. Registration Requirements

Integrity of form, materials, workmanship and setting must be intact for the building to be considered eligible. Acceptable changes include roof materials and minor alterations to openings. Setting is important to the character of these buildings; moving is discouraged but if necessary the resource must remain near railroad tracks or similar transportation routes to remain eligible.
I. Name of Property Type: Buildings Associated with the Production of Cotton Seed Oil

II. Description

Cotton seed oil complexes varied in size and number of buildings according to their productivity and the type or types of products manufactured from the cotton seed. Typical buildings found on the grounds of a cotton seed oil complex were a cotton seed and hull house; building or buildings for manufacturing linters, fertilizer, meal, cotton seed oil and explosives; and various warehouses, cotton gins, cotton oil tanks, and offices. Structural materials also depend on the size, age, and function of the particular structure. Usually the largest building, the seed and hull house was originally frame with wood siding. The later and larger types, such as the Muskogee-type found in Lancaster, were sheathed and framed in metal. Masonry was commonly used for the areas used for processing and manufacturing by-products. Warehouses and cotton gins were typically wood frame covered with either wood or metal siding. Offices were typically frame either within another structure or in the case of Lancaster, a renovated house.

III. Significance

The cotton seed oil industry was developed during the late nineteenth century as means for the disposal of cotton seeds, a by-product not used by the textile mills. The textile mills and cotton farms produced enough seeds where the cotton seed oil industry became a significant industry in Lancaster County until the mid-twentieth century. Originally many small cotton oil industries developed in small communities such as Pleasant Hill but due to an overexpectation of profits and easy access to larger complexes, like Lancaster, many of the small plants closed. These resources should be listed under Criterion A with INDUSTRY as their area of significance and under Criterion C with ARCHITECTURE as their area of significance.

IV. Registration Requirements

The cotton oil industry is presently obsolete leaving many of the complexes deserted or adapted for other uses, many used for storage. This has lead to vandalism and neglect. A degree of deterioration is expected as is some exterior sheathing replacement.
I. Name of Property Type: Religious Buildings

II. Description

Religious buildings in Lancaster County are basically confined to church buildings but can be Sunday school buildings, parish halls and associated residential structures. These buildings date from c. 1755 to the twentieth century. They reflect the popular styles of their respective eras but are mostly variants of a vernacular Classical Revival style built during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. They are either of brick construction or frame with wood siding. The size of building varies with the age, size, and wealth of the congregation.

III. Significance

These religious buildings are significant intact examples of their respective architectural types and an indication of the communities' expansion and growth. These are also the main form of architectural expression for many of the people of this region. Religious resources should be listed under Criterion C with ARCHITECTURE as their area of significance.

IV. Registration Requirements

Properties must convey their historic character through form, design, materials, and workmanship. Some minor alterations and additions are acceptable if they do not impair the buildings' integrity.
Section G. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

A survey of historic places in the counties served by the Catawba Regional Planning Council was conducted by the council in 1976; the Lancaster County portion of the survey was published as Historic Sites Survey: Lancaster County. Several National Register nominations were prepared for properties identified in this survey; a list of the county's National Register listings to date is in Section E of this multiple property submission. A partial survey of the town of Kershaw was conducted by Deborah Steverson and Jane Odom of the Catawba Regional Planning Council in 1982, but no National Register nominations resulted from that survey. In addition, the textile mills in the county were surveyed by graduate students of the Applied History program of the University of South Carolina in 1983 as part of a statewide survey of South Carolina textile mills. Preservation Consultants, an historic preservation consulting firm from Charleston, was awarded a Survey and Planning Grant from the South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) of the South Carolina Department of Archives and History and hired by Lancaster County to provide a county-wide survey in 1985. This grant was for a historical and architectural survey, excluding the town of Kershaw. The survey was completed in 1985-1986. In order to provide the citizens of Lancaster County with wider access to the information in the survey report, historic preservation consultant Paul M. Gettys was awarded a Survey and Planning Grant from the SHPO and hired by Lancaster County in 1988. This grant was to produce a survey publication based in part on the survey produced by Preservation Consultants. That publication, Historic Properties of Lancaster County, received one of the SHPO's first historic preservation awards in May 1989.

In the winter and spring of 1988-1989 the SHPO National Register staff reviewed past survey information and National Register recommendations, revising those recommendations in light of the criteria for evaluation. The staff made additional site visits and identified several properties, representing a chronological and geographical cross-section of Lancaster County, which it considered the most significant properties not yet listed in the Register. It was determined that this multiple property submission would be conducted in two phases, the first to be completed in July 1989 and the second to be completed in October 1989. The staff also conducted additional historical research concerning the growth and development of Lancaster County and its communities. Staff members involved in the project included Andrew W. Chandler, National Register Manager; J. Tracy Power, National Register Historian; and Frank Brown III, National Register Architectural Historian. Photographs from earlier
surveys were field-checked for accuracy and additional photographs were taken as needed.

The SHPO staff recognizes that some potentially eligible properties in Lancaster County are not being nominated in the first two phases of this multiple property submission. Perhaps the development of this historic context will allow local governments, historical societies, or interested individuals to prepare future nominations for individual properties in Lancaster County.
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