

605
North Carolina State Library
Raleigh

J. Sp1ay

THE

NORTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL REVIEW



OCTOBER 1958

VOLUME XXXV

NUMBER 4

Published Quarterly By
STATE DEPARTMENT OF ARCHIVES AND HISTORY
CORNER OF EDENTON AND SALISBURY STREETS
Raleigh, N. C.

THE NORTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XXXV

OCTOBER, 1958

NUMBER 4

CONTENTS

- FRENCH-AMERICAN TRADE DURING
THE CONFEDERATION, 1781-1789 399
JOHN F. STOVER
- THE OCONALUFTEE VALLEY, 1800-1860:
A STUDY OF THE SOURCES FOR
MOUNTAIN HISTORY 415
ROBERT S. LAMBERT
- APPLETON OAKSMITH, FILIBUSTER AGENT 427
JOHN J. TEPASKE
- THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE TOWN
NEGRO IN POST-RECONSTRUCTION
NORTH CAROLINA 448
FRENISE A. LOGAN
- THE FORT FISHER AND WILMINGTON
CAMPAIGN: LETTERS FROM REAR
ADMIRAL DAVID D. PORTER 461
JAMES M. MERRILL
- BOOK REVIEWS 476
Washburn's *Brother John's Canaan in Carolina*—By W.
B. Yearns; Blanchard's and Wellman's *The Life and
Times of Sir Archie: The Story of America's Greatest
Thoroughbred, 1805-1833*—By John Mitchell Justice;
Wertenbaker's *Give Me Liberty: The Struggle for Self-
Government in Virginia*—By Percival Perry; Wright's
and Tinling's *The London Diary (1717-1721) and Other*

Entered as second class matter September 29, 1928, at the Post Office at
Raleigh, North Carolina, under the act of March 3, 1879.

Writings. By William Byrd of Virginia—By William M. E. Rachal; Bradshaw's *History of Prince Edward County, Virginia, from Its Earliest Settlements through Its Establishment in 1754 to Its Bicentennial Year*—By W. Edwin Hemphill; Miller's *Memphis during the Progressive Era, 1900-1917*—By Robert H. Woody; Doster's *Railroads in Alabama Politics, 1875-1914*—By Malcolm C. McMillan; Harlan's *Separate and Unequal: Public School Campaigns and Racism in the Southern Seaboard, 1901-1915*—By Winston Broadfoot; Dykeman's and Stokley's *Neither Black Nor White*—By Robert C. Cotner; DeConde's *Entangling Alliance: Politics and Diplomacy under George Washington*—By Gilbert L. Lycan; Cunningham's *The Jeffersonian Republicans: The Formation of Party Organization, 1789-1801*—By D. H. Gilpatrick; The Editors' of *American Heritage The American Heritage Book of Great Historic Places*—By W. S. Tarlton; Miller's *American Protestantism and Social Issues, 1919-1939*—By James W. Patton; and Summers' *The Cabinet Diary of William L. Wilson, 1896-1897*—By Stuart Noblin.

THE NORTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XXXV

OCTOBER, 1958

NUMBER 4

FRENCH-AMERICAN TRADE DURING THE CONFEDERATION, 1781-1789

By JOHN F. STOVER*

In the early Confederation period Americans and Frenchmen alike hoped that they could maintain and augment the heavy war-stimulated commerce of the American Revolution. In March, 1783, Benjamin Franklin wrote Vergennes pledging his full co-operation in any project which would sponsor and further commerce between the two countries.¹ Writing in the same month to the same French Minister, Lafayette pointed out the absurdity of the French losing the commercial fruits of the gold and blood France had contributed to the American War for Independence.² Thomas Jefferson, shortly after his arrival in Paris in 1785, made the same basic point to Vergennes when he wrote, "In truth, no two countries are better calculated for the exchanges of commerce. France wants rice, tobacco, potash, furs, and ship-timbers. We want wines, brandies, oils and manufactures."³ Throughout the 1780's it was not a question of the benefits and mutual advantages to be gained from a vigorous commerce. Rather it was a question of overcoming the inherent advantages of the English—advantages of language, generously extended

* Dr. John F. Stover is an Associate Professor of History at Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana.

¹ A. H. Smyth, *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin* (New York, 10 volumes, 1905-1907), IX, 19-20, hereinafter cited as Smyth, *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin*.

² Marquis Marie Joseph Paul de Lafayette, *Memoirs, Correspondence and Manuscripts of General Lafayette* (London, 1837), II, 66, hereinafter cited as Lafayette, *Memoirs*.

³ Jefferson to Vergennes, August 15, 1785, *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson* (Washington, D. C., Memorial Edition, 1904), V, 75, hereinafter cited as *The Writings of Jefferson*.

credit, and a long commercial experience in America. Lord Sheffield in England in 1783 and George Washington, a few years later, both agreed that the crucial British advantage was the easy credit obtainable from the English merchants.⁴

The British commercial losses in America during the Revolution naturally were substantial. From 1776 through 1780 British exports to her revolting colonies averaged less than £265,000 per year, or little more than 10 per cent of her average annual exports for the preceding decade. During the first three of these years, 1776 through 1778, British exports to America averaged less than £50,000 a year, a figure much smaller than her pre-war exports to most of the individual colonies.⁵ North Carolina, a colony of perhaps average population and foreign trade, was buying British goods to the extent of £100,000 annually in the years before the Revolution⁶ British imports from all the American colonies in the years 1776 through 1780 averaged no more than £35,000 per year or under 3 per cent of the average for the years 1766 through 1775.⁷ French commerce and military aid to the revolting colonies helped to fill this trade vacuum. From 1776 to 1780 French exports to the American colonies averaged over

⁴ Lord Sheffield, *Observations on the Commerce of the American States* (London, 1784), 4-6, hereinafter cited as Sheffield, *Observations on American Commerce*; John C. Fitzpatrick (ed.), *The Writings of George Washington* (Washington, D. C.: 39 volumes, 1931-1944), XXIX, 446, hereinafter cited as Fitzpatrick, *The Writings of George Washington*.

⁵ Sheffield, *Observations on American Commerce*, Appendix, Table XIV.

⁶ Charles C. Crittenden, *The Commerce of North Carolina, 1763-1789* (New Haven, 1936), 83-84, hereinafter cited as Crittenden, *The Commerce of North Carolina*. While the population of North Carolina was 8 to 10 per cent of the total, the absence of good ports reduced her share of the import trade to only 5 to 8 per cent.

⁷ Sheffield, *Observations on American Commerce*, Appendix, Table XIV. In Table IX of the Appendix, Sheffield made the following estimates for earlier British-American trade:

Average Yearly Trade in	Exports to America	Imports from America
1720's	£ 471,000	£ 519,000
1730's	660,000	670,000
1740's	813,000	709,000
1750's	1,577,000	803,000
1760's	1,763,000	1,045,000

4,000,000 livres a year or about \$800,000. American exports to France in the same five years averaged just over 2,800,000 livres a year or about \$560,000.⁸

Both the extensive French-American trade of the war years and the high hopes for a large and prosperous post-war commerce were based in part upon the commercial treaty concluded at Paris, February 6, 1778. Early in the war American trade was linked with the desired French military assistance. In October, 1776, Silas Deane, American purchasing agent in Paris, was instructed by Congress to offer the French American exports of "tobacco and other valuable produce" in exchange for French guns, blankets, tents, and ammunition.⁹ In the same month a proposed draft of a treaty of commerce with France was sent to Deane, even before Benjamin Franklin and Arthur Lee arrived to help him with his duties.¹⁰ Over a year elapsed before the three commissioners, under the adroit direction of Franklin, completed successfully the negotiations for the treaty of commerce. On February 16, 1778, the three men wrote to the American Committee for Foreign Affairs that they were sending home for ratification two agreements, a treaty of amity and commerce, and a military alliance.¹¹ Even before the trade treaty was signed the trade with France was rapidly expanding, especially in the southern states. The trade directed toward North Carolina was extensive because the larger American ports were blockaded or occupied by the British. In 1777 and 1778 dozens of vessels, both French and American, were carrying

⁸ "General Table of Commerce between France and the United States from 1775 to 1792 . . ." Document No. 1, Edmund Buron, "Statistics on Franco-American Trade, 1778-1806," *Journal of Economics and Business History*, IV (May, 1932), 571-580, hereinafter cited as Buron, "General Table of Commerce."

⁹ Francis Wharton (ed.), *The Revolutionary Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States* (Washington, D. C.: Wharton Edition, 6 volumes, 1889) II, 159, hereinafter cited as Wharton, *Revolutionary Correspondence*.

¹⁰ Wharton, *Revolutionary Correspondence*, II, 162.

¹¹ Wharton, *Revolutionary Correspondence*, II, 495. Franklin reported a full and final ratification of the treaties on July 17, 1778, Wharton, *Revolutionary Correspondence*, II, 650.

tobacco and naval stores to France and returning with munitions of war and manufactured goods.¹²

The treaty of amity and commerce of 1778 was an exceedingly liberal agreement, granting the American colonies "most favored nation" privileges, giving the Americans one or more free ports in France, and promising that the French king would use his influence with the Barbary pirates to obtain safety for American ships. The Americans for their part, were not to disturb France in its traditional fishing rights in the Newfoundland Banks. Other provisions fully defined prizes, shipwrecks, contraband and noncontraband goods, and comparable mercantile subjects.¹³ Americans, both at home and in Paris, generally were well-satisfied with the treaty and the prospects for trade. Writing to John Lloyd in January, 1779, the three commissioners reported that France had thrown all her ports open and that it was probably unnecessary to worry about the specified "free ports" at the present.¹⁴ Franklin was somewhat more concerned about American rights under the "most favored nation" clause. Writing in March, 1779, to Joshua Johnson, a merchant and later father-in-law to John Quincy Adams, Franklin reported:

I have not as yet been able to obtain a certain knowledge of the Duties paid by other Nations in France, and I am told it is not easy to obtain, as they are very different in the different Provinces, and there is not, as in England, a printed Book of them.¹⁵

A few months later he was complaining to Congress that they should hurry up and appoint some consuls to France.¹⁶

As a result of the new commercial agreement and particularly the substantial French military aid, French exports

¹² Crittenden, *The Commerce of North Carolina*, 129-130, 134. As the trade between North Carolina and France declined after 1778, the French consul to Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina, the Chevalier D'Ammours, complained that the reason for the decline was the lack of a law in North Carolina which would permit French ship captains to recover easily deserting crew members. After 1780 a more important reason for the decrease in trade was the reopening of other more important American ports.

¹³ W. M. Malloy (ed.), *Treaties, Conventions, International Acts, Protocols and Agreements between the United States and Other Powers* (Washington, D. C., 1910), I, 468-479.

¹⁴ Wharton, *Revolutionary Correspondence*, III, 32.

¹⁵ Smyth, *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin*, VII, 259.

¹⁶ Smyth, *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin*, VII, 326.

to America reached a very high level in the early 1780's. In the three years, 1781 through 1783, French exports to the American states climbed to well over 11,000,000 livres (\$2,200,000) a year, a figure nearly three times the volume of French exports in the preceding five years. American exports to France in the same three years increased only slightly, being a little less than 3,500,000 livres (\$700,000) a year. The trade balance for the eight years, 1776 through 1783, was, therefore, heavily in favor of the French, running to over 30,000,000 livres or about \$6,000,000 for the period.¹⁷

The heavy French exports of 1781 can in part be explained by the marked French military aid given in the last campaigns of the war. During 1782 and 1783 British merchants were still kept out of American ports and the relative trade monopoly of the French continued. Compared to the previous British exports to the colonies in the decade before the Revolution, however, the French trade was small indeed. The figures of Lord Sheffield, the British trade expert, indicate the high year for British exports to have been 1771 when goods to the value of £4,202,475 (\$20,000,000) came into the colonies.¹⁸ The average of British exports for the pre-war decade (1765-1774) was well over £2,000,000.¹⁹ Thus French exports at their height were not over an eighth of the peak British year and less than a quarter of the pre-war British average.

British exports to the United States also reached a wartime peak in 1781, when goods to the value of £847,883 were sent to the revolting colonies, principally, of course, to the armies of the king. In 1782, with the war over and British troops no longer needing supplies and munitions, British exports dropped to a little over a third of those of the previous year.²⁰ British trade after the war was slowed by the Congressional prohibition of trade with England, pending a final peace.

¹⁷ Buron, "General Table of Commerce."

¹⁸ Sheffield, *Observations on American Commerce*, Appendix, Table XIV.

¹⁹ Sheffield, *Observations on American Commerce*, Appendix, Table XIV.

²⁰ Sheffield, *Observations on American Commerce*, Appendix, Table XIV. British exports to America were only £256,324 for the year. American exports to England at the war's end were insignificant, amounting to £99,847 in 1781 and only £28,676 in 1782.

This prohibition was very popular in France as William Carmichael, in a letter from Madrid to Robert Livingston, the first "Secretary for Foreign Affairs," wrote:

The resolution of Congress prohibiting all intercourse between the citizens of America and the subjects of Great Britain gives a secret satisfaction both in France and in this country²¹

In April, 1783, Franklin also wrote to Livingston that English merchants, with loaded vessels detained in port, eagerly awaited the repeal by both America and Britain of the laws prohibiting their trade.²²

As she anticipated peace in 1783, Britain was confident of the future of her American commerce. Lord Sheffield contended that in several fields of manufacture, especially woollens, iron goods, glass, stockings, shoes, cotton goods, and goods for the Indian trade, the British would find little competition from any foreign source.²³ The English also claimed that they could hold their own in such products as linens, paper, "printed calicoes," silks, and salt. Only in wine, brandies, gin, cambric, and southern European fruits and oils did they admit their inability to meet foreign competition.²⁴ Sheffield boasted that the French-American military victory would gain the French little in a commercial way. The superior English credit facilities, the inexperience of the French in the American trade, the growing American resentment against restraints on their French West Indian trade—all these things he saw as favoring the British merchant. Pointing out that previous peacetime American trade had largely depended on freely extended credit, he claimed that any French merchant who tried to match the generous English credits would only gain ruin and bankruptcy for himself.²⁵ In opposing William Pitt's proposal to gain American favor by relaxing the Navigation Laws, Sheffield argued that all Britain need do was have patience:

²¹ December 20, 1781, Wharton, *Revolutionary Correspondence*, V, 64.

²² Wharton, *Revolutionary Correspondence*, VI, 379.

²³ Sheffield, *Observations on American Commerce*, 7-35.

²⁴ Sheffield, *Observations on American Commerce*, 40-59.

²⁵ Sheffield, *Observations on American Commerce*, 248-249.

Friendly indeed we may yet be, and well disposed to them; but we should wait events rather than endeavor to force them . . . and with prudent management she [Britain] will have as much of their [American] trade as it will be her interest to wish for.²⁶

Events soon proved Sheffield to be correct. During the summer of 1784 the majority of sixty-four ships seen on the Cape Fear River in North Carolina flew the British flag.²⁷ Reports to the British government for the year 1785-1786 showed the number and tonnage of British vessels calling at Philadelphia, New York, and South Carolina to be nearly eight times that of the French.²⁸

In 1783 some Frenchmen, as well as Americans, were beginning to agree with the predictions of Sheffield. French consular reports in 1783 indicated that British packing of goods was superior to that of the French. The reports also referred to the bad practice that French merchants had in allowing ship captains to sell goods and make up return cargoes. The consuls pointed out the need for permanent French commercial agents in American seaports, agents who could speak English and who were ready to grant long credits.²⁹ Franklin in a letter to Vergennes in March, 1783, stated that some American merchants were complaining of the restraints, duties, and searches their trade suffered in the interior of France.³⁰ Sheffield reported in the same year that mercantile men recently returned from America all agreed that French goods, "were high charged, and in no instance adapted to the country."³¹ Even during the war years the French had frequently shown poor judgement in the selection of their exports to America. North Carolinians in the late 1770's had complained not only that French goods were often inferior to the British, but also that French cargoes often included

²⁶ Sheffield, *Observations on American Commerce*, 157-158.

²⁷ Crittenden, *The Commerce of North Carolina*, 157-158.

²⁸ George Bancroft, *History of the Formation of the Constitution of the United States* (New York, 2 volumes, 1882), II, Appendix, 407.

²⁹ Henri See, "Commerce Between France and the United States, 1783-1784" in *American Historical Review*, XXXI (July, 1926) 732-751.

³⁰ Smyth, *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin*, IX, 19-20.

³¹ Sheffield, *Observations on American Commerce*, 320. A contrary estimate from the consular reports in See, "Commerce Between France and the United States, 1783-1784" reported that French goods in America in 1783 were priced from 8 to 12 per cent cheaper than the English goods.

such items as anchovies, nightcaps, olives, and truffles, products little suited to a people struggling for their independence.³² In September, 1784, Lafayette wrote Vergennes that a satisfactory French-American trade could only be obtained when French merchants learned to consult the tastes and wants of Americans.³³ French-American trade in 1783 and 1784 clearly was on the defensive.

With the complete return of peace in 1784 French-American trade definitely shifted in volume and trade balance. Where American exports to France had been small they soon increased nearly three-fold in the remaining years of the decade. Conversely, French exports to the United States fell off to little more than a sixth of their former size. Probably the best estimates for French-American trade during the Confederation are those of Ambroise-Marie Arnould, French economist, in his "General Table of Commerce between France and the United States from 1775 to 1792. . . ." His estimates for the Confederation period are shown in the following table.³⁴

United States Exports to France			French Exports to United States	
Year	in livres: (approx. dollars)		in livres: (approx. dollars)	
1781	3,369,000	(\$ 673,800)	11,197,000	(\$2,239,100)
1782	3,498,000	(699,600)	11,520,000	(2,304,000)
1783	3,615,000	(723,000)	11,723,000	(2,344,600)
1784	9,110,000	(1,822,000)	1,678,000	(335,600)
1785	9,211,000	(1,842,000)	1,778,000	(355,600)
1786	9,476,000	(1,895,200)	1,781,000	(356,200)
1787	9,595,000	(1,919,000)	1,815,000	(363,000)
1788	9,705,000	(1,941,000)	1,888,000	(377,600)
1789	9,653,000	(1,930,600)	1,719,000	(343,800)

As the table indicates, favorable American trade balances became substantial in the late 1780's, amounting to 46,000,000 livres (\$9,200,000) for the six years 1784 through 1789. This balance was nearly twice the French balance built up from

³² Crittenden, *The Commerce of North Carolina*, 133-134.

³³ Lafayette, *Memoirs*, II, 100.

³⁴ Buron, "General Table of Commerce," 571-580. A second document in the Buron article gives somewhat different figures for the last three years

1781 through 1783, and about 50 per cent larger than the French balance for the entire war period, 1776 through 1783.

Although they already had a most favorable trade balance, the Americans were constantly harping upon the necessity of the French buying American goods. Jefferson reminded Lafayette in the summer of 1786 that France could not find gold or silver in a catalog of American exports and the French must be prepared to take American produce.³⁵ Washington made the same point to the young Frenchman just a month later.³⁶ As late as August, 1788, Washington, in writing to Comte de Moustier, again urged the necessity of France buying American goods if she wished to sell any to the Americans.³⁷ This "over selling" plus the constant reference to the need for French credits does not seem to tally entirely with the available trade statistics. The talk of credit and more credit was only natural, however, when it is recalled that the American government owed France 35,000,000 livres or nearly \$7,000,000. Only part of this loan is shown in the favorable French trade balances during the war, for much of it was advanced in the form of cash. Also the Americans probably achieved their own favorable trade balance in the middle and late 1780's without being fully aware of the new trend and the reversal of the balance.³⁸

Four American commodities, tobacco, grain and flour, rice, and train oil made up the bulk of the American exports to France. In the four years, 1787 through 1790, these four

of the period:

	Exports to France	Exports to United States
1787	14,106,900 livres	2,079,000 livres
1788	3,470,100 livres	1,377,300 livres
1789	13,039,200 livres	1,644,514 livres

The three year totals do not vary greatly, the above figures being 6 per cent larger for exports to France and 6 per cent smaller for exports to the United States. The substantial discrepancy in the figures on exports to France can probably be explained in differences in figuring the huge American exports of tobacco under the Robert Morris contract with the Farmers General in France. This contract ended in 1787.

³⁵ Gilbert Chinard (ed.), *The Letters of Lafayette and Jefferson* (Baltimore, 1929), 95, hereinafter cited as Chinard, *The Letters of Lafayette and Jefferson*.

³⁶ Washington to Lafayette, August 15, 1786, Fitzpatrick, *The Writings of George Washington*, XXVIII, 518-520.

³⁷ Fitzpatrick, *The Writings of George Washington*, XXX, 43-47.

³⁸ A further complicating factor probably was the huge Robert Morris tobacco contract during the years 1785 through 1787.

items constituted perhaps 80 per cent of all the exports to France from the United States.³⁹ The statistics of trade in general followed the earlier predictions of Jefferson, who in 1785 had written Vergennes that France wanted American rice, tobacco, potash, furs, and ship-timbers.⁴⁰ In a more specific estimate of American exports, made for Lafayette a year later, Jefferson listed the major ones as tobacco, wheat, flour and bread, timber, hops, and rice.⁴¹ Washington gave a comparable list to Comte de Moustier in 1788.⁴²

Of the several major products, tobacco was the most important, probably amounting to nearly half of the American exports in the decade. Lord Sheffield considered tobacco "the principal article of American commerce" and seemingly did not feel that Britain had any reason to fear the French in that trade.⁴³ However, as early as 1778 the three Americans in Paris, Franklin, Deane, and Lee, had been urging Congress to expedite the shipment of 5,000 hogsheads of tobacco to the Farmers General, the group that had long possessed the tobacco monopoly in France.⁴⁴ At the end of the war Franklin had proposed that Robert Morris supply the Farmers General with their tobacco.⁴⁵

Morris was slow in responding to Franklin's suggestion, but early in 1785 he signed a contract to supply the Farmers General with 20,000 hogsheads of tobacco in each of the years 1785, 1786, and 1787. The price was to be 36 livres per hundredweight, and the cargoes were to be shipped in American vessels.⁴⁶ Morris thus achieved a three year export mono-

³⁹ "A Statement of the Annual Value of Commerce between France and the United States . . .," Document No. 2, Edmund Buron, "Statistics on Franco-American Trade, 1778-1806," *Journal of Economic and Business History*, IV (May, 1932), 571-580, hereinafter cited as Buron, "A Statement of the Annual Value of Commerce between France and the United States. . . ."

⁴⁰ *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, V, 75.

⁴¹ Chinard, *The Letters of Lafayette and Jefferson*, 95-98.

⁴² Fitzpatrick, *The Writings of George Washington*, XXX, 43-47.

⁴³ Sheffield, *Observations on American Commerce*, 100-103.

⁴⁴ Wharton, *Revolutionary Correspondence*, II, 496. The tobacco was to pay for a million livre earlier advanced by the Farmers General.

⁴⁵ Smyth, *The Writings of Benjamin Franklin*, IX, 139.

⁴⁶ *Diplomatic Correspondence of the United States of America, 1783-1789* (Washington, D. C., 1833), III, 64-67. A full account of the Morris tobacco contract is given in Frederick L. Nussbaum, "American Tobacco and French Politics," *Political Science Quarterly*, XL (December, 1925), 497-516.

poly comparable to the import monopoly of the Farmers General in France. Shortly after arriving in Paris, Jefferson along with Lafayette and other interested Frenchmen worked to have the monopoly destroyed. Lafayette succeeded in getting a committee named to deal with the whole problem of the tobacco trade.⁴⁷ Jefferson came to the support of Lafayette throughout 1786, and offered him guidance, arguments, and all the influence of his position. In a letter to John Adams in July, 1786, Jefferson claimed that the Morris contract had reduced the domestic price of tobacco in America from 40 to 22 livres the hundredweight, and that the planters of Virginia and Maryland had suffered losses of nearly \$2,000,000.⁴⁸ The expanding tobacco export trade of North Carolina seems to have been only slightly affected by the Morris contract. As the bulk of the export trade moved south from Port Roanoke to Port Brunswick, about half of the tobacco was sent to Britain with most of the remainder going to American ports.⁴⁹

But the best that Jefferson and Lafayette could do was to prevent the renewal of the Morris contract. The Morris contract may have cut the price of tobacco produced by the fellow planters of Jefferson, but tobacco still made up much of the total American trade with France. In 1787 it constituted 70 per cent of the total and in the four years 1787 through 1790, still accounted for 40 per cent of the American exports.⁵⁰ After the Morris contract was ended, England quickly took over the bulk of the American tobacco crop. In 1789-1790 British imports of American tobacco were over seven times those of France.⁵¹

In the decade of the 1780's grain and flour made up almost a quarter of the American exports to France. In his 1786

⁴⁷ Lafayette, *Memoirs*, II, 129.

⁴⁸ *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, V, 356-357.

⁴⁹ Crittenden, *The Commerce of North Carolina*, 161. Of the 6,000,000 pounds of tobacco exported in 1788, Port Brunswick shipped about sixty per cent.

⁵⁰ Buron, "A Statement of the Annual Value of Commerce between France and the United States. . . ."

⁵¹ Tench Coxe, *A Brief Examination of Lord Sheffield's Observations on the United States* (Philadelphia, 1791), Part III, 24-25, hereinafter cited as Coxe, *A Brief Examination of Lord Sheffield's Observations*. British imports of American tobacco in 1789-1790 amounted to \$2,754,493, while those of France were only \$384,642.

estimate of American trade with Europe, Jefferson figured that flour, bread, wheat, and Indian corn made up over a fifth of the American exports.⁵² Three years later Jefferson reported to Lafayette that in the spring of 1789 (March through May), 56,337 quintals of American grain and flour reached French ports on the Atlantic.⁵³ In 1789 and 1790, as the French economy was disrupted by revolution, American grain and flour accounted for nearly half of the exports, even exceeding tobacco by a wide margin.⁵⁴ During his years in Paris, Jefferson also sought to increase French consumption of American rice.⁵⁵ In 1789 and 1790 rice made up over a tenth of the total exports, but for the entire decade a figure of seven or eight per cent would be more accurate. Of nearly equal importance in the American export trade was "train oil" or whale oil. Jefferson, the eternal salesman, was also interested in expanding the French market, and in 1785 was trying to get contracts to supply French cities with whale oil from Boston. He also inquired of William Carmichael in Madrid: "Can anything be done, in this way in Spain? Or do they light their streets in the night?"⁵⁶ In addition to these major items of American export, other important products sent to France included whalebone, planks and other wood, indigo, furs and skins, potash, medicinal drugs, and dried and salted fish.

Naval stores, North Carolina's major export, figure only slightly in the French-American trade. Jefferson wrote James Madison in December, 1786, that he was hoping to improve the French market for turpentine.⁵⁷ A year later the French did materially reduce the duties on pitch and tar to two and one-half per cent. But the French market for American naval stores never developed, chiefly because the Americans had to compete with the pitch and tar production of southwestern France.⁵⁸ In the 1780's northern states provided a major

⁵² Chinard, *The Letters of Lafayette and Jefferson*, 95-98.

⁵³ Chinard, *The Letters of Lafayette and Jefferson*, 131.

⁵⁴ Coxe, *A Brief Examination of Lord Sheffield's Observations*, Part III, 24-25; Buron, "A Statement of the Annual Value of Commerce between France and the United States. . . ."

⁵⁵ *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, I, 96; VI, 374-375.

⁵⁶ *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, V, 198.

⁵⁷ *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, VI, 8.

⁵⁸ *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, VI, 406-407.

market for the tar, turpentine, and pitch of North Carolina, but considerable quantities were also sold to the British. The French bought little. In the year 1789-1790 American naval stores exported to England amounted to \$190,670, while those sold to France came to only \$3,169.⁵⁹

The bulk of the French exports to the United States in the decade consisted of five items: brandies, wine and vinegar, linen and cloth, silks, and salt. Despite Lord Sheffield's prediction that Americans would prefer cheap West Indian rum to French brandies, the Americans purchased the more expensive French product in great amount. Washington noted an increase in its use in 1788 and in the last three years of the decade French brandies probably amounted to nearly 30 per cent of their American trade.⁶⁰ In the same period wine and vinegar ranked second with 12 per cent and linen, cloth, and hemp came next with 8 per cent. Silk was nearly as important amounting to over 300,000 francs for the three years. Salt was another major item of export, frequently being used as ballast in the American bound ships. Washington however complained in 1788 that French salt was not used too greatly in America as the people found it not as clean as other European salt.⁶¹ The remainder of the French exports consisted of a variety of such luxury items as hosiery, hats, lace, liqueurs, oils, gloves, parasols, perfumes, soaps, ribbons, and glassware.⁶²

The 1780's saw some increase in the American consumption of certain French products. In a letter to Lafayette in

⁵⁹ Coxe, *A Brief Examination of Lord Sheffield's Observations*, Part III, 24-25.

⁶⁰ Sheffield, *Observations on American Commerce*, 57; Fitzpatrick, *The Writings of George Washington*, XXX, 43-47; Buron, "A Statement of the Annual Value of Commerce between France and the United States. . . ."

⁶¹ Fitzpatrick, *The Writings of George Washington*, XXX, 43-47.

⁶² Buron, "A Statement of the Annual Value of Commerce Between France and the United States. . . ." The two friends, Washington and Lafayette, exchanged many gifts during the decade, thus doing their bit for French-American trade. The following exchanges all occurred in the single year 1786. Washington was asked by Lafayette to obtain a vocabulary of Indian names to be given to the Empress of Russia. Martha Washington sent to Madame Lafayette "a barrell of Virginia hams," which Lafayette served to American friends upon their arrival in France. Lafayette also received a request from Washington for a wolf hound. Earlier he had sent Washington a "jackass and two females" after the King of Spain has failed to fulfill a promise of a pair. Lafayette, *Memoirs*, II, 124, 131, 141, 142, 149.

1786 Washington mentioned that Americans were learning to like French goods, finding their quality and price good.⁶³ But in the same year, Jefferson, Minister to France, and lover of things French, had to defend his purchase of English harness in a letter to Lafayette:

The reason for my importing harness from England is a very obvious one. They are plated and plated harness is not made at all in France as far as I have learnt. It is not from a love of the English but a love of myself that I sometimes find myself obliged to buy their manufactures.⁶⁴

Most Americans, like Jefferson, found themselves "obliged to buy their manufactures" from England, not because of a love for the British, but simply because only the British could supply their wants. From 1784 through 1790 French exports to the United States totalled well under one-twentieth of those of the British. The best year for the French was 1790 with exports to the value of 1,937,000 francs coming to the United States. The poorest year for the British (in the seven year period), 1786, saw about £1,603,000 of goods come to American ports.⁶⁵ For American exports to the two countries, the difference was not so great, being probably only two to one in favor of the British. This was to be expected since American trade balances were unfavorable with the English and highly favorable with the French.⁶⁶

Other markets than the French increasingly benefited as the Americans sought to shift their commerce away from

⁶³ Fitzpatrick, *The Writings of George Washington*, XXVIII, 518-520.

⁶⁴ Chinard, *The Letters of Lafayette and Jefferson*, 108.

⁶⁵ "General Table of Commerce between France and the United States. . ." Timothy Pitkin, *A Statistical View of the Commerce of the United States* (New Haven, 1835), 30, hereinafter cited as Pitkin, *A Statistical View of Commerce*.

⁶⁶ Pitkin, *A Statistical View of Commerce*, 30. A summary of the British-American trade for these years is shown below.

American exports to England in £	British exports to America in £	
1784	£ 749,345	£ 3,679,467
1785	893,594	2,308,023
1786	843,119	1,603,465
1787	893,637	2,009,111
1788	1,023,789	1,886,142
1789	1,050,198	2,525,298
1790	1,191,071	3,431,778

the British. This was especially true in parts of the South. Foreign trade in North Carolina in the 1780's shifted away from Britain in favor of modest increases for northern American ports and major increases for the trade with the West Indies.⁶⁷

In the post-war years American trade with the French West Indies rose rapidly. In 1789-1790 American exports to the French islands of the Caribbean amounted to over \$3,000,000, or roughly twice the volume of exports to France.⁶⁸ The major products sold in the islands included flour, lumber and wood products, salted fish, salted meats, and live animals.

The condition and the prospects of French-American trade were no brighter in 1789 than they had been in 1784, the first full year of peace. Nor were they destined to flourish in the early 1790's, years of revolution for France. It was not that the French had not tried. By 1784 they had fulfilled their treaty obligations in naming four free ports for American use, Dunkerque, L'Orient, Bayonne, and Marseilles.⁶⁹ The French arret of December 29, 1787, provided duties on American imports that were quite reasonable. Several important American exports, flour, wheat, rice, wood, and potash were charged duties of but one-eighth per cent ad valorem. Jefferson, in explaining the new arret to John Jay, pointed out that these light duties were, "merely to oblige the masters of vessels to enter their cargoes, for the information of the government, without inducing them to attempt to smuggle."⁷⁰

A variety of reasons were responsible for the failure of the trade with France. In the fall of 1787 Lafayette was blaming the undeveloped trade on the British combination of commercial aggressiveness and generously extended credit, and also on French governmental indolence, mercantile cautious-

⁶⁷ Crittenden, *The Commerce of North Carolina*, 158-159, 161-162, 166. Another post-war commercial development in North Carolina was the important role played by the merchants of New York, Philadelphia, and Baltimore.

⁶⁸ Coxe, *A Brief Examination of Lord Sheffield's Observations*, Part III, 135, 24-25. Tench Coxe estimated total American exports in 1789-1790 at \$20,415,000. Of these 33 per cent went to Britain, 15 per cent to the French West Indies, 9 per cent to British West Indies, and 7 per cent to France.

⁶⁹ Lafayette, *Memoirs*, II, 87.

⁷⁰ *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, VI, 406-407.

ness, and governmental protected monopolies.⁷¹ A few months later, in writing to Lafayette in April, 1788, Washington blamed the sad state of commerce on the ineffectual Confederate government in America.⁷² But the absence of adequate commercial regulations in the United States did not seem to cause the British or the West Indies trade to suffer. Pleasant as the American palate might find French beverages and luxuries, for the hard workaday necessities the Americans seemed to prefer the fabrics, cutlery, and manufactures from British looms and shops. Whether it was British aggressiveness, French caution, or American governmental confusion that was responsible, American-French trade during the Confederation never achieved the proportions anticipated by its many sponsors.

⁷¹ Chinard, *The Letters of Lafayette and Jefferson*, 119.

⁷² Fitzpatrick, *The Writings of George Washington*, XXIX, 477.

THE OCONALUFTEE VALLEY, 1800-1860: A STUDY OF THE SOURCES FOR MOUNTAIN HISTORY

By ROBERT S. LAMBERT*

In their efforts to reveal the struggles of the "average" citizen of times past, historians have long had to puzzle over the paucity of surviving primary sources on the lives of common folk. A sense of historical urgency on the part of rich and prominent figures, combined with diligent research among their papers by their biographers, has portrayed for posterity the circumstances from which have emerged our national and sectional statesmen, heroes, and entrepreneurs.

In more recent years some significant strides have been made in assessing the environment of the ordinary inhabitants of the South. The late Professor Frank L. Owsley led the way in scrutinizing the "plain people" of the antebellum southeast while Professor Bell I. Wiley has revealed the travails and aspirations of the common soldier of the Confederacy.¹ Our understanding of the Negro in this section has been enhanced by the studies of Vernon L. Wharton and George B. Tindall.²

The attention of these students to the "plain people" has rarely been focused on the mountain whites of the antebellum southeast. Professor Owsley did advance a thesis by which he accounted for the isolation of the herdsmen of the mountains and piney woods.³ But most writers on the subject have drawn upon personal observation rather than the traditional historical sources for their descriptions of moun-

* Dr. Robert S. Lambert is Associate Professor of History and Government at Clemson College, Clemson, South Carolina.

¹ Frank L. Owsley, *Plain Folk of the Old South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1949); Bell I. Wiley, *The Life of Johnny Reb* (Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1943).

² Vernon L. Wharton, *The Negro in Mississippi, The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science*, Volume XXVIII (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1947); George B. Tindall, *South Carolina Negroes, 1877-1900* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1952).

³ Frank L. Owsley, "The Pattern of Migration and Settlement on the Southern Frontier," *Journal of Southern History*, XI (May, 1945), 150-173.

tain life and institutions. The most thorough account of the North Carolina mountaineer was written by Horace Kephart who lived among or near the residents on Hazel Creek in Swain County for extended periods during the first thirty years of the twentieth century.⁴

Kephart was more concerned however, with his contemporaries than with their origins. To a large measure this preoccupation with the recent is characteristic of most writings which deal with the farmers of the North Carolina mountains in general and the Great Smoky Mountains in particular. Some writers of regional and county history have touched upon the mountain folk as they have traced the progress of settlement in their chosen regions. But a great deal of their information on the more remote parts of these counties has come from traditions handed down from earlier generations, and the authenticity of some of these accounts might be called into question by competent historical investigation.⁵

The dearth of written records appears to be the principal factor which explains the relatively small quantity of material on the history of the first settlers of the Great Smokies. Indeed two categories of source material which are indispensable to the historical investigation of any subject cannot be included among sources available to the student of Smoky Mountain history. There are no files of newspapers extant in this region during most of the nineteenth century except in the cities of Asheville and Knoxville; these centers received little news from the isolated coves.⁶ Furthermore, the great depositories of personal papers at Raleigh, Durham, and Chapel Hill contain few collections which bear on the Smokies. Of course, the same might be said of sources pertaining to most yeomen of the Piedmont and the Coastal Plain because of the low incidence of literacy in the period

⁴ Horace Kephart, *Our Southern Highlanders* (New York: The MacMillan Company, second edition, 1922).

⁵ John Preston Arthur, *Western North Carolina, A History, 1730-1913* (Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton Printing Company, 1914), 208-209, hereinafter cited as Arthur, *Western North Carolina*; W. C. Allen, *Annals of Haywood County* (Waynesville, 1935).

⁶ Winifred Gregory (ed.), *American Newspapers, 1820-1936: A Union List of Files Available in the United States and Canada* (New York: H. W. Wilson Company, 1937).

and the simplicity of the few business transactions in which they participated. The scarcity of such sources can be explained, but the task of the historian is much more difficult because of the near absence of such contemporary accounts.

Because circumstances have deprived him of newspapers and personal papers, the historian must fall back to a second class of sources, public records. Here he must place reliance for statistical information on the Population Schedules, 1830-1880,⁷ and the Agriculture Schedules, particularly for 1850 and 1860,⁸ as made available by the United States Bureau of the Census. Only those population figures for 1850 and after are detailed enough to do more than trace lineage of heads of families. Of course, all such figures are to some degree subject to the whims of the enumerator and his informants.

County records provide the researcher with information on the acquisition and transfer of property due to purchase, sale, or decease. The researcher is handicapped here, however, by the fact that wills and deeds were legal instruments used by men of sufficient property and business acumen to wish to control the disposition of that property. This applies particularly in the case of wills. Should the investigator rely wholly on such county records he will only skim the surface; he will be dealing with the exceptional settler who was literate and relatively affluent. On the other hand, the records of the county courts provide some information on such public concerns as roads, elections, and jury duty.⁹

Several other categories of sources provide additional, but limited, data. Travel accounts are of but little value in

⁷ Microfilm copies (originals in the National Archives) of Manuscript Population Schedules, Third, Fourth, and Fifth Census, 1810-1830, State Department of Archives and History, Raleigh; and Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, and Ninth Census, 1840-1870, Library, Great Smoky Mountains National Park, Gatlinburg, Tennessee, hereinafter cited as National Park.

⁸ Microfilm copies of the Seventh Census, 1850, Schedule IV: Agriculture, for Haywood County; and Eighth Census, 1860, Schedule IV: Agriculture, for Jackson County, State Department of Archives and History. The Oconaluftee Valley lay in Haywood County until the formation of Jackson County in 1851 and became a part of Swain County in 1871.

⁹ Manuscript Minutes, Court of Pleas and Quarter Sessions, Haywood County, Clerk's Office, Waynesville, and Jackson County, Clerk's Office, Sylva, hereinafter cited as County Court Minutes; wills in the same offices and locations; deeds in the Register of Deeds' offices for Jackson and Haywood counties.

a day when most travellers preferred to go around the Smokies rather than to cross them.¹⁰ Some church records have survived and are among the most valuable sources for such local history. Finally, the efforts of a few unheralded researchers have brought to light information which, when combined with other evidence, gives some insight into life in some of the early mountain settlements.¹¹

The following account of the settlement of a single community in the Great Smokies is provided to demonstrate what documentary information is available to scholars. Implicit in the selection of this community is the fact that the primary sources are more numerous than for the other valleys in this region; the life in the Oconaluftee Valley cannot be considered as typical of much of the mountain region because of the relatively wealthy and literate people who inhabited it. However, it should also be noted that many of the mountain people about whom Kephart wrote were descended from families who first inhabited valleys like this one.

The Oconaluftee River rises just below Newfound Gap in the Great Smoky Mountains and flows into the Tuckaseegee River at the town of Cherokee in Swain County. Known by the first settlers as the West Fork, it was joined from the east by the Bradley Fork and the Raven Fork. Near its source it is a typical mountain stream narrow and winding, but below the Bradley Fork its "beautiful and fertile though narrow flat bottoms," made a vivid impression on the Swiss physical geographer, Arnold Guyot.¹² Indeed, by the standards of the mountain areas of North Carolina the Oconaluftee would be considered a broad valley. Most of it now lies within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, while the balance is a part of the Qualla Tract of the Cherokee Indian Reservation. Here the relatively rich agricultural lands provided

¹⁰ Charles Lanham, *Letters from the Alleghany Mountains* (New York: George P. Putnam, 1849), 84-92.

¹¹ The writer is indebted to H. C. Wilburn of Waynesville for personal suggestions as to sources. The frequent citations herein of his manuscript writings are further testimony of Mr. Wilburn's contributions to knowledge of Great Smoky Mountains' history.

¹² Myron H. Avery and Kenneth S. Boardman (eds.), "Arnold Guyot's Notes on the Geography of the Mountain District of Western North Carolina," *The North Carolina Historical Review*, XV (July, 1938), 284, hereinafter cited as Avery and Boardman, "Arnold Guyot's Notes."

the basis for a civilization which was distinctive in comparison with the usual picture of mountain life.

The Charleston traders did business with the Cherokees in the Tuckasegee Valley as early as the second decade of the eighteenth century.¹³ Part of the Indian war trail from modern Sevierville, Tennessee, closely followed the course of the Oconaluftee on the North Carolina side. The beauty of the valley does not seem to have caught the notice of white farmers until the period of the American Revolution. In 1776, a punitive expedition of North Carolina troops under General Griffith Rutherford destroyed a number of Indian villages in the Cherokee country including some settlements on the Oconaluftee.¹⁴

Shortly after the winning of independence, a number of land speculators began to take interest in the country inhabited by the red men. The Oconaluftee lay within the bounds of a North Carolina grant of 33,280 acres to William Cathcart in 1796, and a Buncombe County grant of 2,550 acres to Felix Walker in 1795, but these men were not actual settlers of the valley. Another early recipient of a sizeable grant resided in the valley only briefly and his holdings had been disposed of by 1812.¹⁵

The meager records of the early settlements on the Oconaluftee indicate that some whites had settled in this region in the 1790's. The first permanent residents of record were the family of John Jacob Mingus who migrated from Saxony about 1792. Three of his sons settled on the Raven Fork of the river until the mid-nineteenth century, two as prosperous farmers and the third as a preacher. The other son, Dr. John Mingus, a physician, and his wife occupied the home of his birth until very late in the nineteenth

¹³ Verner W. Crane, *The Southern Frontier, 1670-1732* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1929), 130-131.

¹⁴ H. C. Wilburn, "The Indian Gap Trail," files, National Park Headquarters, hereinafter cited as Wilburn, "Indian Gap Trail"; William E. Myers, "Indian Trails of the Southeast," in the *Forty-Second Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1924-1925* (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1928), 771-775, hereinafter cited as Myers, "Indian Trails."

¹⁵ Wilburn, "Indian Gap Trail"; Deeds, Haywood County, Book A, 185-186; North Carolina Park Commission, Abstracts of Titles to Lands in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, National Park Headquarters, IV, 148 ff.

century. During his lifetime he acquired considerable property to the west of the river along the Mingus Creek.¹⁶

Abraham Enloe, originally a South Carolinian, acquired lands from Walker near the site of the present Lufty Ranger Station. Most of his nine sons married and settled on nearby lands. The name Enloe remained prominent until a grandson of the original settler sold out to the Floyd family after 1900.¹⁷

Gradually in the period of the War of 1812, other families moved into the area. One of the first settlers was Samuel Sherill; another, Robert Collins, was born in the valley and was a prominent community leader until his death in the 1860's. These pioneers were followed by Isaac Bradley, Samuel Conner, and John Beck.¹⁸

Most of the early settlers had left homes in the older parts of North Carolina. It was not unusual however, for South Carolinians and Virginians to take up land in the valley. From time to time some residents departed for new adventures elsewhere, one group migrating as far as Missouri. For the most part, however, these first inhabitants seem to have been content to remain in an area which afforded them such a good living.¹⁹

As in so many frontier communities, the basic economic unit was the family farm. The majority of North Carolina farms of the ante-bellum period contained 100 acres or less.²⁰ By these standards several of the farms in the Oona-

¹⁶ H. C. Wilburn, Memorandum for the Superintendent, National Park, March 22, 1939, on the Mingus Creek Mill, Wilburn Papers, accession number 13-27, National Park Library, hereinafter cited as Wilburn, Mingus Creek Mill; Deeds, Haywood County, Book A, 202; Population Schedules, Third and Fourth Census, 1810-1820, Fifth Census, 1830, 379, Seventh Census, 1850, 165, all for Haywood County, and Eighth Census, 1860, Jackson County, 58.

¹⁷ J. A. Sharp, Memorandum on the Enloe Family, files, National Park Headquarters; Population Schedules, Fourth Census, 1820, Fifth Census, 1830, 379, Seventh Census, 1850, 167, all for Haywood County; and Eighth Census, 1860, Jackson County, 58.

¹⁸ Arthur, *Western North Carolina*, 208-209; Population Schedules, Third and Fourth Census, 1810-1820, Haywood County.

¹⁹ Population Schedules, Seventh Census, 1850, Haywood County, 165, 167; Eighth Census, Jackson County, 56, 58. This was the first census to show the birthplaces of all members of families and if accurate, is particularly valuable for the origins of early settlers in a remote region.

²⁰ C. O. Cathey, *Agricultural Developments in North Carolina, 1783-1860, The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science*, Volume XXXVIII (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1956), 48.

luftee Valley could be considered fairly large, such as Robert Collins' 335 acres.²¹ Much of the land held probably was not under cultivation. Woodlands and pastures seem to have made up over eighty per cent of the average farm. The size of the family unit and the proportion which was cultivated varied with the number of mouths to be fed and the number of hands and backs which could contribute to the planting and harvesting of the crop.

Most farm labor came from members of the family. Some younger men hired out as laborers on other farms from time to time, but work for others seems to have been a temporary expedient designed to contribute toward saving enough for future farm ownership. Several farmers in the valley were prosperous enough to own a few slaves; Samuel Sherill and Abraham Enloe each owned five in 1829. The few slaves which the valley farmers owned seem to have been used for domestic service rather than as fieldhands.²²

Although many land titles were obscure, where there was clear title to acreage it was in fee simple. Farm tenancy in the modern sense was virtually unknown. At least until after the Civil War the supply of fresh lands up the tributaries of the Oconaluftee seems to have been sufficient to allow the sons of the original families to settle on small farms of their own.²³

The inhabitants of the valley engaged in grain and livestock farming. The principal crop was the staple of the American frontier, Indian corn, food for both man and beast. There was a wide variation in the yield per acre, but several farmers produced harvests of 1,000 bushels in 1849. A few of the larger operators produced significant quantities of wheat such as the 200 bushels which John Mingus' lands yielded in 1859. Small quantities of oats and rye were grown on a few farms. Other contributions to the diet were made

²¹ Agriculture Schedules, Seventh Census, 1850, Haywood County, 453.

²² Agriculture Schedules, Seventh Census, 1850, Haywood County, 453; Population Schedules, Fifth Census, 1830, Haywood County.

²³ North Carolina Park Commission, Land Title Abstracts, IV, contains numerous examples of the land purchases of the sons of the older families; see also Population Schedules, Seventh Census, 1850, Haywood County, 165, 167.

by sweet and Irish potatoes, peas, beans, honey, and sorghum molasses.²⁴

The isolation of the Oconaluftee Valley from markets and the necessity to concentrate on the essentials for frontier existence relegated the traditional southern cash crops to a position of relative insignificance. Some tobacco was grown by the larger operators but little or no cotton was produced.²⁵

Pork provided the basic ingredient of the settlers' meat diet. Hogs were more numerous than most other species of livestock combined, and the value of swine is clearly indicated in the few recorded wills and estate inventories which have survived. Almost every farmer owned a few head of sheep and the total for the region was exceeded only by the number of swine. The wool yield seems to have been a vital factor for family use. Beef cattle outnumbered milk cows in the valley, and this preponderance was especially marked on the long-established farms. The usual sources of animal power were horses and work oxen, but mules were rarely used.²⁶

The total value of animals slaughtered in 1869 was \$9,835. Aside from meat, the principal animal product of value was butter of which some 5,000 pounds was produced. Neither milk nor cheese was produced in quantities sufficient for commercial use.²⁷

An indication of the economic status of farmers in the Lufty valley is shown by individual statistics. Wesley Enloe was a successful farmer on a relatively large scale. He farmed 200 of his 500 acres which he valued at \$3,000. His livestock was valued at \$934 and included 8 horses, 12 milk and 24 beef cows, 2 oxen, 15 sheep, and 60 hogs. In 1849, he produced 25 bushels of wheat, 50 of rye, 800 of corn, and 50 of oats. Young Samuel Beck was not so well established; he cultivated 50 of his 90 acres, had 4 horses, 6 cows, 18 sheep,

²⁴ Agriculture Schedules, Seventh Census, 1850, Haywood County, 453; Eighth Census, 1860, Jackson County, 18-19.

²⁵ Agriculture Schedules, Seventh Census, 1850, Haywood County, 453; Eighth Census, 1860, Jackson County, 18-19.

²⁶ Agriculture Schedules, Seventh Census, 1850, Haywood County, 453; Eighth Census, 1860, Jackson County, 18-19.

²⁷ Agriculture Schedules, Seventh Census, 1850, Haywood County, 453; Eighth Census, 1860, 18-19, and Ninth Census, 1870, Jackson County.

and 12 hogs. His efforts yielded 14 bushels of rye, 6 of wheat, 10 of oats, 300 of corn, and 50 pounds of tobacco. A few inhabitants were more prosperous than Enloe or of smaller means than young Beck, but the economic position of most lay within these indicated bounds.²⁸

Virtually all of the adult males were farmers, yet occasionally one found employment as a miller, mechanic, blacksmith, or tanner. The principal industrial installation near the Oconaluftee was the Mingus Creek Mill; it used an overshot water wheel and was employed principally for grinding corn. In 1886, it was replaced by a turbine mill which is still standing.²⁹

The valley of the Oconaluftee not only provided unusual opportunities for prosperous agricultural development, but its upper reaches afforded the best route for crossing the Smokies into Tennessee. Long before white settlers had penetrated these lands, the Indians had come to use this Indian Gap Trail as one of their principal trading paths in the whole mountain region. It is interesting to note that when a turnpike road was projected in the 1830's to approximate the route of the early Indian path, one of its prime supporters was Colonel William H. Thomas, the Cherokee agent.³⁰

The Oconaluftee Turnpike Company was chartered by the North Carolina legislature in 1832. Among the commissioners for the road were Samuel Sherill, John Beck, and Abraham Enloe.³¹ The actual work advanced slowly. Even when it was opened to use one observer referred to it as a "mule path."³² However, it appears that large numbers of cattle and hogs were driven over it from East Tennessee. In the lower part of the valley these numbers were augmented by local stock and all were driven to market usually in the towns of upper South Carolina.³³ The road also helped

²⁸ Agriculture Schedules, Seventh Census, 1850, Haywood County, 453; Eighth Census, 1860, 18-19, Ninth Census, 1870, Jackson County. See also the inventory of the estate of John Beck, Wills, Jackson County, I, 74-77.

²⁹ Population Schedules, Seventh Census, 1850, Haywood County, 165, 167; Wilburn, Mingus Creek Mill.

³⁰ Wilburn, "Indian Gap Trail"; Myers, "Indian Trails," 771-775.

³¹ Wilburn, "Indian Gap Trail."

³² Avery and Boardman, "Arnold Guyot's Notes," 284.

³³ Wilburn, "Indian Gap Trail"; Minutes of the Macon County Court, Clerk's Office, Franklin, March 28, 1829, 16.

to promote contact with the settlements on the forks of the Little Pigeon River in East Tennessee.³⁴

The scarcity of records makes it difficult to determine how much contact the inhabitants of the valley had with the outside world. As a part of Haywood County, "Oconolufy" was named as an election precinct in 1831. From time to time the county court appointed road jurors and impaneled individuals to serve on trial juries from the area.³⁵ There is meager evidence that the farmers of the valley had business dealings with firms and individuals at the county seat at Waynesville, and periodic meetings were held with associated church groups.³⁶

Indeed the religious institutions loomed large in the lives of these early settlers. The principal denomination along the Oconaluftee as in so many other pioneer communities was the Baptist. Records of other faiths have not come to light, but membership in a Baptist congregation was so widely held in the valley that other denominations could have been of but secondary importance in the picture of local religious life.

The Lufty Baptist Church was constituted as a separate congregation in 1836. Among its charter members were listed such prominent residents of the valley as John Jacob Mingus and three of his sons, Robert Collins, John and Samuel Beck, and Samuel Conner. Prayer meetings and church business meetings were held alternately at the residences of Samuel Conner on the West Fork, and John Jacob Mingus on the Bradley Fork until a church was erected on land donated by John Beck.³⁷

The membership concerned itself with a number of matters of church business and morals. A moderator and deacons were chosen periodically, new members were received and a letter of "dismission" was granted to persons moving to other places. The congregation was called upon to review

³⁴ See references to East Tennesseans in Lufty Baptist Church Minutes, manuscript in the possession of Mrs. Ben Fisher, Smokemont, National Park, microfilm copy on file, State Department of Archives and History, and photocopy in the Library, National Park, I, 5, 11, 52; Wills, Jackson County, I, 74-77; Arthur, *Western North Carolina*, 209.

³⁵ Minutes of Haywood County Court, June 30, 1831, Book J, 12.

³⁶ Wills, Haywood County, Book ½, 44-47.

³⁷ Minutes of the Lufty Baptist Church, I, 6 (of the Introduction).

the conduct of certain members and occasionally one was dismissed from the brotherhood. Delegates were chosen to travel to associational meetings in places as distant as Cullowhee and northern Georgia.³⁸

Census data on literacy indicates that there was some effort, however sporadic, to provide opportunities for formal education in the valley. Often the heads of the earlier households could read and write, although in many instances their wives were not literate. In some families where the parents were not literate, their children were afforded the chance to attend school from time to time.³⁹ There are occasional references to individual teachers in the later period, but they provide no answers to the numerous questions which must arise concerning the educational methods in that place and time.

The available documents might provide longer and more detailed studies of certain aspects of life in the "Lufty" Valley, but the foregoing summarizes the information to be gleaned from such sources. The picture is one of a relatively prosperous community made up of devout, hard-working people. One does not get the impression of a society left behind but rather of one whose vitality would compare most favorably with that found on frontiers elsewhere in the mid-nineteenth century.

On the other hand there may be discerned here the seeds of mountaineer isolation and "backwardness." The large families led to ever-increasing demand for farms for the young adult males. This led inexorably to the lands on the more remote tributaries of the Oconaluftee in narrower valleys and on steeper hillsides.⁴⁰ The tempo of life here was no match for that in a nation of expanding industries, burgeoning cities, and rapid transportation and communication. It may be that Kephart's people were not so "backward" as the rest of the nation was "forward." Much needs to be done

³⁸ Minutes of the Lufty Baptist Church, I, 1, 6; typed copy of an autobiographical account by Edward Clarence Conner, a former resident, files, National Park Headquarters.

³⁹ Population Schedules, Seventh Census, 1850, Haywood County, 165-167.

⁴⁰ For pertinent data on this secondary migration, see North Carolina Park Commission, Land Title Abstracts, III, 1-21, 566-598; IV, 148-178, 777-802, 862-880.

in analyzing the documents of the later period to seek an explanation for the increased isolation of the mountain regions from the currents of the twentieth century.

But in a sense, the study of mountain culture is entering a new and highly significant phase. The Western North Carolina Historical Association founded in 1952, has launched an ambitious program to encourage research and publication in the field of mountain history.⁴¹ Mrs. Wilma Dykeman Stokely is following her important study of the French Broad River country with one on the Great Smokies.⁴²

The renewed interest in pioneer culture by the Great Smoky Mountains National Park will make a worth-while contribution to the knowledge of the subject as well as to tourist interest. Although the beginnings of a pioneer culture program were undertaken by H. C. Wilburn and others in the 1930's, it was forced by circumstances to take a secondary place because of the emphasis on natural history. Pioneer artifacts gathered in the 1930's by Charles S. Grossman and other National Park Service personnel will soon be displayed in a new pioneer museum to be located in the Oconaluftee Valley. The museum will house the collections which have been accumulated and catalogued, and a continuing program of historical research and interpretation will take shape in the years to come.

These recent developments cannot help but produce new insight into the culture of the mountains of western North Carolina. But every encouragement must be given to this work for time is short. Every year marks the passing of older settlers who may possess or know of the existence of documentary material, and the lapse of time increases the opportunity for the loss or destruction of such papers. They must be preserved, and only through the selfless co-operation of interested individuals and organizations can this worthy work be brought to a successful conclusion.

⁴¹ Clarence W. Griffin, "History and Progress of the Western North Carolina Historical Association," *The North Carolina Historical Review*, XXXIII (April, 1956), 202-212.

⁴² "Historical News," *The North Carolina Historical Review*, XXXIV (July, 1957), 449-450.

APPLETON OAKSMITH, FILIBUSTER AGENT

By JOHN J. TEPASKE*

No phase of the manifest-destiny movement created more excitement in the American press than the Nicaraguan expedition of the filibuster William Walker.¹ In this, "the most audacious piece of unofficial imperialism in the history of American foreign politics,"² Walker planned to establish a Central American empire that would ultimately include Spanish Cuba. Whether Walker's conquests were, like Texas, to be annexed to the Union is conjectural, but in the United States he had many adherents. Of these none labored more earnestly to organize American support for the Nicaraguan undertaking than Appleton Oaksmith, the filibuster's chief agent during 1856.

Oaksmith's place in this enterprise has received little attention. In his own narrative Walker fails to recognize this ambitious manipulator, who became his chief diplomat,³ supply agent, recruiter, and financier in the United States. Oaksmith's papers have lain in the musty, termite-ridden attic of his North Carolina home for almost eighty years. Their discovery now reveals Oaksmith's vital importance to the Walker cause and brings to light new information about filibuster organization and techniques during this restless era.

A brief narrative of Oaksmith's kaleidoscopic career will best explain the underlying motives for his participation in Walker's venture.

He was born on St. Valentine's Day of 1827 in Portland,

* Mr. John J. TePaske is an Assistant Professor of History at Memphis State University, Memphis, Tennessee.

¹ The standard work on Walker's expedition is W. O. Scroggs, *Filibusters and Financiers* (New York, 1916), hereinafter cited as Scroggs, *Filibusters and Financiers*. Walker's own account, *War in Nicaragua* (Mobile, 1860), is the best military narrative.

² Quoted from Dexter Perkins, *The Monroe Doctrine, 1826-1867* (Baltimore, 1933), 230.

³ Oaksmith's diplomatic activities constitute a separate story, but his duties as Minister Plenipotentiary of Nicaragua to the United States took much of his time and effort during the summer and fall of 1856.

Maine.⁴ Although he had no formal education, he learned from his cultured mother, who taught him four languages and stimulated his interest in the arts and sciences.⁵ In 1843 he added to these already varied studies by sailing to the Orient. Two years later he returned to the new family home in New York City.

By 1845 travel and reading had developed the eighteen-year-old Oaksmith into an urbane man of experience, but they did not prevent a costly involvement with a charming New York woman. Debts incurred during this affair became so oppressive that they caused his hurried departure for Panama in 1847.⁶ Here he spent three uneventful years as a shipping agent. Unhappy in the tropics, Oaksmith then went to San Francisco to pursue the same occupation. He also became a leading member of a vigilance committee, established after the great fire of 1851 to deal with lawlessness in the devastated city.

His shipping agency was a dismal failure. He therefore bought a small ship with money obtained from a law suit and in 1851 put to sea. He visited Mexico, Peru, Brazil, and finally Africa, where he evidently hoped to secure a cargo of slaves.⁷ As he sailed up the Congo River in June, 1852, hostile natives attacked his ship. Luckily for the har-

⁴ His father was Seba Smith, a Portland newspaper editor; his mother was Elizabeth Oakes Prince Smith, a poet and writer. Both achieved prominence in mid-nineteenth century American literary circles. See the sketch of Elizabeth Oakes Prince Smith by Louise M. Moore and Robert W. Bolwell, and of Seba Smith by Mary Alice Wyman, Dumas Malone and Others, *Dictionary of American Biography* (New York: 20 volumes and index [with Supplementary Volumes XXI and XXII], 1928-), XVII, 260-261 and 345-346 respectively. See also Mary Alice Wyman, *Selections from the Autobiography of Elizabeth Oakes Smith* (Lewiston, 1924), and *Two American Pioneers* (New York, 1926). The manuscript autobiography of Elizabeth Oakes Smith is in the Elizabeth Oakes Smith Collection, New York Public Library. Appleton received his first name from a former president of Bowdoin College, of which his father was an alumnus. He adopted the name Oaksmith early in his career to have a more distinguished title for his business activities.

⁵ *Weekly Record* (Beaufort), November 18, 1887.

⁶ Journal of Appleton Oaksmith, Acapulco, Mexico, April 18, 1851. Appleton Oaksmith Papers, Manuscript Division, Duke University Library, Durham, hereinafter cited as Oaksmith Papers.

⁷ Despite Oaksmith's vigorous denials, the suspicion of Brazilian officials that his ship was a slaver, his own failure to denote the intended cargo, and the native attack on his ship all lead to the conclusion that he was seeking slaves. For Oaksmith's denials see Journal of Appleton Oaksmith, At Sea, April 26, 1852, Oaksmith Papers.

assed Oaksmith, a nearby British man-of-war intervened at the last moment and beat back the savages.⁸ This incident, however, forced him to leave Africa without his intended cargo. Late in 1852, after a stop in Haiti, he returned to New York.

A more sedentary life proved less exciting but more profitable for Oaksmith. In New York he established another shipping firm and became immediately successful, but this prosperity lasted only a short time. In 1855 he became enmeshed in the abortive Quitman scheme to supply Cuban revolutionists with arms and ammunition.⁹ A year later his activities on behalf of William Walker entangled him in even deeper financial troubles, wiping out whatever wealth and reputation he may have acquired before 1855. From 1857 to 1861 he became successively a magazine editor, railroad speculator, and paper mill owner.

Oaksmith also drifted into politics and became an active member of New York's Tammany Hall. Working through this organization, he and others arranged mass meetings to work up support for Walker in 1856.¹⁰ Later in 1861 he became a leader of Tammany's Union League—a committee of New York Democrats seeking peaceful solutions to sectional problems. As one of three commissioners appointed by the League, Oaksmith was to discuss grievances with leading southern statesmen and consider conciliatory proposals.¹¹ Unfortunately, he and his two cohorts never carried out their charge. War broke out in April, 1861, forcing the League to abandon its plans.

Oaksmith's return to the shipping business at the beginning of the Civil War marked his investment in another illicit enterprise. In the fall of 1861, he outfitted a slaver in Boston, hotbed of New England abolitionism. Not even a pro-slave

⁸ Journal of Appleton Oaksmith, off Shark's Point on the Congo River, June 27, 1852, Oaksmith Papers.

⁹ Oaksmith's part in this venture is set forth in the Journal of Appleton Oaksmith, May 26, 1855-October 18, 1855, Oaksmith Collection, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, hereinafter cited as Oaksmith Collection.

¹⁰ See the *New York Herald*, May 10 and May 24, 1856, and the discussion of the episodes below.

¹¹ Copy of credentials given to Appleton Oaksmith by the Union League, New York, January 28, 1861, Oaksmith Papers.

speech in Old North Church could have created more of a stir, and in December he was indicted for his part in the venture. Imprisoned at Fort Lafayette, he had nine months to mull over his indiscretion while awaiting trial. In the meantime, however, with the help of friends who bribed his guards, Oaksmith escaped to Portland, Maine, where he was sheltered by his maternal grandmother.¹² Here he stayed until late in 1863 when he left for England.

In England he became captain of a blockade runner. Sailing between Liverpool and Galveston, Texas, Oaksmith provided the Confederacy with English guns and ammunition in return for southern cotton. His first voyage early in 1864 was without incident, but on his second trip later in the year, a fast Union frigate overtook him near Galveston. He ultimately had to abandon his ship and its valuable cargo, escaping in a small boat. After some time spent floating in the Gulf of Mexico, he reached Tampico and from there got passage back to England.¹³

Oaksmith could not return to the United States at the close of the war because of the Boston slave-trading charge still pending against him. Thus he remained in England where he continued to make his living as a sea captain. In 1869, however, he left this nomadic life to become associate editor of the London *Cosmopolitan*. During the Franco-Prussian War, he went to France as correspondent for the London *Globe*.¹⁴ At the same time, he helped draw up a plan to furnish military and naval supplies to the embattled French.¹⁵ Again, whatever hopes he entertained for quick profits vanished. The French surrendered before the plan could be put into effect.

Oaksmith was nostalgic for the United States after eight long years in a foreign land. Hoping the passions of war had

¹² *Boston Herald*, January 6, 1862, and the *Raleigh News*, July 11, 1879, which prints an account of the *Boston Herald*, September 11, 1862.

¹³ The details of the escape were provided by Oaksmith's daughters, Mrs. Dorothy Agrillo and Miss Geraldine Oaksmith in an interview in Brooklyn, New York, April 13, 1952.

¹⁴ Articles written by Oaksmith for both the *Cosmopolitan* and the *Globe* may be found in a scrapbook in the Oaksmith Papers.

¹⁵ Agreement over the formation of the William Frear Company, London, December 12, 1870, Oaksmith Papers.

cooled, he and his family left England in June, 1872, on Oaksmith's vessel, the "Troubadour." A few months later he dropped anchor in Beaufort Harbor, North Carolina. On the outskirts of nearby Morehead City, he and his family made their home.

The slave-trading affair still hung ominously over him, and early in 1873 he went to Washington in an effort to erase the stigma of this unfortunate act. The story of this visit is still circulated in the Morehead City area. Oaksmith, it appears, obtained a personal interview with President Grant without disclosing his true identity. After a short conference, Grant signed a pardon for him. When the President asked why he pleaded so earnestly for this man, Oaksmith smugly replied, "Because I am Appleton Oaksmith."¹⁶ Thus absolved, he returned to North Carolina.

As his first southern business venture he accepted the general managership of the Midland North Carolina Railway Company. This organization hoped to build a railroad from Knoxville, Tennessee, across North Carolina to a proposed terminus in Beaufort.¹⁷ As spokesman for the company, Oaksmith went before the House of Representatives in Raleigh in February, 1873, but failed to persuade skeptical legislators to finance the railway.¹⁸ A visit to England for the same purpose later in the year proved equally unrewarding.¹⁹ Returning to Beaufort, he resigned his post with the railroad early in 1874.²⁰

After this business failure Oaksmith entered local politics. In 1874 he won election to the North Carolina House of Representatives on the Republican ticket, which opposed the Ku-Klux Klan. In the House he introduced a bill authorizing his Carteret County constituents to compromise their

¹⁶ This account was related by Mr. Leslie Davis of Beaufort, in an interview on December 14, 1951.

¹⁷ The Midland North Carolina Railway Company Charter, New Bern, February 12, 1873, Oaksmith Papers.

¹⁸ John Morehead to Appleton Oaksmith, Charlotte, February 23, 1873, Oaksmith Papers.

¹⁹ Oaksmith wrote glowing accounts of economic possibilities in North Carolina. See the article by him entitled, "North Carolina and Her Future," *Cosmopolitan* (London), August 28, 1873.

²⁰ Minutes of the meeting of the Board of Directors, Midland North Carolina Railway Company, New Bern, April 9, 1874, Oaksmith Papers.

state debts.²¹ He also introduced and was instrumental in the passage of a bill repealing the Beaufort town charter.²² Otherwise his term in the House merited little attention, and he did not return to Raleigh for another term.

Failure, sickness, and tragedy highlighted Oaksmith's last years. In an effort to contest Wilmington's monopoly of North Carolina shipping, he proposed the dredging of the Neuse River and Beaufort Harbor.²³ He also advocated the erection of dry docks in the Morehead City area.²⁴ Another far-sighted plan called for the development of nearby beaches into resort playgrounds.²⁵ Oaksmith schemed and connived to see these projects through, but lack of financial backing, an unreceptive populace, and restricting malaria attacks frustrated him at every turn. Only through the labor of his devoted wife Augusta, who operated a small ships' store on the shores of Beaufort Harbor, was his family able to survive.

Hand in hand with business setbacks came severe attacks of malaria.²⁶ The tragic drowning of his four daughters on a holiday outing in 1879 only weakened him more and upset his already precarious mental and physical balance.²⁷ In 1886 care by specialists in New York City evidently cured him of his recurring malady, and he returned to North Carolina.²⁸ The next year, however, he suffered another seizure, this time accompanied by paralysis. He again went to New York for treatment but failed to recover. Oaksmith died there on October 29, 1887.

Underlying motives, in any case, are difficult to determine. Yet a brief look at Oaksmith's varied career indicates that

²¹ *Journal of the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina at its Session of 1874-'75* (Raleigh, 1875), 252-253, hereinafter cited *Journal of the House, 1874-'75*.

²² *Journal of the House, 1874-'75*, 507, 535-536.

²³ Appleton Oaksmith to the United States Engineer's Office at Norfolk, Hollywood, August 24, 1878, Oaksmith Papers.

²⁴ Contract for the establishment of the Beaufort Marine Railway Company, New York, November 12, 1877, Oaksmith Papers.

²⁵ Appleton Oaksmith to J. W. Seligman, Hollywood, July 30, 1879, Oaksmith Papers.

²⁶ Alvin Oaksmith to Appleton Oaksmith, Patchogue, June 8, 1877, Oaksmith Papers.

²⁷ Appleton Oaksmith to Zebulon Vance, Hollywood, December 9, 1879, Oaksmith Papers.

²⁸ Appleton Oaksmith to Elizabeth Oakes Smith, New York, August 15, 1886, Oaksmith Collection. This letter describes his stay in New York.

association with the Nicaraguan enterprise was entirely in keeping with his character. Time after time his impetuosity threw him into similar activities in many corners of the world. Imaginative but questionable schemes with possibilities of big profits inevitably attracted him, whether these were supplying a filibuster with guns and equipment, fitting out a slaver, or running a blockade. As an experienced sea captain and dealer in supplies, he could realize high profits should his dangerous investments prove successful. Quick to gamble, Oaksmith surely loved the excitement surrounding his adventures. A less apparent but significant motive for his filibuster predilection was his drive for fame. Walker's victory in Nicaragua would have assured him an important place in the filibuster's Central American empire, in a little pond, it is true, but still he could have won the prominence he desired.

The immediate cause of his interest in Walker is more apparent. On March 18, 1856, General Domingo Goicouría, the Cuban patriot and Oaksmith's intimate friend and associate in 1855, wrote from Granada, Nicaragua, requesting two hundred rifles and sufficient cartridges for them.²⁹ Oaksmith immediately settled a law suit with the New York supply house, William Hitchcock and Company, and opened the way for procurement of supplies for Walker.³⁰

In New York he became acquainted with the filibuster's most avid supporters. In April he met Major George Hall, hero of the Mexican War, son of a former Brooklyn mayor, and Walker's principal agent in New York at that time. It was Hall who obtained and sent supplies and recruits from the Atlantic States to Nicaragua on the ships of the financier Cornelius Vanderbilt. It was this same Hall who enlisted Oaksmith's help in planning a mass meeting to stir up support for Walker in New York City.

Tammany Hall members played a large part in fostering the filibuster cause in New York, and Oaksmith joined them on May 6 to draw up plans for the mass meeting. Conspicuous

²⁹ General Domingo Goicouría to Appleton Oaksmith, Granada, March 18, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

³⁰ Agreement between Appleton Oaksmith and William Hitchcock and Company, New York, April 14, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

among the pompous schemers at the Saint Charles Saloon were Hall and Tammany politicians like John Clancy, New York City Alderman from the Fifth Ward.³¹ They set May 9 as the date for the public gathering in National Hall. It was to express sympathy with the cause of liberty in Nicaragua and to obtain pledges of money and supplies for Walker's "struggling patriots." Their handbill vigorously headlined: "No pent up Utica contracts our powers. The whole boundless continent is ours."³²

The Saloon conference also drew up an imposing slate of speakers. Among those asked to attend—with two days' notice—were the Democratic presidential aspirants Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois and Lewis Cass of Michigan. Other luminaries included Robert Toombs and Alexander Morton of Georgia, Judah P. Benjamin of Louisiana, John Quitman of Mississippi, J. B. Weller of California, and Hiram Walbridge, Daniel Sickels, and Gilbert Dean of New York. Even today, in the age of the jet airliner, two days warning for such an occasion would be extremely presumptuous. In 1856 it was preposterous. The *New York Daily Tribune* noted that it would be easy to excuse the absence of the distinguished orators whose names were obviously being used to attract a crowd. Perhaps the notice of the meeting meant to invite the speakers as well as the audience. Surely the crowd would have to be content with the "smaller fry."³³

The May 9 meeting was nonetheless large and enthusiastic. A noisy crowd of 1,500 people filled National Hall and spilled over onto the steps outside. Though none of the important speakers appeared, the Tammany Hall "smaller fry" on the rostrum read telegrams from both Cass and Morton, which expressed sympathy with the meeting. Oaksmith read the resolutions drawn up by the planning conference, three of which stood out. First, the United States should recognize the Walker Government in Nicaragua; second, the United States should renounce the neutrality laws which prevented American recruits from going to Walker's aid; third, financial

³¹ *New York Daily Tribune*, May 7, 1856.

³² Original draft of handbill, New York, May 6, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

³³ *New York Daily Tribune*, May 9, 1856.

help must be given Walker to carry on his campaign in Central America. Several august politicians like John Clancy delivered eloquent manifest-destiny speeches. H. N. Wild, a New York City Councilman, pledged five hundred rifles and five hundred thousand cartridges for Walker. He commented that he would rather see them sent to Nicaragua than to Kansas.³⁴

Press reaction to the gathering varied. The *New York Daily News* applauded the "intense and profound attachment of the true people to the cause of liberty in Central America."³⁵ Strong support also came from the *Herald* and the *Sun*.³⁶ Among the opponents, the *New York Daily Times* pointed out that the "Democrats of Tammany never presented a more imposing list, and never fell further from fulfillment of their promises."³⁷ The *Mirror* classed the leaders of the meeting as "politicians of the office seeking stamp."³⁸ The *Evening Express* joined the critics of the meeting with less caustic but derogatory comments.³⁹

Response to the meeting could not have delighted its planners more. The adulation of the overflow crowd and the appearance of their names in all the New York newspapers prompted plans for another, larger gathering. Forsaking the Saint Charles Saloon for the more elegant Astor House, Oaksmith and his cohorts met on May 16 to lay plans for a May 23 meeting. Elaborate preparations called for one hundred cannon to announce the assembly, this time to be held in the park rather than National Hall in order to accommodate a larger crowd. The attraction of the cannon made an impressive list of speakers unnecessary, for the new slate was much less pretentious than the previous one. Press relations became Oaksmith's charge while Clancy, Wild, Hall, and others arranged for the cannon, invitations, music, and speakers.⁴⁰

³⁴ *New York Herald*, May 10, 1856.

³⁵ *New York Daily News*, May 10, 1856.

³⁶ *New York Herald*, May 10, 1856; *Sun* (New York), May 10, 1856.

³⁷ *New York Daily Times*, May 10, 1856.

³⁸ *Evening Mirror*, (New York), May 10, 1856.

³⁹ *New York Evening Express*, May 10, 1856.

⁴⁰ Minutes of the planning conference, New York, May 16, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

Tammany's artillery did its job well. The guns enticed between five and fifteen thousand people into the park.⁴¹ Except for the booming of the cannon and the marked increase in attendance, the second meeting followed the pattern set by the first. The same militant speeches prefaced pleas of aid for Walker. From the podium Oaksmith repeated the resolutions of the previous meeting, reveling in his new-found glory. Despite the noise of the crowd, which at times bordered on rowdiness, there is no record that this enthusiasm brought about donations or promises such as H. N. Wild had given earlier.⁴²

At the close of the meeting, its leaders and most of the raucous audience organized an impromptu parade. Led by the music of Shelton's band, they stepped gaily up Broadway to the Metropolitan Hotel, temporary residence of Walker's new Minister to the United States, Padre Agustín Vijil. The crowd called noisily for the Padre, who finally appeared on the balcony of the hotel. He thanked the crowd for its reception with a few remarks in Spanish, interpreted by the ubiquitous Oaksmith. The parade then moved down Broadway and dispersed.⁴³ Press comments on the second meeting and the parade differed little from reactions to the first, as the New York papers hewed to the same lines.

Major Hall also led Oaksmith into recruiting for the filibuster cause. Early in 1856 Hall had encountered many obstacles in securing men for Walker, largely because of the vigorously upright District Attorney of New York, John McKeon. McKeon had challenged the legality of Hall's methods and attempted to prosecute all those Hall enlisted to fight in Central America.⁴⁴ A second difficulty was the opposition of Cornelius Vanderbilt, who possessed the charter of the Accessory Transit Company and owned the ships on which recruits travelled to Nicaragua. Initially, he offered free passage for 250 volunteers. Then in March, 1856, Walker turned the charter over to Charles Morgan and Cornelius Garrison, two

⁴¹ The hostile *New York Tribune* estimated 5,000 while the sympathetic *New York Herald* estimated 15,000.

⁴² *New York Herald*, May 24, 1856.

⁴³ *New York Herald*, May 24, 1856.

⁴⁴ Scroggs, *Filibusters and Financiers*, 140-148.

former officers of the Accessory Transit Company. Vanderbilt was enraged and vowed to destroy Walker and his employees.⁴⁵ At the same time, he offered Oaksmith a high-paying position with his firm for assistance in wrecking the filibuster movement and in ruining Morgan and Garrison. Oaksmith refused the tempting offer, however, and cast his lot with the filibusters. He had already tasted imminent glory in the two mass meetings.⁴⁶ Still, the interval between Walker's confiscation of Vanderbilt's charter and the reinstatement of the Nicaraguan run by Morgan and Garrison was critical, as it left Hall without ships for carrying recruits to Central America.

Weary of these troubles and impressed by Oaksmith's enthusiastic backing of the two mass meetings, Hall placed all recruiting correspondence in Oaksmith's hands and charged him with organization of a new recruiting system.⁴⁷ Oaksmith immediately began to answer inquiries from all parts of the United States about ways of joining Walker. He invited interested volunteers to act as his procurement officers in their home towns.⁴⁸ To insure discipline on the voyage to Nicaragua, he encouraged those enlisting from the same area to choose officers before they left for embarkation in New York.⁴⁹ Oaksmith clearly pointed out, however, that agents for Walker's government could not sign military recruits, only emigrants.⁵⁰ All volunteers thus became ostensible emigrants, as Oaksmith worked to circumvent any legal difficulties with McKeon and to prevent another "Crampton Affair."⁵¹

⁴⁵ Scroggs, *Filibusters and Financiers*, 152.

⁴⁶ There is no documentary evidence of such a meeting, but the account of Vanderbilt's proposal to Oaksmith was given by Mrs. Dorothy Agrillo in an interview in Brooklyn, New York, April 13, 1952. Oaksmith and Vanderbilt were acquainted, however, and corresponded later about another matter.

⁴⁷ Oaksmith Papers for late 1855 and early 1856 contain many letters to Hall requesting information about Walker.

⁴⁸ See papers for the month of June, 1856, *passim*, Oaksmith Papers.

⁴⁹ Appleton Oaksmith to James Neal, New York, June 14, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁵⁰ Appleton Oaksmith to E. D. Denson, New York, June 14, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁵¹ John F. Crampton was a British diplomat accused by the United States Government of recruiting illegally for the British Army in the United States. See Richard W. Van Alstyne, "John F. Crampton, Conspirator or Dupe?" *American Historical Review*, XLI (1936), 493-502.

Oaksmith could not miss the opportunity to make a personal visit to Nicaragua and interrupted his recruiting activities in the early summer of 1856. On June 24 he left New York on the "Orizaba" to attend Walker's inauguration. On board the ship were a number of filibusters and many war supplies for the filibuster, yet the *New York Herald* wrote:

The only persons known to have filibustering tendencies that went off with the steamer were, Major George Hall, of Northern Light notoriety, and Appleton Oaksmith Esq. . . . These two gentlemen stood alone high up on the roof of the hurricane deck, and as the ship left the dock, they waved their handkerchiefs and smoked their segars [*sic*] in a perfect halo of present satisfaction and prospective glory.⁵²

Prospective glory was theirs, or at least imposing titles. Hall remained in Nicaragua as Commissary General of Walker's Army while Oaksmith became Minister Plenipotentiary of Nicaragua to the United States and Agent of the Nicaraguan Government.

Upon his return to the United States, Oaksmith optimistically laid down a plan of recruit procurement similar to one used by Walker's agents in New Orleans in 1855.⁵³ This new scheme established a Nicaraguan Emigration Agency, headed by a certain Alexander Lawrence. Its outward purpose was supplying information to the public on settlement prospects in Nicaragua; its more clandestine aim was to provide a clearing house for recruits and adventurers under the guise of a settlement promotion agency.

On August 28 the New York newspapers announced Oaksmith's plan. He offered single men 250 acres of Nicaraguan land and families 350 acres. Those taking advantage of the offer were to relinquish a parcel of this land to Lawrence, who would use it as his agency's capital stock. Single men gave up one hundred acres and families two hundred acres. Single men desiring free passage to Nicaragua gave Morgan and Garrison an additional sixty-six acres while families

⁵² *New York Herald*, June 25, 1856.

⁵³ Scroggs, *Filibusters and Financiers*, 139.

donated 133 acres. The Colonization Director of Nicaragua would allot the land upon the emigrant's arrival.⁵⁴

Response to the plan was meager indeed, for its ingenious provisions ultimately promised little to the prospective settler. A family emigrating to Nicaragua free received only seventeen of the 350 acres originally granted. Eighty-four acre plots for single men were more attractive, but there was no assurance their land would be anything but worthless tropical jungle. Nevertheless, while the agency failed to lure the steady, hard-working pioneer, it did provide a publicized information center for military prospects.

Oaksmith also encouraged recruiting agents laboring under his old system. Early in September he promised financial support to Colonel Jack Allen, his principal recruiter in the Kentucky-Tennessee area.⁵⁵ In the same month he appointed a new agent in New Orleans⁵⁶ and sent two more into the Southwest.⁵⁷ He also bolstered the few semi-official recruiters in smaller cities and towns.

Oaksmith's early efforts had revitalized the recruiting work, but by September lack of co-ordination among Walker's adherents led to a decline in the number of men obtained. In August, for example, Fermín Ferrer, Walker's Secretary of State, signed an emigration agreement with a General William Cazneau of Texas. In negotiations conducted without Oaksmith's knowledge, the Texan was granted the right to procure 1,000 able-bodied colonists for Nicaragua.⁵⁸ On September 13 Cazneau wrote Oaksmith requesting details on travel arrangements.⁵⁹ In his cautious reply Oaksmith asked more information about Cazneau's activities.⁶⁰ The General arrogantly refused to give any details, stating that

⁵⁴ *New York Herald*, August 28, 1856. See also the Emigration Agreement, New York, August 30, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁵⁵ Appleton Oaksmith to Colonel Jack Allen, New York, September 1, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁵⁶ Appleton Oaksmith to William Walker, New York, September 11, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁵⁷ Appleton Oaksmith to William Walker, New York, September 23, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁵⁸ Scroggs, *Filibusters and Financiers*, 236.

⁵⁹ William Cazneau to Appleton Oaksmith, New York, September 13, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁶⁰ Appleton Oaksmith to William Cazneau, New York, September 18, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

he was proceeding independently.⁶¹ Later Oaksmith wrote to Walker with irritation that such unco-operative attitudes caused his plans to go "awry."⁶²

Recruiting factionalism also developed in New Orleans. Here Colonel John Jaquess had served as Walker's chief recruiter until the fall of 1856. Then on September 28 Oaksmith appointed a new agent, Pierre Mancosos, to take over the New Orleans office. Jaquess immediately protested his ouster and requested equal status with Mancosos.⁶³ For almost three weeks the New Orleans agents hurled strikingly bitter recriminations at one another with their reciprocal accusations of lavish spending, speculation, and indifference to the filibuster cause. Oaksmith finally smoothed out these difficulties by establishing two separate offices, but in the meantime recruiting work had suffered.⁶⁴

Reports of the New Orleans agents and others indicate why Oaksmith's recruiting system collapsed in the fall of 1856. Mancosos wrote pessimistically that "the approaching election engrosses all minds here" and that few would leave for Nicaragua.⁶⁵ Jaquess stated that failure to have ships ready to sail for Central America hampered his activities. Many of the men he had signed were returning to their homes.⁶⁶ Oaksmith believed that the inability of Walker to achieve a decisive military victory contributed to the scarcity of volunteers.⁶⁷ Newspaper accounts also painted a bleak picture of Walker's position and undoubtedly discouraged enlistments. Favorite themes of these papers were the sickness, poverty, death, and desertion, which were thinning the

⁶¹ William Cazneau to Appleton Oaksmith, New York, September 19, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁶² Appleton Oaksmith to William Walker, New York, September 22, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁶³ John Jaquess to Appleton Oaksmith, New Orleans, October 2, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁶⁴ Pierre Mancosos to Appleton Oaksmith, New Orleans, October 13, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁶⁵ Pierre Mancosos to Appleton Oaksmith, New Orleans, October 13, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁶⁶ John Jaquess to Appleton Oaksmith, New Orleans, October 2, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁶⁷ Appleton Oaksmith to William Walker, New York, September 11, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

ranks of Walker's vagabond army.⁶⁸ Walker's decree of September 22 establishing slavery in Nicaragua possibly deterred some Northern expansionists who would have fought for the filibuster. Oaksmith's earlier recruiting efforts had secured between five hundred and one thousand men, but by the end of October, he could persuade few new volunteers to go to Walker's assistance.

In the procurement of supplies, Oaksmith walked on more familiar ground. His knowledge of trade and shipping had been acquired from ten years' experience. In New York he had the reputation of one who dealt extensively in arms, ammunition, and goods of war.⁶⁹ Walker could have found few men better fitted than Oaksmith to take on his supply problems.

He quickly proved his mettle by obtaining many goods for shipment to the filibuster despite his absorption in recruiting and propaganda work. Among the supplies he shipped on the "Orizaba" on June 24 were five hundred percussion muskets, one hundred Sharp's rifles, 120,000 cartridges for the muskets, and fifty thousand for the rifles. He also sent bacon, bread, camp kettles, coffee, crackers, fives, spoons, and sugar.⁷⁰ These articles, which he remitted on credit, were originally intended for the 1855 Cuban expedition. Now their shipment to Nicaragua filled Walker's needs and gave Oaksmith hope of salvaging his earlier investment.

As Walker's official agent, he redoubled his supply procurement efforts upon his return from Central America in August. In Nicaragua the Quartermaster General's Department, the Ordnance Department, and the Commissary Department had given Oaksmith long lists of their needs.⁷¹ Awaiting him upon his arrival in New York were more requests which he was expected to satisfy.⁷² Altogether these requisitions pro-

⁶⁸ *New York Daily Tribune*, September 2, 1856.

⁶⁹ *New York Herald*, November 3, 1855.

⁷⁰ List of goods shipped on the "Orizaba," New York, June 24, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁷¹ Requisitions of the Nicaraguan Army, Granada, Nicaragua, July 16, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁷² F. F. Fischer to Appleton Oaksmith, Granada, July 25, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

vide an interesting commentary on Walker's situation. Those marked *A* listed absolute necessities; those marked *B* listed less significant items and so on to the *G* list. On the *A* requisition were account books, anvils, blankets, boots, buttons, drawers, hats, pants, kettles, and pots while arms and food were relegated to less important categories.

Whether Oaksmith furnished supplies for the army departments in order of their importance cannot be ascertained from receipts of goods sent; only medical articles have been itemized. Still he achieved some success and provided 248 cases of war supplies for Walker in the fall of 1856. In September the "Texas" sailed with 103 cases in its hold; in October the "Tennessee" left the United States with 145 more, testimony to Oaksmith's skill in handling the filibuster's supply problems.⁷³

Hand in hand with his responsibilities as purchasing agent went the duty of executing contracts already concluded by Walker's followers in the United States. Such a contract was effected by Francisco Alejandro Lainé, a Cuban friend of General Goicouría. Lainé had made an agreement for five thousand Minié barreled rifles with Benjamin Perkins, a Worcester, Massachusetts, manufacturer. Under its terms the rifles would be ready for Walker on October 20, 1856, at a cost of \$17.25 apiece. Financial arrangements called for a small cash down payment, but in the main, were predicated upon a proposed Nicaraguan bond issue.⁷⁴ Since Lainé left the United States on the "Orizaba" the day after signing this contract, Oaksmith became obliged to fulfill its terms.

When the October 20 deadline arrived, neither party could carry out its part of the bargain. Perkins had not manufactured the rifles, and Oaksmith had neither the cash down payment nor the promised Nicaraguan bonds. Thus, he and James Devoe, an agent for Perkins, made a supplementary agreement for 2,120 rifles instead of the five thousand originally promised but with almost identical financial arrange-

⁷³ Receipts of goods shipped on the "Texas" and "Tennessee," New York, September and October, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁷⁴ Contract between Benjamin Perkins and Francisco Alejandro Lainé, Worcester, June 23, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

ments.⁷⁵ Oaksmith also signed a large contract with William Hitchcock and Company for five hundred Sharp's rifles, one thousand Minié rifles, five hundred Colt revolvers, five thousand blouses, five hundred sabers, and innumerable other items costing \$250,000, again to be financed by the hoped-for bond issue.⁷⁶ This was by far the largest contract yet made for Walker but Oaksmith's last as the filibuster's official agent and ultimately his most miserable failure as supply negotiator.

Oaksmith's real problem lay not in his inability to contract for supplies but in his inability to pay for them. While Walker's backers in the United States were outspoken in support of his enterprise, they did not convert their effusiveness into dollars for Walker's treasury. All attempts to secure money from apparent friends of the filibuster in the United States failed miserably despite the pleas of Oaksmith, Morgan, and Garrison.⁷⁷ These men had made great financial sacrifices, albeit for personal prestige and profit; now they wished American believers in manifest destiny—for nobler motives—to do likewise. They were sadly disappointed.

Twice during 1856 Walker lost superb opportunities to get aid and money from Cornelius Vanderbilt. In March the rich shipping magnate had offered free passage to 250 volunteers, but Walker's untimely cancelling of the Transit Company's charter prevented recruiters in the United States from taking advantage of the offer.⁷⁸ Apparently, Vanderbilt was, or should have been, completely alienated by Walker's deed. Yet in August General Goicouría, who had returned to the United States, persuaded the then vengeful Commodore to advance the Nicaraguan Government \$100,000 for return of his old transit rights. Vanderbilt promised an additional \$150,000 during the course of the year, once the bargain was carried out.⁷⁹ Either unaware of his backers' desper-

⁷⁵ Contract between James Devoe and Appleton Oaksmith, New York, October 22, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁷⁶ Contract between William Hitchcock and Company and Appleton Oaksmith as agent for the Nicaraguan Government, New York, October 29, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁷⁷ Charles Morgan to Appleton Oaksmith, New York, September 22, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁷⁸ Scroggs, *Filibusters and Financiers*, 219.

⁷⁹ Scroggs, *Filibusters and Financiers*, 221.

ate financial straits or too stubborn to accept aid from a man who had sworn to ruin him, Walker refused the offer and admonished Goicouría for making the arrangements.⁸⁰

Lack of donations and Walker's rejection of Vanderbilt's proposal made recourse to a bond issue an extreme necessity if the filibuster was to continue in Central America. Plans for the issue evoked the enthusiasm of Oaksmith and others who were hard pressed to finance recruiting and to meet obligations incurred in supply contracts. When Oaksmith visited Nicaragua at the time of Walker's inauguration, he strongly advocated the vital need for the bonds and possibly drew up the provisions of the loan decree himself.⁸¹

The terms of the July 22 proclamation provided for issuance of \$2,000,000 in bonds of various denominations. The securities would mature in twenty years at an interest rate of seven per cent per annum, payable each year in New York. Plots of land in Nicaragua would serve as security for bond buyers should the Nicaraguan Government forfeit on any part of its obligations. Oaksmith was negotiator of the loan for Walker. Its avowed purpose was the development of the resources of Nicaragua, but its underlying intent was obviously the financing of Walker's Nicaraguan venture.⁸²

Oaksmith optimistically returned from Nicaragua by way of New Orleans. Here he discussed the bond issue with Pierre Soulé, M. Pilcher, and S. F. Slatter, adherents of Walker in that city. All three adamantly refused to support his new plan,⁸³ and later went to Nicaragua themselves to make their own loan arrangements. Their decree for \$500,000 in securities promised only six per cent interest secured by one million acres of public land. Unlike Oaksmith, these men were backed by a reputable bank, which promised to pay the interest. Ultimately they sold the few Nicaraguan bonds which were issued in the United States.⁸⁴

⁸⁰ Scroggs, *Filibusters and Financiers*, 221.

⁸¹ The date of the decree coinciding with Oaksmith's visit to Nicaragua strongly suggests that he drew up the terms of the decree.

⁸² Loan Decree of the Nicaraguan Government, Granada, July 22, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁸³ Appleton Oaksmith to William Walker, New York, August 9, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁸⁴ Scroggs, *Filibusters and Financiers*, 210.

Unsuccessful in New Orleans, Oaksmith returned to New York. He too hoped to obtain support for his loan promotion from a well-established bank. In September he requested and obtained an interview with the financiers Duncan Sherman and Company but could not keep the appointment because of pressing diplomatic business in Washington.⁸⁵ He asserted late in November that "reputable capitalists" were considering the bond issue,⁸⁶ but it is unlikely they were deliberating over the matter seriously. If Oaksmith had made contacts other than Duncan Sherman and Company, they are not apparent from his papers.

His failure to persuade a bank to promote the bond issue was only one reason for the ill-success of his efforts. More important was that Walker's star was waning in Nicaragua. Had the bonds been put on the market, there would have been few, if any, buyers. Oaksmith himself pointed out that to issue the securities, he needed a favorable moment like a decisive military triumph.⁸⁷ That moment never came.

Miscarriage of the bond issue project had disastrous results. Oaksmith had to cancel contracts with Perkins and Devoe for the Minié rifles and with Hitchcock and Company for the supplies worth \$250,000. The forfeiture of these agreements, countersigned for the Nicaraguan Government by Oaksmith, also destroyed whatever remained of his honor and reputation. He had spent his personal fortune for supplies. Now the added damage to his good name resulted in efforts to recoup his Nicaraguan losses elsewhere.

On December 1 he demonstrated his break with Walker by a contract with José Antonio Páez, the Venezuelan dictator who was attempting to re-establish himself in his country. Oaksmith promised to furnish Páez \$1,000,000 worth of arms and war supplies, goods originally earmarked for Nicaragua.⁸⁸ But like the large contracts made for Walker in October, this

⁸⁵ Appleton Oaksmith to Duncan Sherman and Company, New York, September 22, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁸⁶ Appleton Oaksmith to William Walker, New York, November 22, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁸⁷ Appleton Oaksmith to William Walker, New York, November 22, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁸⁸ Contract between Appleton Oaksmith and José Antonio Páez, New York, December 1, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

too came to nothing. Páez was evidently as poor as Walker and could not pay for the goods. Oaksmith thus failed to compensate for his losses by allying himself with the Venezuelan.

By the late fall of 1856, the Walker movement was rapidly losing its poise. The filibuster met almost continual defeat at the hands of the stronger Central American Allies—Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador—while Oaksmith's setbacks in New York simply mirrored those of his chief in Nicaragua. Because of the failure of the bond issue, Oaksmith had to repudiate contracts for badly needed supplies. Lawrence had resigned his post as head of the Nicaraguan Emigration Agency and pressed Oaksmith for money due him.⁸⁹ Vanderbilt had Morgan and Garrison deeply involved in a law suit for their earlier activities in seizing the Transit Company.⁹⁰ The recruiting system had almost collapsed, and newspaper accounts of the Nicaraguan situation by even Walker's staunchest apologists were becoming dismal. Filibuster diplomacy also failed to secure recognition of the Walker regime by Pierce's administration.

Finally in a November 22 letter to Walker, Oaksmith aired his many grievances and indicated his reasons for severing connections with the filibuster movement. He first listed his accomplishments, both real and imaginary: he had acquired confidence for Nicaraguan securities, obtained three men from a reputable bank as negotiators for the bond issue, made a large number of supply contracts, organized an effective recruiting system, and secured influences which assured his acceptance as Minister from Nicaragua. He complained strongly, however, that he had used up his own money and incurred twice that amount in debts and bills to supply houses. He implored the filibuster to send him money and finally wrote:

No one man or body of men, shall with impunity undertake to sully the fair record of my connection with the cause of Nicaragua. If I abandon it I do so fairly and squarely and honorably—

⁸⁹ Alexander Lawrence to Appleton Oaksmith, New York, November 20, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

⁹⁰ Scroggs, *Filibusters and Financiers*, 155-156.

if circumstances should induce me to continue with it, I shall insist upon the fullest justice being done to all of my actions.⁹¹

Oaksmith thus ended his association with Walker. Although he appeared at a mass meeting on the filibuster's behalf on December 20, his contract with Páez practically demonstrated his disaffection. Oaksmith's badly shaken financial position now overrode any serious ideological reasons he entertained for continuing support. His hope for quick profits had evaporated; his chance for fame and glory had disappeared. Walker's defeat was now inevitable.

Oaksmith had made his exit from the Walker movement. He had rocketed into prominence to become the filibuster's chief American leader during the summer and fall of 1856. His activities had spread to all fields of endeavor—diplomacy, finance, propaganda, recruiting, and supply. He achieved some notable successes but experienced even more discouraging defeats. Nevertheless, his activities demonstrate Walker's organization and methods in the United States. They also point up the American difficulties which contributed to the filibuster's ultimate defeat. In that period of expansion preceding the Civil War, there were limits to manifest destiny in the United States. Oaksmith's story attests to that fact.

⁹¹ Appleton Oaksmith to William Walker, New York, November 22, 1856, Oaksmith Papers.

THE ECONOMIC STATUS OF THE TOWN NEGRO IN POST-RECONSTRUCTION NORTH CAROLINA

By FRENISE A. LOGAN*

“The colored laborers,” observed the editor of *The Farmer and Mechanic* in 1877, “congregate about the market places, whiskey shops, and grocery stores, and live upon a lean pittance, rather than remove to the corn and cotton fields, where they can obtain a good support for themselves and families.”¹ Indeed, there is ample evidence available to show that the Negroes after 1876, especially those living in the eastern part of the State, demonstrated a willingness equal to or surpassing that of the whites to concentrate in the larger towns and cities of North Carolina. Raleigh, for example, in 1880 had a total population of 10,818, of which 5,047 or nearly fifty per cent were Negroes.² Ten years later the proportion between the two races was the same as in 1880.³ New Bern, by 1890, had become almost a “black town.” Of its total population of 7,843, no less than 5,271 or 67.2 per cent was Negro.⁴ Other leading towns and cities of eastern North Carolina presented similar Negro-white proportions.⁵

Even the towns of western North Carolina were affected by the city-ward habits of the Negro. For example, Warner, on his visit to Asheville in the early 1890's, tells us that the “swarming presence” of the Negro gave a “ragged aspect” to that mountain city. He writes of streets thronged with Negroes of varied colors and economic levels, from the “comely waitress” to the “slouching corner loafer.”⁶ This

* Dr. Frenise A. Logan is Professor of History at The Agricultural and Technical College of North Carolina, Greensboro.

¹ *The Farmer and Mechanic* (Raleigh), November 8, 1877.

² Charles Emerson and Co.'s, *Raleigh Directory, 1880-'81* . . . (Raleigh: Edwards, Broughton and Company, 1879), 38. This and other city directories are titled variously as they were private publications rather than official city publications.

³ U. S. Bureau of the Census, *Eleventh Census of the United States: 1890, Population, I, Part I* (Washington, 1897), 473, hereinafter cited as *Eleventh Census, 1890*.

⁴ *Eleventh Census, 1890*, 473.

⁵ *Eleventh Census, 1890*, 473.

⁶ Charles D. Warner, *On Horseback: A Tour in Virginia, North Carolina and Tennessee* (New York, 1892), 113.

mania for flocking to towns and cities was by no means a characteristic exclusively associated with the Negroes of North Carolina. It was south-wide. The significant difference was in degree. In 1890, Negroes made up 48.1 per cent of the total urban population in North Carolina. No other southern state could match this percentage.⁷

The preponderance of the Negro population in the leading towns and cities of North Carolina raises an interesting question: "How did the members of that group earn a livelihood?" That certain economic limitations, including job ghettoing, would be placed upon the Negroes by the whites of the State should occasion no surprise. This article will concern itself with the nature, extent, and effects of these limitations as they relate to the Negro workers in domestic and personal service, manufacturing and mechanical industries, trade and transportation, as well as to Negro business and professional men and women.

In 1887, the *Daily Review* (Wilmington) featured a front page article which enthusiastically told of the spreading industrialization of the State. In part it stated:

There is no doubt that there is now an era of remarkable prosperity in the State, such as it has seldom if ever witnessed . . . new villages are springing up in almost every direction. Capital in Durham, Goldsboro, Greensboro, and Fayetteville is being invested in real estate and in industrial, mechanical and manufacturing enterprises, giving employment to hundreds of mechanics and artisans. . . .⁸

In the industrial North Carolina that was emerging, however, the Negro was destined to be confined largely to domestic and personal service.⁹ For example, in Raleigh in 1876, Negroes engaged in domestic and personal service comprised

⁷ For example, the percentage of Negroes in the total urban population of Virginia, Tennessee, Louisiana, and Arkansas was 41.4, 38.8, 30.7, and 34.8 respectively.

⁸ *Daily Review* (Wilmington), January 7, 1887.

⁹ Domestic and personal service included the following occupations: barber and hairdressers, boarding and lodging house keepers, hotel keepers, janitors, laborers (not specified), launderers and laundresses, nurses and mid-wives, waiters and waitresses.

56.6 per cent of the total Negro labor force of that city.¹⁰ Twelve years later, the percentage had risen to 68.9.¹¹ An examination of the New Bern directory of 1881, as well as those of Asheville (1887), Wilmington (1889), and Charlotte (1893) reveals a like situation.¹² Moreover, it is interesting to note that a closer examination of the domestic and personal service field, as revealed in the Census of 1890, shows that the Negroes of the state were largely confined to six occupations. These were barbers and hairdressers, laborers, laundresses, nurses and mid-wives, restaurant and saloon keepers, and servants.¹³ Because Negroes were numerically and percentage-wise superior in these six occupations, they can be properly labeled "Negro jobs."

That the 1890 Census Schedules, with respect to "Negro jobs" in the domestic and personal service field, reflected an occupational pattern which was present throughout the entire period may be seen from an examination of the occupations Negroes held in specific towns and cities of the State. In Raleigh in 1876, out of 405 Negroes in domestic and personal service, 346 or 85.4 per cent were in the six "Negro jobs."¹⁴ Twelve years later the percentage stood at 91.4.¹⁵ In other major cities and towns of North Carolina the concentration of Negroes in the "Negro jobs" was similar. For example, in Charlotte in 1893, the percentage stood at 93.4, the highest recorded for the entire period.¹⁶ The Negroes of North Carolina, then, instead of escaping from the "Negro jobs," found themselves toward the close of the nineteenth century confined almost exclusively to these pursuits in the domestic and personal service field.

However, in spite of the employment of large numbers of

¹⁰ Compiled from *Chataigne's Raleigh City Directory . . . 1875-'76* (Raleigh, 1875[?]), 41-130, hereinafter cited as *Raleigh City Directory, 1875-'76*.

¹¹ Compiled from the *Directory of the City of Raleigh, 1888* (Raleigh: Observer Printing Company, 1888), 2-119, hereinafter cited as *Directory of City of Raleigh, 1888*.

¹² New Bern, 48.0; Asheville, 77.0; Wilmington, 57.3; Charlotte, 79.0 per cent.

¹³ Compiled from *Eleventh Census, 1890*, 592.

¹⁴ *Raleigh City Directory, 1875-'76*, 41-130.

¹⁵ *Directory of City of Raleigh, 1888*, 2-119.

¹⁶ *Directory of Charlotte, 1893-'94*, 148-193.

Negroes of North Carolina in domestic and personal service, frequent objections were voiced by the whites as to the honesty, reliability, availability, and efficiency of the "colored help," particularly with the performances of Negro servants. In 1892 a white lady in Edenton complained that it was "hard to get on with servants who have no honesty and no virtue."¹⁷ A white man in another small North Carolina town bemoaned the fact that the only Negro servants available were "rough farm laborers, brought up in cabins off the plantations," because "all the well trained family Negroes who had spent their lives in their masters' houses" had departed for the larger cities of the State "to see something of the world."¹⁸ The problem of securing cooks in Greensboro in 1891 convinced one white housewife of that city that Negroes could not be employed "for love or money."¹⁹

The question may well be asked, "If the Negroes were inefficient, unreliable, and dishonest, how can one explain their monopoly of the domestic and personal service field?" The answer seems to be found in the belief of the North Carolina whites that it was economically and socially desirable that the Negroes perform the menial tasks. Aside from the belief held on the part of many white employers that the Negro was less arrogant and more controllable than the "poor but respected white man," was the idea that nature had made the Negro inferior. In addition to the social inferiority of the Negroes as a justification for his employment in the menial pursuits, there was the simple, elementary economic fact that Negro labor could be bought for less money. As an Iredell County white man put it: "The colored laborers are less grasping and are more disposed to accept wages that will leave some margin of profit. . . ."²⁰

Not only was the work of the Negro laborer and servant obtained on the cheapest possible terms, but part of this wage

¹⁷ A. B. Hart, "Cross-Section Through North Carolina," *The Nation*, LIV (March 17, 1892), 208.

¹⁸ A. L. Bassett, "Going to Housekeeping in North Carolina," *Lippincott's Magazine*, XXVIII (August, 1881), 206, hereinafter cited as Bassett, "Housekeeping in North Carolina."

¹⁹ *Daily Record* (Greensboro), February 11, 1891.

²⁰ *First Annual Report of the North Carolina Bureau of Labor Statistics*, 1887, 68, hereinafter cited as *First Annual Report*, 1887.

was paid in orders on the local stores. Thus money was kept partially, or entirely in some instances, out of the hands of Negro workers. A white carpenter in Anson County wrote the North Carolina Bureau of Labor Statistics that "many hundreds" of Negro laborers in his area "are paid in orders, and never see a cent of money. . . ." ²¹ Thus it would appear that the complaints and protestations possibly would not have been necessary had the servants and laborers been adequately paid. Their wages, in spite of the absence of official wage statistics, were admittedly "extremely low." ²² This fact, standing alone, may provide one with a partial explanation of the Negro's alleged dishonesty, or tendency as one white man said "to get a good deal in other ways." ²³

The next largest group of predominantly non-agricultural workers among the Negroes of North Carolina was to be found in the manufacturing and mechanical industries. ²⁴ Here, according to the Census Schedules of 1890, 12,518 or 5.5 per cent of the total working population were working at some occupation in this area. ²⁵ Although this group made up some thirty or more occupations, the bulk of Negroes, male and female, were employed in five. These were tobacco and cigar factory operatives, saw and planing mill employees, carpenters and joiners, blacksmiths and wheelwrights, and marble and stone cutters. ²⁶ Although state-wide statistics before 1890 are lacking, an examination of the occupation of Negroes in individual cities and towns between 1876 and 1890 will reveal a comparable circumstance. For example, in Raleigh in 1876, 124 or 73.8 per cent of all workers in manufacturing and mechanical industries were employed as carpenters, blacksmiths, stone cutters, or saw and planing

²¹ *Second Report of the North Carolina Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1888*, 57, hereinafter cited as *Second Annual Report, 1888*.

²² Bassett, "Housekeeping in North Carolina," 206.

²³ Bassett, "Housekeeping in North Carolina," 206.

²⁴ This group included the following occupations: bakers, blacksmiths, boot and shoemakers, brickmakers, butchers, cabinetmakers, carpenters and joiners, carriagemakers, machinists, marble and stone cutters, brick and stone masons, mill and factory operatives, saw and planing mill employees, tobacco and cigar workers, and seamstresses.

²⁵ *Eleventh Census, 1890, Population, I, Part II, ci-ciii*.

²⁶ Out of the 12,518 employed Negroes in the mechanical and manufacturing industries, 9,680 or 77.3 per cent were to be found in these five occupations.

mill workers.²⁷ In Winston in 1880, 82.3 per cent of that city's total working Negro population were tobacco workers, blacksmiths, and stone cutters.²⁸ The *Directory of Durham City for 1887* listed the above three occupations as comprising 84.1 per cent of all its employed Negro population.²⁹ However, in only two occupations in the mechanical and manufacturing industries can the term "Negro job" be applied. These were brickmaking and tobacco factory work. In 1890, out of a total of 607 white and Negro brickmakers in the State, 443 or 72.9 per cent were Negroes; while out of a total of 5,719 white and Negro tobacco and cigar factory operatives, 4,241 or 74.1 per cent were Negroes.³⁰

The question at this point may well be asked, "How is the predominance of Negroes in certain skills, and the absence of that group in others to be explained?" In an effort to interpret the scarcity of Negro workers in the cotton and woolen mills of North Carolina, two opinions have been advanced. One holds that Negroes in the textile mills of the State were either barred altogether, or restricted to a small number engaged in some of the preparatory processes because of the large numbers of white women inside the plants. Thus, if Negroes were employed, they worked outside the mills as laborers, draymen, and firemen and were, therefore, removed from all close contact with the white females. No opportunity, then, was afforded which encouraged the slightest possible lessening of the Negro's deference toward white women.³¹ The other view suggests that the Negroes were barred from work in the textile mills, or employed in the more menial and "hard labor" jobs in order to prevent them from competing with the large numbers of poor white laborers.³² It would seem, then, that it was both economically and socially unde-

²⁷ *Raleigh City Directory, 1875-'76*, 41-130.

²⁸ *Winston-Salem and Greensboro Directory, 1879-'80*, 1-44.

²⁹ *Directory of Durham City for 1887* (Raleigh: Levi Branson, 1887), 2-138.

³⁰ *Eleventh Census, 1890*, 592.

³¹ See Holland Thompson, *From the Cotton Field to Cotton Mill* (New York, 1906), 249.

³² Liston Pope in his study, *Millhands and Preachers: A Study of Gastonia* (New York, 1942), 12-13, espouses this view.

sirable to employ Negro labor extensively in the textile mills of North Carolina.

On the other hand, there appears to be only one school of opinion as to the "why" of the wide use of Negroes in the tobacco industry of North Carolina. The work in the leaf factories in post-reconstruction North Carolina was mainly a hand process, performed under very bad working conditions, extreme dust, and poor wages. The work itself was monotonous, offering little or no opportunity for advancement, often carried on in badly lighted factories under the worst sanitary conditions.³³

There were serious objections by whites to the employment of Negroes in many of the mechanical and manufacturing industries. A white laborer in a town in Iredell County voiced opposition to Negroes working in the tobacco factories, but felt that if they must be hired, it was unwise to pay them "good wages," because they spent the money "as fast as they make it." He said that the average Negro of his town was "content if he owns a good axe, razor and possum dog."³⁴ A white carpenter in Burke County complained about "the unjust and unnatural discrimination against white workingmen by their own race," and declared that he had personally witnessed many instances in which white men had been turned down and Negroes employed.³⁵

A great deal of the opposition to the employment of Negroes arose over the fact that Negroes could be hired much more cheaply than whites. For example, a bricklayer and plasterer in Lenoir County wrote:

Wages are going down all the time. Five years ago we got fifteen cents per yard to do plastering, and now we only get eight or nine cents for the same work. The botch of a Negro has put wages down. There are some of our wealthiest men who never employ a white man for anything.³⁶

³³ John Donald Rice, "The Negro Tobacco Worker and his Union," (unpublished M. A. thesis, Department of Sociology, University of North Carolina, 1941), 11-13.

³⁴ *Third Annual Report, 1889*, 281.

³⁵ *Second Annual Report, 1888*, 63.

³⁶ *Second Annual Report, 1888*, 105, 185. See also *First Annual Report, 1887*, 42.

Significantly, the protests against the employment of Negroes in the manufacturing and mechanical industries came mainly from the white worker and not the white employer. The latter group's protests were negligible possibly because of its ability to exploit the cheapness of Negro labor for its own benefit. At any rate, the white employers were more apt to praise the Negro worker than to criticize him.³⁷

As it has already been shown, the large majority of Negroes residing in the towns and cities of North Carolina were confined to domestic and personal service jobs in spite of the huge concentration in the tobacco industries. This fact is further attested to by the small number found in trade and transportation. Comprising approximately fourteen occupations, the federal Census Schedules of 1890 shows that of the total number of Negroes employed in the State, only 4.4 per cent were in trade and transportation.³⁸ And the bulk of these were railroad employees, followed by draymen, drivers, teamsters, and hackmen. Although no detailed breakdown of the railroad workers is given by the 1890 Census Schedules, it is reasonable to assume that the greater proportion of the Negro workers in trade and transportation were "hands," or common laborers, performing most of the out-of-door, laborious, and hazardous work. Along with the railroad jobs, the vast majority of Negroes engaged in trade and transportation were found in occupations requiring little or no skill, but a great deal of physical strength and stamina. It is noteworthy, therefore, that of the 7,696 Negroes employed in trade and transportation, 5,522 or 70.4 per cent were railroad employees, draymen, hackmen, teamsters, and drivers.³⁹

On the other hand, certain pursuits in trade and transportation were almost "lily-white." Negroes were not listed in any appreciable numbers in areas such as clerks, bookkeepers,

³⁷ See *First Annual Report, 1887*, 71; *Second Annual Report, 1888*, 178.

³⁸ Compiled from *Eleventh Census, 1890*, Population, I, Part II, 592. The occupations included agents, auctioneers, clerks, draymen, hackmen and teamsters, hostlers, hucksters, livery stable keepers, messengers and office boys, porters and helpers in stores, and steam railroad employees.

³⁹ *Eleventh Census, 1890*, Population, I, Part II, 592.

agents, and salesmen or saleswomen. The small number engaged in these occupations was there as a result of the establishment of Negro businesses and since most of these enterprises were small, the number of positions available was also small.

The inequality of economic opportunity in trade and transportation was extended to the wage scale. For example, in 1887 the Carolina Central Railroad employed five white brakemen at 96 cents a day, and forty-two Negro brakemen at 75 cents a day.⁴⁰ Differences in the wages paid to Negro and white railroad laborers were manifest on the Raleigh and Gaston, and Raleigh and Augusta Air-Line Railroad, and the North Carolina Railroad. The former paid the whites 89 cents a day, the Negroes 80 cents a day; while white laborers on the latter railroad received 87 cents a day, the Negroes received 72 cents a day.⁴¹

Although North Carolina Negroes were not conspicuous among the big businessmen of the State, it should occasion no surprise to learn that Negroes of North Carolina in the years after 1876 did join the ranks of small entrepreneurs. The insistent urging of white southerners like Henry W. Grady to build a "New South" based on industry and commerce also fell upon the ears of Negroes. And not being ignorant of or indifferent to the successes of many white individuals, a number of Negroes were tempted to invest their modest savings in some modest venture. Another factor which undoubtedly contributed to the rise of Negro merchants, manufacturers, and traders was the refusal on the part of most white businessmen to employ Negroes in other than menial occupations. Therefore, some Negroes felt that the only certain way to free themselves from the wage earning class was to become their own employers.

In January, 1880, according to the Dun and Barlow Company of New York City, there were eighty Negro business establishments in North Carolina with an estimated working

⁴⁰ *First Annual Report, 1887*, 163-164.

⁴¹ *First Annual Report, 1887*, 167, 169.

capital of \$79,000.⁴² Nine years later, in 1889, that company listed 175 Negro merchants, manufacturers, and traders in North Carolina with an estimated working capital of \$129,000.⁴³ A majority of these businesses, both in 1880 and in 1889, were decidedly little ones, individually being valued at \$500 or less. Raleigh, Wilmington, New Bern, Warrenton, and Enfield were notable Negro business centers.

The status of Negro businesses in North Carolina, as reflected by the Dun and Barlow credit rating, was not a healthy one. According to that company's report of January, 1880, fifty-three or 66.6 per cent received no credit rating whatever as Dun and Barlow felt that the unsatisfactory state of these businesses and their investments did not meet the minimum accrediting standards.⁴⁴ Nine years later, in 1889, the credit rating of Negro businesses in North Carolina was lower than it was in 1880. One hundred and twenty-four, or 70.8 per cent, received no credit rating.⁴⁵ However, in the matter of credit rating it should be stressed that the amount of capital regulated the amount of credit. Thus the credit ratings are proportionate and relative, and are not to be taken separately in an arbitrary sense.

Although it is true that the vast majority of the Negro establishments were modest ones operating on small amounts of capital, and with little or no credit rating, there were, nonetheless, prosperous, highly credited individual businesses owned and operated by Negroes. A Negro, Thomas Hunter, owned a granite stone yard which employed "a great many hands." He declared in August, 1886, that his business was "first class in every respect," and that he had just recently furnished "about thirteen hundred dollars worth of stone" in the construction of a white church in Charlotte.⁴⁶ In Kin-

⁴² Compiled from the *Mercantile Agency Reference Book*, January, 1880 (New York, 1879), hereinafter cited as *Mercantile Agency Reference Book*, 1880.

⁴³ Compiled from the *Mercantile Agency Reference Book*, January, 1889 (New York, 1888), hereinafter cited as *Mercantile Agency Reference Book*, 1889.

⁴⁴ *Mercantile Agency Reference Book*, 1880.

⁴⁵ *Mercantile Agency Reference Book*, 1889.

⁴⁶ Thomas Hunter to Charles N. Hunter, August 25, 1886, Charles N. Hunter Papers, Duke University Library, Durham, hereinafter cited as Charles N. Hunter Papers.

ston, L. H. Fisher and Wiley Lowry were looked upon as two of that town's most successful businessmen. One newspaper stated that Fisher was "the largest colored merchant in the place, and he is doing business that many a one with much larger capital in larger and much more reputed wealthier places might envy withough being accused of malice."⁴⁷ Lowry was described as "an energetic, wealth-earning, money-saving gentleman."⁴⁸

In Concord in 1889, population 3,600, Warren C. Coleman owned the only general store. His business was estimated to be worth \$5,000, and was listed among that town's top ten concerns, irrespective of race.⁴⁹ In Oxford, B. Gee's general store was estimated to be worth \$10,000. Of the thirty-three such stores in Oxford (thirty white and three Negro), only one, operated by whites, D. A. Hunt and Son, carried an estimated value higher than Gee's.⁵⁰ The largest grocery business in Winston in 1889, estimated worth \$10,000, was operated by two Negroes, Newson and Jones.⁵¹ Their store was the only one in the town, white or Negro, to carry a credit rating of "good."⁵² In the same year, several Negroes in Greenville and Warrenton were listed among the more prominent businessmen of their respective communities.⁵³

While domestic and personal service occupations constituted the largest number and percentage of the total number of employed Negroes in North Carolina, professional service constituted the smallest percentage, 2,036 or 1.0 per cent.⁵⁴ Of the seven occupations included in this group, the ministerial and teaching professions predominated. Indeed, 1,940 or 95.2 per cent were either clergymen or teachers. The number of lawyers, government officials, physicians and surgeons,

⁴⁷ *North Carolina Republican*, quoted in the *Kinston Journal*, October 23, 1879.

⁴⁸ *North Carolina Republican*, quoted in the *Kinston Journal*, October 23, 1879.

⁴⁹ *The Mercantile Association of the Carolinas Reference Book*, July, 1889 (Wilmington, 1889), 33-34, hereinafter cited as *Mercantile Association Reference Book*.

⁵⁰ *Mercantile Association Reference Book*, 107-109.

⁵¹ *Mercantile Association Reference Book*, 131.

⁵² *Mercantile Association Reference Book*, 131.

⁵³ *Mercantile Association Reference Book*, 131.

⁵⁴ Compiled from *Eleventh Census, 1890*, Population, I, Part II, 592.

and artists was so small as to be inconsequential.⁵⁵ The reason for the large number of teachers and ministers, and the comparatively smaller number of lawyers, government officials, physicians and surgeons, and artists is fairly obvious. As a result of segregation, the Negro minister and school teacher enjoyed an almost complete monopoly with his own race, being relatively free from white competition; whereas, such was not the case with the other professions.

An examination of the Negroes in professional service in individual towns and cities of North Carolina shows, as was the case state-wide, that this group constituted only a very insignificant proportion of those employed. In Raleigh in 1876, Negro professionals (almost exclusively teachers and clergymen) made up only 1.6 per cent of the gainfully employed Negroes of that city.⁵⁶ By 1888, the percentage had inched up to 3.8, with the overwhelming number continuing to be teachers and clergymen.⁵⁷ As it has been stated, teachers comprised the larger per cent of the professionally employed Negroes of North Carolina.

The exceedingly small number of Negro surgeons and physicians in North Carolina (in 1890 the federal census schedules listed only forty-six for the entire state) led one Negro physician, L. A. Rutherford, to seek the advice of a North Carolina Negro educator in regard to the wisdom of the establishment of a North Carolina Negro medical association. One of the purposes of the proposed association was to bring to the attention of the mass of Negroes the presence of Negro physicians and surgeons, for Rutherford declared that "hundreds of our people never met a colored physician."⁵⁸ Apparently the difficulty of the Negro doctors to secure patients—possibly because of the belief held by some whites *and* some Negroes that Negro physicians were incompetent and untrained—was another motive which prompted such a proposal. An example of this doubt as to the competency of the Negro physician was expressed by a white school teacher of

⁵⁵ *Eleventh Census, 1890, Population I, Part II, 592.*

⁵⁶ *Raleigh City Directory, 1875-'76, 41-130.*

⁵⁷ *Directory of City of Raleigh, 1888, 2-119.*

⁵⁸ Rutherford to Charles N. Hunter, n. d., Charles N. Hunter Papers.

Tarboro. In a letter to his mother on September 20, 1882, he said that although a recently arrived Negro doctor rode around Tarboro "with a very fast horse as if he was busy," the white teacher declared that he knew very little about his skill or charges. He therefore concluded that "the darkies had better employ the [white] doctors they have. . . ." ⁵⁹

Thus a study of the economic status of Negroes in the cities and towns of North Carolina in the post-reconstruction era reveals that the greater portion of that group was relegated to low paying, non-promotional menial and semi-menial jobs. In instances where Negroes held so-called non-Negro jobs, as in the case of railroad brakemen, wages paid to them were uniformly lower than those paid to whites performing the same tasks. The one outstanding characteristic common to all the cities and towns of the State during the period under the study was the large preponderance of Negro domestic and personal service workers. It is significant to note that this race, instead of escaping from these purely menial tasks, found themselves toward the close of the nineteenth century confined almost exclusively to these pursuits. This observation offers tangible evidence to the rigid economic restrictions confronting the Negroes of North Carolina after 1876. That the socio-economic effects of such restrictions worked to the disadvantage and detriment of the Negroes of the State is all too obvious.

⁵⁹ Letter dated September 20, 1882, Peter Evans Smith Papers, Duke University Library. This letter is incomplete and does not give the names of the sender or the recipient.

THE FORT FISHER AND WILMINGTON CAMPAIGN: LETTERS FROM REAR ADMIRAL DAVID D. PORTER

By JAMES M. MERRILL*

When Admiral David Farragut damned the torpedoes, and plowed full speed into Mobile Bay with his flotilla, he sealed off that harbor to blockade runners in August, 1864. Attention, North and South, became riveted on the last remaining port open to the Confederacy, Wilmington, North Carolina, the pipeline through which British arms and ammunition were funneled to General Lee's Army around Richmond. The Union Navy Department in Washington pondered the problem of tightening the blockade off the North Carolina coast, a problem which, if solved, would not only cut off supplies to Richmond but would sever the South once and for all from European aid. After weeks of discussion with top naval and military commanders, Secretary of the Navy Gideon Welles and his assistant, Gustavus Vasa Fox, decided to send a joint land-sea expedition to smash Fort Fisher, guardian of the river approach to Wilmington and, once this target was demolished, to steam up the Cape Fear River and capture Wilmington.

At Hampton Roads, Virginia, and Beaufort, North Carolina, major bases for the North Atlantic Blockading Squadron, Admiral David D. Porter, who had been recalled from Mississippi River duty, beefed up his already powerful fleet with monitors and additional frigates and gunboats. Washington stripped the other squadrons down to minimum efficiency and dispatched their fighting craft to Hampton Roads. This was to be the Union Navy's major effort in the war.

Meanwhile, at City Point, Virginia, General Grant, his mind preoccupied with the actions of Lee's Army, reneged on his promise of sending troops for the expedition. October and November came and went. Porter brooded on board his

* Dr. James M. Merrill is Associate Professor of History at Whittier College, Whittier, California.

flagship, "Malvern," cursed Grant repeatedly, and whiled away the long hours at Hampton Roads puffing expensive cigars, drinking champagne, and harping about Army inefficiency.

Grant finally moved in December. General Godfrey Weitzel, equipped with 6,500 men, supplies, and Army mules, arrived in Hampton Roads along with his superior, General Benjamin F. Butler, who came "along just for the ride." The operation was badly managed from the outset. "Old Cock-Eyed Ben" Butler, the pot-bellied military amateur, and "Black Dave" Porter, the bearded and boisterous professional, failed to co-operate on anything. After missed connections, military bungling, and erratic naval gunfire, the Porter-Butler expedition against Fort Fisher failed miserably in December, 1864.

Another joint military-naval attack force was quickly fitted out at Beaufort and ordered to Fort Fisher in January. This time with Porter in sole command and with a qualified general leading the army contingent the combined Union forces assaulted the Confederate bastion with fury. Out-manned and out-gunned, the southerners, seeing that further resistance was hopeless, surrendered. A month later Wilmington collapsed and with it went the South's last chance for survival.¹

With the fall of Wilmington, the Union Navy's job of blockading the southern coast was finished. In Washington Gustavus Fox, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, was pleased with his handiwork. Throughout the war, he had been the brains of the Union Navy, responsible for energizing the forces afloat, responsible for the Navy's mighty war effort. Affable, respected by Lincoln and his Cabinet, this erstwhile professional seaman spoke the language of the quarter-deck and had become the confidant of naval officers, ashore and afloat.

The New-York Historical Society houses the Gustavus Vasa

¹ For a detailed study of the Fort Fisher campaign, see James M. Merrill, *The Rebel Shore: The Story of Union Sea Power in the Civil War* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1957), 201-233.

Fox correspondence. This collection, perhaps the most important single private source on Civil War naval operations, contains hundreds of private and confidential letters written by officers to the Assistant Secretary, letters which reveal the difficulties and the frustrations of fighting a war at sea.

In 1918 Richard Wainwright and Robert Thompson edited and published about one third of Fox's war correspondence in *Confidential Correspondence of Gustavus Vasa Fox*.² In these volumes are letters written by Admiral Porter while on ironclad duty in western waters. Wainwright and Thompson, however, failed to include Porter's later correspondence relating to the Fort Fisher and Wilmington campaign.

The following letters, seven in number, discuss the preparations for the attacks on Fort Fisher, the importance of Wilmington to the southern cause, the problem of supply as a factor in joint naval-military expeditions, the confusion caused by administrative red tape, the significance of the Federal naval brigade attack upon the ramparts of the Confederate fort, and the troubles involved in the final push toward Wilmington. The correspondence points up clearly Porter's impatience with the Army, his downright hatred for Ben Butler, and his belief that General Grant was highly overrated. Porter seemed to delight in lambasting military brass for impotence and inefficiency. Fearful that his professional reputation would become tarnished in the case of a debacle at the hands of the Confederates, Porter shifted the responsibility for the reversal at Fort Fisher in December squarely on the shoulders of the Army. These letters give a concise description of the collapse of Fort Fisher and the struggle that ensued along the Cape Fear River.

² Robert M. Thompson and Richard Wainwright (eds.), *Confidential Correspondence of Gustavus Vasa Fox . . .* (New York: Naval History Society, 1918).

Private

Hampton Roads
Octo. 15th 1864

My Dear Fox:

Yours of Octo. 12th has been received. I think the *Cambridge*³ will do in place of the *Adger*.⁴ The *Mercedita*⁵ is worn out and it would hardly be fair to send a lame duck for a well one. So if you will give the order, the exchange will be made. . . .

Things are gradually getting into shape here, and having abolished all the red tape I could, we are getting along faster.—There are no stores here whatever and the vessels that come from the north do not come provided:—the same with regard to clothing. Still, we have beef and pork—and people *can* fight in their shirt tails. I am all ready to cover the Army landing, whenever they say they are.

I am practicing all the vessels at targets and the firing is very good.

There seems to be a great deal of enthusiasm in the squadron and desire to go into the fight. The old commanders are *all very pleasant*, and quite tickled at having command of such large divisions, *on paper*. They will be somewhat astonished when they can't find the vessels.

I send you a list of the lame ducks. Their name is legion: but I will go into the Rebs when the army is ready, and win, I hope, at that.

I wish we had more force at the [Norfolk] Yard. Machinists and boiler-makers are much wanted and they work night and day. A little hint from the Department might do [Lieutenant George B.] Livingston good: he loses much time in talking about *what he has done*.

Dont forget to send down at once my Calcium lights. I want twelve or sixteen. Every one here thinks they will be very serviceable.

I should be *thankful* for *every vessel* that can carry a *heavy* gun—particularly one hundred pounder rifles.

I go up in the morning to try and stir Grant up. I am afraid he is not sufficiently interested in this business. Your old School-mate [General Benjamin F.] *Butler* has charge of him, and he wants to get Richmond (which can not be done) without outside aid. Take the forts [guarding the river approaches to Wilmington] and Richmond will fall.

³ A two-masted square rigged screw steamer.

⁴ A wooden side-wheeler.

⁵ A wooden screw steamer. On January 31, 1863, while on blockading duty off Charleston, the "Mercedita" was attacked and disabled by the Confederate ram "Palmetto State." In February, 1863, the "Mercedita" was ordered to Philadelphia for repairs.

Will you send us speedily a large supply of stores—all here was burnt on the *Brandywine*.⁶

I am glad you like the horse; he was my favorite and without a fault. I should have liked to see the mare *lying down* when the old gentleman tried to mount her. But she soon drops that when she *knows* her rider, and is worth her weight in gold as a riding horse. . . . I never saw an ordinary horse that could keep up with her when pacing at speed. I hope the bay will cure your dyspepsia. Put him to his speed. . . . You will find him pretty rough.

I am trying to make something out of this craft: [the "Malvern"] she is a poor concern and in no way suitable for the business. The most she can make in smooth water is seven knots, and about five in a fresh breeze. She is a one horse affair altogether:—but I will rough it out in her.

I have telegraphed for more seamen and ordinary seamen. Do let us have them. There are none in the fleet.

I think [Captain Melancton] Smith is doing well on the River, and it would be better to keep him there, though he will suit well for the *Wabash*,⁷ if you should detach [Commander John] De Camp.

I will keep you posted from time to time, and as events occur.

North Atlantic Squadron
U. S. Flag-Ship "*Malvern*,"
Hampton Roads. Octo. 19 1864

My Dear Fox

I went up yesterday to see Grant in that "tub" the "Osceola"⁸—not making more than 16 miles an hour going up—& coming down at a little over that rate. With 50 pounds of steam & well trimmed I think she could be made to go 17 knots, though a poor looking model. I can't go any where in the *Malvern*⁹ she is so foul.

Prospects look gloomy up in front. All this talk about Butler's going into Richmond is all talk. They can't move *an inch* & won't move an inch until Wilmington is taken.

I have been ready for three or four days, but Grant can't raise any men until [General Philip] Sheridan whips [General James] Longstreet! I had a long talk with [General George]

⁶ A wooden sailing frigate which was used as a storeship at the Norfolk Navy Yard. She burned on September 3, 1864.

⁷ A wooden steam frigate launched on October 24, 1855. For most of the war, the "Wabash" served as the flagship for the South Atlantic Blockading Squadron.

⁸ A wooden side-wheeler built at Boston and delivered to the United States Government on January 9, 1864.

⁹ An iron side-wheel gunboat. Captured under the name of "Ella and Annie" in November, 1863, by Union blockaders, she was purchased from the Boston Prize Court by the Federal Navy Department and fitted out as the flagship of the North Atlantic Blockading Squadron.

Meade & [General John] Rawlins, Grant's Chief of Staff. They both think nothing can be done at present in the way of attacking Richmond, in which any man of common sense would agree with them. I went close up to the front of the enemy's works & when Grant gets through I would like to know. The canal may get through but if the rebels are going to let them work at it when the upper bulk head is down, they are bigger fools than I take them to be. . . .

. . . I hope never to see the army again as long as I live—they never come up in time—we are out of all patience with them—every one here is full of zeal and full of fight. I am practicing the crews at target firing, which none of them knew anything about. The firing is generally very poor—no wonder, when they have scarcely ever fired a gun.

Is there no way to get troops here from the North for our special purpose? [General Winfield] Hancock would be the man to command them if we could get them.

I have nearly worked my liver out to organize and get this squadron ready, and it puts me out of spirits not to be on the spot now, when we have had such good weather for our purpose.

Grant don't talk at all sanguine about anything. What a pity [General James] McPherson was killed & [General William T.] Sherman could not bring his brains here.—I found the yard [at Norfolk] full of blockaders—I am kicking them out as fast as possible—half that came here want but little repairs, and I will promise them they don't get here again in a hurry. They don't do enough of their own repairs, and sigh for the joys of Norfolk as the Peri did for Paradise. There are very few vessels to arrive here. *Dictator* and *Monadnock*¹⁰ will be here in time judging from appearances—I don't fear for the result. I shall not want the Provision boat—I found one here that will suit, but I would like to have 4 small tugs—those we have here are nearly all worn out and are constantly in the Blacksmith's hands. I shan't trouble you for anything else if you send me the tugs. I am obliged with the press of work to keep the *Clematis* and *Bigonia*¹¹ here, where they will do for blockade.

The iron clads are all up in fresh water relieving the minds of the fellows near the Barricade or obstructions, who *are* afraid the Rebel Rams will jump over. . . .

There is no doubt in my mind but that any of [Lieutenant William B.] Cushing's boats was taken to the Rebels *purposely*, up the River—how else she got there I cannot imagine. I have sent to ascertain if she was *certainly destroyed*, or she may be

¹⁰ Mammoth iron monitors.

¹¹ Wooden tugboats.

paying us a visit some dark night. I sent Cushing off through the canal—he wanted to go round Cape Hatteras. He thought he could succeed, & the chances are better with one than with two. I think he talks *rather large* but I will reserve my opinion until I see whether or not he blows the Ram¹² up.

As they say in the papers, “all is quiet in front,” and I bid you good night.

North Atlantic Squadron
U. S. Flag-Ship “Malvern”
Beaufort N. C.—Jany 7 1865

My dear Fox

I have not given you a long letter yet,¹³ having written so many official ones, and going over all the ground of the late failure, that there is nothing more to be said about it, so will try it again, and hope to have no more failures; though the man Grant is going to send here (a volunteer general) is one of Butler’s men, who will likely white-wash Butler by doing just as he did.

Don’t be surprised if I send him home with a flea in his ear, I will as sure as a gun if he comes here with any of his “ifs and buts,” and stops to consider as to taking the forts. It is the easiest work I ever undertook. . . . It can’t be beaten unless it is on the next occasion when I will put all doubts at rest about the invincibility! of Fort Fisher and its dependencies as far as the Navy is concerned. I will silence their guns in twenty five minutes, and go to work and dismount them scientifically. I have my doubts about Grant’s sending troops here—I don’t believe in any body but my own good officers and men. I can do anything with them, and you need not be surprised to hear that the web-footers have gone into the forts.

I will try it anyhow, and show the soldiers how to do it. The weather though is frightful—our ships are riding it out outside—the sea as seen from here making a clean breach over them—this is the way to make sailors of them—It is all very fine for us in here, but it would be useless for us to go outside and ride it out with them, when we have such a snug harbor. I rode out one heavy gale with them, anchored at sea, to show them how it should be done, but the old “Malvern” cut so many eccentric capers, that the eyes of the whole fleet were riveted on her, to

¹² The Confederate ironclad ram “Albemarle” was sunk at Plymouth, on October 28, 1864, by a Federal torpedo boat commanded by Lieutenant W. B. Cushing.

¹³ Beaufort, where this letter was written, fell to Union arms in 1862. It became the chief base for the North Atlantic Blockading Squadron.

see what she would do next. She turned us all inside out, and the best punishment that could be inflicted on Butler and his staff would be to send them out in a N. E. gale in her.

There is a matter of veracity between Grant and Butler. Grant says "Butler went against his wishes"—Butler says "assaulting was not in his instructions," but Butler is too cunning for Grant, and will make him do what he pleases. Wait till Sherman joins Grant—he will make Butler's fur fly, and Butler will never be heard of more. I am glad on his account we didn't take the forts—we never would have obtained credit for it, if we had—besides we will have another fight, I was afraid this was to be the last. It is strange but true, that the desire to kill and destroy grows on a man, the oftener he hears shot whistle, and I must confess, I and all hands are itching to go to work again at Fort Fisher. Every vessel that was in the last affair will go in—damages are all repaired—rifled guns have been sent to Coventry and replaced with IX inch, which are good enough for me.

It would have done your heart good, or any other man's heart good, to see that large fleet maneuvered into position on the second day—it was beautiful, and without a fault—jib booms lapped the taffrails, and not a collision of any kind—no cotillion was ever better gone through. I would like to have this party about three months, just to put them through their exercises—I could whip the largest fleet John Bull could send out. The first day one or two vessels got into wrong places, but that is not to be wondered at—anchoring on a bar represented as dangerous in the extreme—no chance to take soundings. . . wrecks by dozens strewed all along were our only beacons. I will tell you it was hard to beat, and all the firings you ever saw or heard of could not come up to it.

We have filled up with coal, ammunition and provisions, and are ready to go as soon as the troops arrive or the weather permits, I shall keep my eye on Sherman, and when he is about thirty miles off, will pitch in—soldiers or no soldiers.

I don't believe in Grant's troops coming—he says to me—"hold on Dear Admiral, I will be back with more troops soon, and with another commander"—that says a good deal but no troops are yet in sight—we want white men here—not niggers—I don't believe in them.

Will you give orders to hurry down 12,000 tons of coal—if the Bureau is out of funds, take my prize money, and lay it out in coal. Remember this is a large squadron, requires coal, ammunition, clothing and provisions, and I should not be expected to give such things a thought—they should come without asking.

The *Newbern*¹⁴ brought down fresh beef enough, the other day, for about a dozen vessels—we will all have the scurvy if we don't have fresh grub. . . .

[Henry A.] Wise¹⁵ I suppose, feels bad about the guns bursting—It may not be the fault of the guns, but the fault of the people who loaded them. Some are suggested that “they bursted for the same reason Butler did, they went off too fast!” Don't worry about us—we are like Micawber—waiting for something to turn up, and the wind to turn down. Best wishes to engineering friends—with kind regards to Mr. Welles.

D. D. Porter

Confidential

Flagship “Malvern”:
off Smithville N. C. Jan 20. 1865

My dear Fox:

I mentioned in my dispatch that we had plenty of force to hold this place, and that so many guns etc. were bearing on the neck of land on which the troops were entrenched. This was written to mislead the rebels, for they read our morning papers almost as soon as we do.

The fact is, we cannot hold this place unless heavily reinforced at once.

It is too important a place for the rebels to give up without a struggle for it. If a gale comes on the outside vessels must go to sea, and the vessels in the river cannot reach the rebels, who are now entrenched in front of our troops. We can take the place again, no doubt, if we should lose it now, but that would be a long job again. *We want troops here*, we have barely six thousand (6000) men, and a number of them are negroes. No doubt the Lieut. General [Grant] thinks it enough but he has shown an indifference to the matter, *all the way through*, and permitted the most inefficient men in the country to come here. He displayed bad judgement in sending the few troops that came here and it is not his fault that we have all these important works in our possession now. We want thirteen thousand (13,000) men here, and that without delay and it will require higher authority than that of the Lieut. General to get them here, for I don't believe that he will move in the matter. He did not propose the expedition himself, and thus his indifference to the subject. I may say this from what I know of human nature and of the disposition of the General. I am not one of those who consider him the

¹⁴ A wooden screw steamer which was the supply vessel for the North Atlantic Blockading Squadron. She made several round trips a month from Hampton Roads, Virginia, to Beaufort.

¹⁵ Henry A. Wise was Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance.

military genius of the age, and think he makes mistakes. He alone is to blame for the first failure.

These are huge works here to hold with six thousand (6000) men, and none but foolish people would risk such a place with less than twenty thousand (20,000).

Now if my advice is not heeded, *you will see the consequences.*

I would like some light draft gun boats sent to Newbern at once.

The rebels will take that place and are getting ready for it now, which I am well informed of. If you would send double enders here (four) the place would be safe. I must keep enough at Plymouth to hold it.

Sherman depends on me to hold Newbern, but I cannot do so unless you send there some light draft gunboats at once.

We are having a jolly time with the blockade runners, which come into our trap.¹⁶ We almost kill ourselves laughing at their discomfiture, when they find they have set out their champagne to no purpose, and they say it is "a damned Yankee trick."

We caught two here last night. This is the greatest lark I ever was on, by a long shot. It beats all creation. I wish you were here to see all this.

Flag Ship "Malvern"
Cape Fear River N. C.
January 21st 1865

My Dear Fox:

The first thing we will want here will be a store vessel, the gunboats have to lighten to get over the Rips which is the inner bar about a mile and a half from Fort Fisher. We will have to keep a store vessel to lie on the outside of the rip and she must not draw more than ten feet to enable her to cross the bar. I don't know what we will do for provisions unless we get it from the army. If you can send at once a steamer drawing less than ten feet with supplies, it would much help us. Once across the rips with coal and ammunition in we are jammed and cant go back without lightening, moreover we cant leave our present position the enemy are strongly fortified at Sugarloaf Hill about five miles from here, and are daily increasing in numbers. I shall move up as soon as I get in ammunition and endeavor to make the place too hot to hold him. I suppose you all at home think we have nothing to do but dash ahead and take forts, dont imagine anything of the kind or you will be acting under a delusion. It will be as much as this army can do to hold its pres-

¹⁶ Unaware that Fort Fisher had fallen, blockade runners heading up river for Wilmington were prey for the Federal squadron.

ent position and I shall never be satisfied until I see 13,000 troops on the neck of land which possesses so much interest for us. [General Alfred] Terry¹⁷ like a young soldier wishes to push ahead, but I will not advise him to do so. If he should get too far away from his base and get licked he would be overthrown and cut to pieces by the Rebel cavalry of which they have a strong force here, and we have none. I never saw so small a force and one so badly equipped left to hold so important a place, and for God sake endeavor to have this reminder. A desperate rush would give us much trouble, what has been taken by one party can be taken by another. I am no alarmist, but I dont think that Grant understands the situation at all, otherwise he would not have written to me that the "only way to take the place was to run by gunboats," he knows as much about it as old Butler.

About four miles above us the Rebels have a strong work called Fort Anderson, it mounts twenty heavy guns, and is protected right abreast of it by a heavy row of timber planted right across the river held up with chains and everything else that ingenuity can devise.

It is quite amusing to hear a stupid fellow here called [Lt. Colonel Cyrus B.] Comstock (who advised Butler to run away the first time, and would have advised Terry if he had any run in him) asking why we dont run the batteries: that is the only idea a soldier has of a gunboat. They are quite astonished we did not bring the ironsides in!! it requires great patience to deal with fools, and I have no patience to spare. I shall bless the day when I am clear of the soldiers and on my native element again co-operating with no one but myself.

We are having a good time here though it is bite and cry with us. We will soon have to go fishing for a living, thank God there is plenty of fish. In the army the Bureaus look out for it without being asked. Wise has given us everything we wanted, and we have waited for nothing, there my obligation ends. The Bureau of Equipment & Recruiting though I have asked for men time after time, never sends any. I receive the old stereotyped letter "Your communication is received etc. etc." and that is the last of it. All we are indebted to that Bureau is for stopping our coal when we most needed it, and had I not seized some army coal, the expedition would have been defeated. . . . The Navigation Bureau has come up to time, but then we have not asked them for anything, but spy glasses. I dont believe in Bureaus, and if I happen to wish them bad, they will have worse luck than old Butler. If I fail by other people's bad judgement I will speak out.

¹⁷ Terry commanded the Federal troops which, with the aid of Porter's gunboats, assaulted and captured Fort Fisher in January, 1865.

We are having a jolly good time setting traps for Blockade runners, we captured two night before last, the most splendid vessels captured this war, "Stag" and "Charlotte." The "Charlotte" is the most valuable prize ever captured. I dont know what her cargo is but she is full of arms, blankets, big guns, provisions and the Lord knows what all. Cushing has charge of the trap. He does it up in style. He makes all kind of unintelligible signals and the Runners seem to think it is all right. Three came to the edge of the bar last night, made a signal and tried to get in but it blew a heavy gale and was so thick they could not see. The "Badger", "Whisper", "Banshee" and "Old Dominion" are expected in tonight, and I have a strong party down at Smithville to welcome them. They have jolly good suppers set out on their arrival and our fellows expect a good time tonight. I am pretty sure of one if the weather clears up, it is now blowing a gale.

I expect you were disappointed at our sailors not carrying the works, they ought to have done it, and would but for the infernal marines who were running away when the sailors were mounting the parapets, and every man fighting like a lion poor fellows, it was a rush of two hundred yards along an open beach.¹⁸ The five big ships instead of changing the fire as directed in general order, stopped (smart fellows) altogether, and gave the Rebels a hint, they mounted the parapets, and mowed our fellows down as they worked their way through a heavy stockade which our guns had knocked down in several places. It was a beautiful rush and a successful one for ten minutes. The grape and canister and minnie balls never stopped them until they reached the top of the parapet, and found themselves deserted by the marines. The officers suffered, twenty one of them killed and wounded in five minutes. We have the comfort of knowing that our [army] troops would not have gained their footing so easy, but for our [naval brigade's] assault, all the forces of the enemy were opposed to the sailors, thinking it the main assault, and, when the Rebels gave three cheers thinking they had won the day they got a volley in their backs from our soldiers who had got up on the parapets almost unnoticed. It was worth the loss we met with to take the place, for God sake dont let us lose it, don't mind what Grant says, work your best to get reinforcements sent here. We are now holding Smithville with sailors and marines, there are heavy works there, and it would injure us to let the Rebels get them back again, they could still get blockade runners to Smithville. . . .

¹⁸ Simultaneously with the military assault and the naval bombardment upon Fort Fisher in January, 1865, a brigade of Union bluejackets tried to storm the seafront of the fort, but were turned back with heavy losses.

The reaction after the last month's excitement has quite broken me down, my mind was on a stretch for a long time, and when the work was over I collapsed. I am all right again today, and have not smoked more than twelve segars. Remember me to Wise. I'll pray for him but no one else. I like the way he does up his work. He is a full rigged Bureau, with full steam power, 32 feet to the square inch, and 60 feet canvas to the square $\frac{1}{2}$ inch of Midship Section; with kind wishes for yourself and believe me.

Private

North Atlantic Squadron,
U. S. Flag-Ship "Malvern,"
Cape Fear River — Feb. 5 1865

My dear Fox:

Since you left here we have been quietly lying on our oars mounting guns and waiting for Grant's soldiers. In the meantime the rebels are making another Richmond of this, and will no doubt hold it for some time to come. I wonder what Grant would have done in case we had failed to take the place, and had been obliged to besiege it with 7,500 men?

Suppose the enemy in possession of the fort on one side, and in strong force on the Wilmington side with their present line—suppose a N. E. gale had blown or driven the ships on or off shore, what would have become of the troops on shore, hemmed in at both ends with the enemy at liberty to throw in re-inforcements as they pleased? They would have been gobbled [up] and then there would have been an outcry against the Navy. . . .

I see the [New York] *Times* is down on me about my monitor report—in saying that the "Monadnock could go to England and France and destroy towns" etc—I wonder if [Admiral Samuel Francis] Dupont¹⁹ ain't the chap who put out that feeler in hopes of getting up an argument—these things are not worth noticing—let those laugh who win.—

I sent you a report on forts the other day, and now send you a plan of an invulnerable fort! It will set General [John G.] Barnard almost crazy. I told him the other day that sailors were the only true engineers—he shook his head *very knowingly*—he admits though that we know how to knock forts down—do send him my plan of an invulnerable fort. It can't be whipped by ships—it can't be assaulted and it can't be blown up—The fellows inside will fight harder than any other people, because they will

¹⁹ Admiral DuPont was in command of the South Atlantic Blockading Squadron when Union monitors, trying to capture Charleston on April 7, 1863, were halted and driven back by the guns of Forts Sumter and Moultrie.

always "keep steam up." I am trying to get vessels off to Key West—those for Galveston have gone. Two for Key West have gone, and another was to have gone yesterday (the *Tristram Shandy*)²⁰ but that little jack—[Acting Master Charles] Dahlgren [commanding the "Gettysburg"] got under way without a pilot and smashed into the *T. Shandy*, and she has to go to Norfolk for repairs, and to be docked.

The *Lilian*²¹ is a very light draft, and if you will hurry them at Norfolk she can be ready in ten days, all the vessels are pretty well run down, and mostly want docking, which they can't get, out at Key West. I am at a loss what vessels to send—but in ten days, two or three might be started from Norfolk. The rebs still keep up flashing lights at little River inlet, and no doubt [blockade running] vessels will attempt to run in there, we have to look out for that place—there is 9 feet water there. I am very tired waiting for Grant, and hope he will be along soon. . . .

I think he intends to send them to Wilmington by way of Newberne—it is a long march but could be easily done at this moment.

I enclose you the article from the [New York] *Times*—it will amuse you—it reminds one of a "gnat swallowing a camel", or something of that kind. Between the *Times*, and *Post*, and Greeley *et alias*, and the young man who does up the scoldings, I am afraid I shall be brought to grief.

Well, as there is only one more Fort to take now, and as Sherman will kill that, it is likely I would not be much of a loss—

North Atlantic Squadron
U. S. Flag-Ship "Malvern,"
Cape Fear River Feb. 10 1865

My dear Fox:

The *Rhode Island*²² got back here I think on a misunderstanding so I send her back to Fortress Monroe at once to wait the War Committee.²³ Don't fear of their making anything out of me; they will go back thinking I am the cleverest fellow they ever saw—I don't wear a long feather, big boots, and spurs, and have a long sword jingling after me, which I know is very impressive, but I keep a good larder, and some good champagne which is always a pass-port to a sensible man's heart. Some of

²⁰ An iron side-wheeler steamer. Captured by the "Kansas" at sea, "Tristram Shandy" was purchased by the Union Navy Department from the Boston Prize Court in May, 1864.

²¹ A steel side-wheel steamer. Captured at sea while running the Union blockade, "Lilian" was purchased by the Union Navy Department from the Philadelphia Prize Court on September 6, 1864.

²² A wooden side-wheel steamer.

²³ The Congressional Committee on the Conduct of War.

the troops have arrived, and this seems likely to become the theatre of war—whether it will be comedy or tragedy, remains to be seen. I send you two slips from the rebel papers.

I have not found that letter yet, but it is not lost—I shall find it, in some of my coat pockets.

BOOK REVIEWS

Brother John's Canaan in Carolina. By W. Wyan Washburn.
(Salisbury: Privately printed. 1958. Pp. 335. Illustrations.)

For 65 of his 86 years the Reverend John William Suttle has been a Missionary Baptist "country preacher" in North Carolina. Son of a substantial Cleveland County farmer, he was ordained at the age of 17 and then spent two years at the Southern Baptist Seminary. He has held pastorates in 37 churches in North and South Carolina, once holding 11 simultaneously in Johnston County. For 40 years he was moderator of the King's Mountain Baptist Association and in 1948 was elected president of the Baptist State Convention.

Dr. W. Wyan Washburn, friend and physician of Mr. Suttle, wrote this book as a "labor of love" (p. 10). He consulted church records, corresponded with friends of "Brother John," examined Mrs. Suttle's scrapbooks and worked over each chapter with the subject himself. For half the book he describes the successive pastorates that Mr. Suttle held, giving statistics on baptisms, funds raised, and building improvements, and pointing up Mr. Suttle's interest in the total religious life of the communities which he served. Prominent church members are acknowledged by name and sometimes by reference to their service; the book is replete with anecdotes and personal experiences, all narrated with dubbed-in conversation. In the background there is a good description of rural North Carolina culture at the turn of the century and of the life of its pastors. The last half of the book is composed of a number of topical chapters on phases of Mr. Suttle's work: his experiences at weddings and funerals, his transportation problems, his theology, his pulpit methods, and others.

Mr. Suttle's activities and accomplishments are both thoroughly and interestingly catalogued and this frail reviewer has only one comment. Dr. Washburn stated that Mr. Suttle "made mistakes, bitter errors in judgment" (p. 299), but

failed to cite them. Their inclusion would have done "Brother John" no injustice and his career would stand even better revealed.

W. B. Yearnis.

Wake Forest College,
Winston-Salem.

The Life and Times of Sir Archie: The Story of America's Greatest Thoroughbred, 1805-1833. By Elizabeth Amis Cameron Blanchard and Manly Wade Wellman. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 1958. Pp. xiii, 198. Illustrations and appendices. \$5.00.)

The first quarter of the nineteenth century was a colorful era in American history. Much has been written to describe the American way of life during this period. It is doubtful, however, if most readers are aware of the extreme interest taken then, especially among southerners, in horse racing. It was a sport that was enjoyed by all, rich and poor, respectable and otherwise.

The Life and Times of Sir Archie is an interesting and well-written account of this sport and especially of the part played in it by one of America's most famous race horses. This horse, Sir Archie, once owned by William R. Davie, spent most of his life on the plantation of the Amis family in Northampton County, North Carolina. By the time he was five years old, his record on the race track was such that no turfman would enter his horse against him. But before his death in 1833, Sir Archie had sired many horses whose fame, together with that of their own progeny, would rival that of their illustrious sire. In fact, most of the famous race horses of modern times in America, including War Admiral and Man o' War, were descended from Sir Archie.

The "times" of Sir Archie produced many colorful characters, human as well as equine. Among Sir Archie's neighbors and admirers was Robert Potter, the demagogic, but forceful, politician who later became Senator and Secretary of the Navy of the Republic of Texas. Turfman John Randolph of

Roanoke owned many of Sir Archie's sons and daughters but allowed himself to become involved in a "scandal" concerning the identity of the famous horse's sire.

Mrs. Blanchard, a descendant of the Amis family of Northampton County, began this study of Sir Archie and his times, but she died many years ago, leaving only a mass of notes. Mr. Wellman, who did the actual writing, used her notes and contemporary publications for sportsmen, as well as considerable other material relating to Sir Archie and his times, both published and unpublished.

John Mitchell Justice.

Appalachian State Teacher College,
Boone.

Give Me Liberty: The Struggle for Self-Government in Virginia.

By Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker. (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society. 1958. Pp. ix, 275. Illustrations, essay on sources, and index. \$3.00.)

Give Me Liberty is a scholarly and stirring account of the struggle for self-government in Virginia. It is an appropriate reminder to later generations of the truth of Thomas Jefferson's observation: "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

According to Professor Wertenbaker, the establishment of self-government in Virginia was largely the work of men, such as Sir Edwin Sandys, who were opposed to Stuart absolutism in England. The Virginia Assembly, established in 1619, sought to imitate the English Parliament by gradually increasing its powers; largely through the use of the "power of the purse." At every step the struggle between the Assembly and the Governors paralleled the struggle between King and Parliament in England, and the victory of Parliament in the Glorious Revolution of 1688 assured victory of the Assembly over the Governors in Virginia.

In the eighteenth century, the long period of Walpole's policy of salutary neglect, the appointment of more amenable Governors, and the extended colonial struggle between England and France, enabled the Virginians to chip away the

King's power and to increase their own measure of self-government until "their Governors became their servants rather than their masters" (p. 150). Perhaps the two most important points which Professor Wertenbaker makes is that the American Revolution was based more on constitutional rights than on economic interests, and that it was fought not to attain self-government, but to keep what had already been achieved.

Give Me Liberty, like the liberty it describes, is the fruit of many years of painstaking effort. The author is adept at drawing pen-portraits of the leading figures and at analyzing and exposing the maneuvers of the Governors and the Assembly. A map of Colonial Virginia and a chronological list of Governors would have been useful to those unfamiliar with Virginia history.

Percival Perry.

Wake Forest College,
Winston-Salem.

The London Diary (1717-1721) and Other Writings. By William Byrd of Virginia. Edited by Louis B. Wright and Marion Tinling. (New York: Oxford University Press. 1958. Pp. vii, 647. Preface and index. \$10.00.)

William Byrd II (1674-1744) was at home in London. Only seven when his father packed him across the Atlantic to get the education of a gentleman, he spent twenty-seven of his first forty-five years in England. After a thorough grounding in the classics and an apprenticeship in business, he entered the Middle Temple. As a member of one of the Inns of Court, Byrd mingled with the best London Society, associating alike with noblemen and scholars.

On the death of his father, Byrd returned to Virginia, a wealthy young aristocrat. He married the beautiful Lucy Parke and settled down at Westover. His life in Virginia is delightfully recounted in *The Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover*, edited by Wright and Tinling some years ago.

Business took Byrd to England in 1715. Lucy followed him but, after a brief whirl in London society, she died of small-

pox. Left a widower, Byrd played the man about town, a role in which he was already well-schooled. His diary, kept in an old shorthand, is at once revealing in its unabashed honesty and disappointing in its terseness. When Byrd wished to entertain his friends he could write charmingly, as the extracts of his more famous books appended to this volume prove, but his diary was not intended for the eyes of others. It is a synopsis for Byrd's own use, but from its pages emerges a wonderful picture of the London gentleman of the time of George I. Morals were at a low ebb and Byrd's relations with the ladies of the street contrast sharply with his faithful Bible reading and prayers.

The last part of the diary deals with Byrd's return voyage and with life in Virginia. Forced by financial difficulties to spend his last years in Virginia, he was always an English gentleman cherishing his London friends. *Another Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover, 1739-1741* has already been published.

Historians are greatly indebted to the two editors for this fine, scholarly edition of the *London Diary*.

William M. E. Rachal.

Virginia Historical Society,
Richmond.

History of Prince Edward County, Virginia, from Its Earliest Settlements through Its Establishment in 1754 to Its Bicentennial Year. By Herbert Clarence Bradshaw. (Richmond: The Dietz Press, Inc. 1955. Pp. xxii, 934. \$10.00.)

To have written a book of this size and seen it through the press within some three or four years of part-time work is a prodigious achievement. To have recorded so comprehensively the history of this particular county is indeed a *useful* achievement as well—and that in connection with a subject of above-average significance, both past and present. Nor could the accomplishment have been much more timely. The county's bicentennial could be foreseen and was; but neither Mr. Bradshaw nor anyone else foresaw that in May of its bi-

centennial the United States Supreme Court would focus international attention upon the public schools of Prince Edward. The story of that spotlight is told on pages 499-503; and on page 829 appears an addendum revealing the county's reaction a full year later. As these words are written in 1958, there are those who predict that Prince Edward will be on the front pages again soon.

Let us hope for nothing drastic to make this review as timely as was the book. Literally, the reviewer has hesitated to evaluate the volume lest in haste he do it an injustice. Through more than two years he has turned often to it, read it, studied it, and put it to several tests as a reference for other purposes. He has discovered a few inconsequential flaws. But at last he has come to a decision: this monumental volume of roughly a million words is, so far as he knows, the outstanding, most useful, and probably the most significant local history of any Southern community published in his and the author's generation. Yet it is not enough to assert this conclusion. What else can a seemingly dilatory but actually admiring reviewer say within twice the few hundred words initially allotted by the editor?

Consider first the size of the volume. Counting the unnumbered pages used for the 71 illustrations, it comprises just under 1,000 pages. Sturdily bound in cloth, it is three inches thick. Its 21 textual chapters fill more than 650 pages. Appendixes add almost 10 per cent more. There are about 3,500 footnotes printed on 113 rear pages of small type. The index, which includes about 9,000 personal and proper names and subject entries, fills almost 90 pages.

Consider next the author's qualifications. Mr. Bradshaw acknowledges by name the distinctive bits of assistance he received from almost 80 individuals; and he makes his bows also to about a dozen institutions impersonally. But only he had the initiative, the ability, and the persistence to produce this reportorial labor of love. His paternal and maternal roots lay in the county; he was born and educated in it; he began to write parts of its history for its chief newspaper fully two decades ago; he served for some years as a Southside Virginia

educator; he has developed his journalistic talents through several additional years of writing and editorial work for the Durham newspapers. He has frequented the major research libraries within a reasonable distance both North and South of his native county; and he has tirelessly followed by mail every clue or hint that he could not track down in person. (Incidentally, he has concluded, in view of the richness of the Duke University Library's collections and of its open doors to night workers, that "Durham is an ideal place for a person engaged in historical research on Southern topics to live.") And he has maintained constantly his connections with Prince Edward.

Finally, consider the nature and merits of the book. With encyclopedic completeness, it comprehends every worthwhile aspect of the county's life—and all in balance, for in even so massive a compilation the thorough researcher had to be selective, a skill in which good journalists often excel. Evidently with a newspaper man's respect for the names-make-news formula, but also for other stated reasons, Mr. Bradshaw has mentioned individuals by the thousands. In style the story is told readably enough; in perspective it is not too provincial, not written as if Prince Edward developed in a vacuum; in tone it is not too laudatory. As for scholarship, Mr. Bradshaws' purpose was more to record and to comment than it was to compare and to assess. His readers should not expect to find in the resultant narrative brilliant expositions evincing rigid application of the severest standards of historical criticism to the extant evidence. But readers can and will find ample evidence of an able feature writer's skills applied, after superjournalistic thoroughness in research, to a subject that was a voluntary, self-imposed assignment.

Mr. Bradshaw's labor of love was not pursued with blind love. Rather, he persisted because he found it meaningful. So, also, will readers who reward his effort with a reasonable fraction of the countless hours he spent upon it. Possibly also, will that larger number who consult this book for answers to small questions rather than in quest for understanding of the county's entire history. Both groups will be grateful to

the author. He knew what he wanted to do; he did it well; the result is worthy of his uncommonly energetic effort and of uncommonly eager, frequent use on our part.

W. Edwin Hemphill.

Virginia State Library,
Richmond.

Memphis during the Progressive Era, 1900-1917. By William D. Miller. (Memphis, Tenn.: The Memphis State University Press; Madison, Wisconsin: The American History Research Center. 1957. Pp. ix, 242. Illustrations, notes, and index. \$4.50.)

The point of view of this book is mainly political, though there is necessarily an examination of some of the sociological aspects of urbanization, and notice is taken of the effects of industrialization. Memphis newspapers and personal interviews seem to have been the chief sources; the author states that the records of the county court were not made available to him. Little effort is made to go behind the election returns and explain the mainsprings of political action. It is clear, however, that the political leaders usually had an understanding with the influential guides of the "lower element," and that it was not unusual to make use of colored voters in critical elections. In keeping with the tenets of the progressives, it was assumed that if the people could express themselves at the polls, then justice would be done and the corrupt politicians and the special interests vanquished. Oddly enough, the leader who finally emerged to lead this democratic protest was none other than "Boss" E. H. Crump.

By the turn of the century Memphis was one of the fastest growing cities in the South. White supremacy was unquestioned; docile and cheap labor was abundant; and the flourishing industries of lumber, cottonseed, lager beer, and snuff were being served by improved transportation. This economic progress created social stresses. A recurrent theme is the difficulty experienced by rural people adjusting themselves to city ways, one reason why Memphis was "easily the most

crime-ridden city in the United States." The homicide rate led it to be called the "murder town" of the country.

Strong leadership was necessary if "urban progressivism" was to promote the "Calvinistic ideals of bourgeois respectability" in the face of "rural newcomers who were susceptible of political manipulation." Crump, who proved to be the strong leader, deserted business for politics. On occasion he would lead a short crusade against sin. More importantly, he denounced the "interests"; he was efficient; and he understood practical politics, if not the theories of the progressives. Without the "demagogic use of the issues of either race or religion" he became "a permanent and absolutely controlling factor in the politics of Memphis and Shelby County." "By temperament Crump was a progressive," and he was "an outstanding progressive leader" as mayor. He was "responsive to the humanitarianism of progressivism." Whether or not the end justified the means is an interesting question.

One suspects that in Professor Miller's book there is more confidence in Crump than in progressivism. It is an interesting and readable study, and the same author's announced biography of Crump will be awaited with interest.

Robert H. Woody.

Duke University,
Durham.

Railroads in Alabama Politics, 1875-1914. By James F. Doster. University of Alabama Studies, Number 12. (University of Alabama Press, 1957. Pp. x, 273. Maps, notes, bibliography, and index. \$5.00, cloth bound; \$4.00, paper bound.)

This volume by Professor Doster, also author of *Alabama's First Railroad Commission, 1881-1885* (University, Ala., 1949) and various scholarly articles on Alabama railroads, deals with the relations of the railroads and the government of Alabama during the years of Bourbonism, Populism, and Progressivism. The emphasis and considerably more than half of the book, however, is on the latter period after 1900.

Effective railroad regulation came later in Alabama than in most southern states. Although the Alabama Railroad Commission was established in 1881, it did not have plenary powers as in Georgia. Under its able chairman, Walter L. Bragg, the commission met with initial successes but its influence declined after the legislature refused to give it additional powers in 1885. In the 'nineties, railroads became more numerous and powerful and popular demand for railroad regulation increased. Alabama Populists, who never got control of the state government, were either unable or unwilling to make effective railroad regulation as basic a part of their program as Populists in other states. As Populism waned, Alabama conservatives called the Constitutional Convention of 1901 in order to write as much of the status quo as possible into the fundamental law. Railroads and other corporate interests dominated that body and thwarted all reform at that time. However, a popular wave for reform under the leadership of Braxton Bragg Comer soon ensued.

The second and major part of the book is organized around three major contenders, Braxton Bragg Comer, chairman of the Alabama Railroad Commission (1904), and governor of Alabama (1906); Milton Hannibal Smith, president of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad and an empire-building mogul who defied the Interstate Commerce Commission as well as state commissions; and Thomas Goode Jones, conservative Federal Judge in Montgomery, who although a lifelong Democrat had been appointed judge in 1901 by Theodore Roosevelt. In the fight over railroad regulation both Bragg and Smith led a formidable host into battle and each vowed no compromise of principle. The state adopted effective laws regulating railroads; and the railroad companies led by Smith appealed to Federal Judge Jones for injunctions against what they called confiscatory state laws. Jones granted temporary injunctions and was charged with being a railroad partisan. Comer called the legislature into session and passed additional drastic regulatory codes for railroads. Smith again appealed to Judge Jones who in turn interposed federal injunctions. A stalemate ensued and the contest violently disturbed state politics for years.

This story is told by the author with thorough documentation, in a readable style, and in great detail. Copious footnotes are included often with additional material. The work is written in the main from newspaper files, state and federal documents, records of various state officials and agencies, and other contemporary published sources. Perhaps, because of the sparsity of manuscript letters and other material, so vital to an analysis of the motives and character of people, the main participants sometimes fail to emerge as real persons. The author also has the disadvantage of pioneering in a new field. A synthesis of railroad participation in Alabama politics is an extremely difficult task when little narrative material exists and the work must be done mainly from primary sources. Existing material has been used effectively and the book is a work of merit. The stimulus provided by its publication should lead others to similar tasks for other southern states. A good index and a meticulously prepared bibliography add to the value of the book.

Malcolm C. McMillan.

Alabama Polytechnic Institute,
Auburn.

Separate and Unequal: Public School Campaigns and Racism in the Southern Seaboard, 1901-1915. By Louis R. Harlan. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 1958. Pp. xii, 290. \$6.00.)

The tide of racism along the Southern seaboard reached its crest in the years 1901-1915. At the same time the area made phenomenal gains in education. Following the pattern set during Reconstruction, the schools were separate and unequal. In his book Louis Harlan concentrates on the inequality of the schools and has little to say about the causes of racism. Perhaps the point is minor and well within the author's right to define his field, but this reviewer cannot help think that a more complete understanding of the inequality would have followed a look into the causes of the racism. It

is somewhat like trying to describe an animal by measuring its tail.

School systems in North and South Carolina, Virginia, and Georgia are examined in detail. Similarity in the pattern of discrimination is a unifying factor in the book and statistics are abundantly and painstakingly set forth. Expenditure per child of school age is the yardstick used, though it is not clear why the more appropriate measure would not be expenditure per pupil enrolled, as used by some students in the field. Either way the picture is not a pretty one.

The reader may experience some confusion with such terms of apparent mysticism as "apostate Readjuster" and "dedicated Redeemer." The author presumably has some confusion as to the cost of the "White Man's Burden" which, at one point, he says "rested lightly indeed." Yet the book makes plain that one of the toughest problems of the educators was to keep white racists from spending on Negro education only the proportion of money which Negroes paid in taxes. Though the amount of taxes paid by Negroes had no legal bearing on the Negroes' share, it was undeniably a factor in determining not only what Negro schools received but, more important, the advisability of attempting any larger support for anyone's education.

The several northern philanthropic agencies interested in southern education are examined and found wanting. They "were not as concerned about Negro civil rights as had been the humanitarian radicals of an earlier generation." The Southern Education Board "lacked the moral firmness of such a movement as Gandhi's Soul Force." On the contemporary scene only W. E. B. DuBois receives full approval from Mr. Harlan. Historically, one may be surprised to learn that the "introduction of the Northeastern public school to the South was an important war aim of the North in the Civil War. . . ."

The problems blocking educational advance were many. The states were relatively poor; "have" groups opposed taxation to educate "have-not" groups; mill owners opposed compulsory attendance and child labor laws; urban areas, with local taxes, opposed state appropriations for rural schools;

white politicians in predominantly white counties fought with white politicians in predominantly black counties; white opposed Negro. In the face of these complexities, crusading educators were successful if their efforts be tested by educational advancement for both races, unsuccessful if tested by the standard of equality. The author sticks to the latter test, with regional comparisons thrown in for good measure. Apparently the effort in North Carolina was a failure by either test: "Despite its rhetoric, the Aycock era was one of rapid deterioration in the concept of universal education, and of retrogression in the actual facilities provided for Negro schoolchildren"—a strong statement that is belied by the author's later statistics.

Legal impediments are impatiently treated. In 1887 the North Carolina General Assembly passed a school appropriation act that went beyond the limits provided by the State Constitution. The North Carolina Supreme Court, understandably, struck down the law as unconstitutional. The 1899 General Assembly repealed the dead law and, notes Mr. Harlan, "kept piously within the constitutional maximum of taxation." Georgia was paying its teachers in script and "the state treasurer refused to divert to teachers' salaries the half-million surplus in the treasury because of his bonded pledge to apply it to the old funded state debt." It would appear, on the face of it, that the treasurer's "refusal" kept him out of jail, and one wonders what might become of constitutional government without "pious" people who consider constitutional limitations important.

Taken altogether, this book is provocative and interesting. It is easy to see the 1901-1915 period, however much ameliorated by later years, as an invitation to the recent decision of the United States Supreme Court. The major defect of the book is that Mr. Harlan has written it on the new bias which somehow is supposed to be more acceptable than the old.

Winston Broadfoot.

Hillsboro.

Neither Black Nor White. By Wilma Dykeman and James Stokely. (New York: Rinehart and Company, 1957. Pp. 371. \$5.00.)

By traveling thousands of miles throughout the South and carefully asking questions and taking voluminous notes, the authors have recorded individual reactions to the decision of the Supreme Court in 1954 preparing the way for public school integration. Adopting the language of Robert Frost, they took not a "regional" approach (they do recognize that "the South" is the sum of quite different parts), but declared themselves to be "realists"—undertaking to "discover, record and interpret a realm of experience, a republic of the human mind." It should have been quite clear to these native southerners before they started their journey that their family's "allegiance" to Calhoun and Grady weighed heavily upon them and with a heavy conscience they would find it difficult to be objective, but rather carry on as crusaders. We can believe that they "searched for facts, but remembered that Mark Twain said there are three kinds of lies: plain lies, damned lies and statistics." We can believe that as they journeyed they sought "courage of judgment and clarity." Courage of conviction is apparent and the reports of conversations are clear and pungent, but in candor it must be said that the end result could have been much more meaningful if more attention had been given to statistics or statistical methods.

Much harm or distortion of truth has been accomplished by regional studies which do not relate themselves to the total national picture. Either other dedicated teams should have been recording opinion in New England, the Mid-West or the West Coast, or perhaps if half our authors' mileage had been spent in other sections we would have known basically as much about the reactions over the South and had other opinions to help in drawing more valid conclusions as to how Americans everywhere reacted to the particular methods for achieving integration as decreed by the Supreme Court. Perhaps we would have found that the people were ready for a new amendment to the Constitution and the decision method with its accompanying heartaches was not the best method

available. It is impossible to tell from the material at hand that evidence along this line was sought.

This is a controversial book and should be read by the members of the Supreme Court, legislators in Washington, Raleigh, or Richmond, members of school boards, all school officials, church leaders, members of Chambers of Commerce and the service clubs—but the authors should have had someone go over the manuscript and summarize for the reader what the numerous garagemen tended to support or oppose; the carpenters' viewpoint; the wage-earners' viewpoint; the difference between state Senators and members of Houses of Representatives; differences in views of low-high income groups, etc. and then show if these conclusions were valid in Georgia and Texas, in Virginia and Florida. If the authors decided to leave a picture of great confusion of minds over what is best to do and when to do it, they have succeeded. There is some effort at organization by chapters. One of the most compact chapters deals with "Pressure on the Press," but when this reviewer attempted to relocate references to Hodding Carter, Buford Boone, and Ronnie Dugger he found there was no index. This is a major weakness in a book of this type and should be remedied in a second printing.

A statistical report on Tennessee Baptist ministers (p. 268) was valuable. However, the failure to indicate what Baptist leadership in Texas thinks of Rev. Mr. W. A. Criswell's extreme position on many subjects is significant. Furthermore, it might have been expected that his reactionary position would have been balanced by a front line fighter for integration, Austin's University Baptist Church's pastor, Dr. Blake Smith. One may happen to notice a reference to him in a chapter on "Pistols and Pocketbooks" (p. 297). Yet, neither one of these men speaks for the rest of the Baptist leaders. Also, Rev. Mr. Louis Newton's position on the Social Service Commission report to Georgia Baptists deserves fuller treatment. In dealing with Negro leadership in the churches, the reference to Nat Turner seems to be an unfortunate one, especially as the Montgomery bus boycott did not get out of hand, and the authors stretched even poetic license on the

morning of December 21, 1956, when they unloosed their imaginations and wondered "if some of the ghosts of 1861 might be lurking nearby" (p. 282). Despite the evidences of violence and bitterness, there is much truth in the report of the Negro woman who started riding the buses after the boycott and the Supreme Court decision—it describes many people in the South—black and white—"My bus driver I hadn' seen in a year welcomed me back this mornin'. Like my family I work for: they told me to stay off the buses, they didn' blame us for what we's doin' " (p. 284). To repeat, despite faults of organization and the difficulty of using it properly without an index, the book ought to be read for the many facts therein, but it needs to be studied carefully.

Robert C. Cotner.

The University of Texas,
Austin.

Entangling Alliance: Politics and Diplomacy under George Washington. By Alexander DeConde. (Durham: Duke University Press. 1958. Pp. xi, 511. \$7.50.)

This is a coherent story of the "Politics and Diplomacy" during Washington's administration, holding the French treaty nearly always in focus. DeConde shows how the people and parties in America became divided along the lines of their social standing and diplomatic predilections into pro-British and pro-French groups. He assumes the alliance was doomed because the Hamiltonian program was designed to create a harmonious relationship with Britain. The story is not complete. The author may be correct in stating the alliance was dead by the end of Washington's administration; yet it played an important part in American diplomacy for another four years.

The work is based mostly on source materials—primarily American, but some British and French. A number of the more important secondary works are used. It is an excellent piece of research.

Fortunately the footnotes are at the bottom of each page, and in this book they must be there, for they contain not only citations and clarifications but also much general information. Sometimes the reader gets a feeling that he is reading parallel accounts of the same subject. Obviously a large portion of the material in the notes belongs in the main text. For instance, when discussing the Genet-inspired plans for attacking Louisiana and the Floridas in 1794 (pp. 250-251) he says if Fauchet had not called a halt "the leaders of the projects . . . would at least have attempted them." In a footnote he adds that they would probably have been successful, too.

DeConde is clearly searching for the truth, yet he leans toward the anti-federalist side. He describes Washington's farewell address as a "piece of partisan politics" (p. 465) and says, "From the beginning, Washington's foreign policy was a partisan policy" (p. 508).

Professor DeConde teaches at the University of Michigan, and has previously taught at Stanford, Whittier, and Duke. This book should establish him among the able American historians.

Gilbert L. Lycan.

Stetson University,
Deland, Florida.

The Jeffersonian Republicans: The Formation of Party Organization, 1789-1801. By Noble E. Cunningham Jr. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 1957. Pp. x, 279. \$6.00.)

The purpose of this book is accurately stated in its subtitle. It is an attempt to trace the Jeffersonian party (of which James Madison appears the real leader for about the first five years) from its nebulous beginnings in the early 1790's (the author discounts the Beard thesis of a connection with the Anti-Federalists of 1787-89) to its triumph in 1800-1801. Emphasis is placed on party leadership, party machinery, and campaign practices on the national, state, and local levels. An exhaustive study of the correspondence, published and un-

published, of political leaders, and of lesser figures, has been made. Such constitutes the author's main sources but the contemporary press and secondary works have also been utilized.

At least two general tendencies are observable in the story of party evolution, first the slow growth and second the growth from the top down. On the first point, the old oversimplification whereby Hamilton's financial program served as a sort of wand—magic or otherwise—to summon into existence the Federalists and the Republicans is discarded. Neither funding nor assumption made Jefferson an immediate political enemy of the Secretary of the Treasury. The cleavage first appears at the time of the plan for the bank when Jefferson began writing friends urging care in the selection of members to the next Congress. In this Second Congress Dr. Cunningham finds the beginning of political alignments and the book contains an appendix showing how the members of the lower house voted with or against Madison on important measures. Possible party divisions of subsequent congresses are examined. A real tightening of party lines is found in the national election of 1796 after which Jefferson takes command. The author refrains from wide generalizations and while pointing out party developments warns that party organization is far from complete. Nothing happened suddenly. The establishment of Freneau's *National Gazette* was a long process and only slowly were party names adopted.

On the second point, according to the author, there was very little of a "grass roots" nature in party formation, national or state, in the 1790's. He takes issue with Claude G. Bowers and Wilfred E. Binkley who view the party as a consolidation of scattered local groups. Rather he follows the approach of Harry M. Tinkcom's study of Pennsylvania politics for the same period. Cunningham notes that even the popular meetings featured in the newspapers of the time were "not infrequently guided." One wonders why in the extensive use of the correspondence of leaders and in the proceedings of Congress, the Senate is entirely ignored especially after that body abandoned its closed sessions. It would be interesting to examine senatorial affiliations on the Jay Treaty

and on the Alien and Sedition Acts. In the section on the press the names of William Duane, William Cobbett, and James Carey find no place.

A few typographical errors are evident such as willing for willingly (p. ix) and in footnotes — fortunately placed at the bottom of the page — such as Winnston for Winston (p. 8), 1913 for 1931 (p. 134) and Sigler for Seigler (p. 233). William Loughton Smith, the South Carolina Federalist, appears as William L. Smith and as William Smith (there was a Republican William Smith in Congress from South Carolina at the same time) and in the Index he is bracketed with a William Smith from Maryland. However, such minor errors do not detract from a book that is both valuable and stimulating. The reviewer looks forward to its sequel promised on the jacket.

D. H. Gilpatrick.

Furman University,
Greenville, South Carolina.

The American Heritage Book of Great Historic Places. By the Editors of American Heritage, with the Narrative by Richard M. Ketchum and an Introduction by Bruce Catton. (New York: American Heritage Publishing Company, Inc., in cooperation with Simon and Schuster, Inc. 1957. Pp. 376. Illustrations, maps, and index. \$12.50.)

Under the direction of such talented men as Publisher James Parton and Editor Bruce Catton, *American Heritage* magazine has become eminently and justly successful during the past few years. In one important respect its success and value are measured by the magazine's impressive popular appeal to large segments of the general public. In format, subject matter, subject treatment, and style *American Heritage* has freed itself from the conventional forms of historical publication. It makes a distinction between *history* and *heritage*. It also makes a distinction between scholarly and popular demands.

These observations apply equally to the *Book of Great Historic Places*, which is a direct outgrowth of editorial experience with the magazine. The editors seldom miss opportunities for the selling of American history. In view of the swelling tide of interest in this country in historic places and shrines, a more timely subject in the magazine's chosen field could hardly be evoked. This is the first of what may develop into a series of special volumes on large popular subjects.

This folio book of 376 pages presents the country by sections—New England, the “Atlantic Gateway” states, the Appalachian Frontier country, the Old South, etc., in that order. For each region there is a profusely illustrated (both color and black-and-white) general section dealing with selected places and events, followed with a regional map and a listing by states of outstanding historic sites in the area.

The northeastern part of the country (New England and the “Atlantic Gateway” area) gets a disproportionate share of the total space—more than a third of the book. This is possibly due to the fact that in this part of the country they may have done more to preserve their historic places and to keep their heritage alive. In the Old South, Virginia—land of many presidents, Williamsburg, and Tidewater plantations—gets main billing. North Carolina is middling well-treated in features on the Lost Colony, pirates, and the Wright Brothers' first airplane flight. Fort Sumter, certainly one of the country's drama-fraught historic spots, is hardly mentioned and is illustrated only by a dim though dramatic black-and-white contemporary print. Paul Revere's Ride, on the other hand, receives nearly five pages, with elaborate and splendid illustration.

Another small matter that southerners may carp about is the arrangement by which the Appalachian Frontier (Kentucky, Tennessee, and West Virginia) is made to follow the section on the New York-Pennsylvania-Maryland area, inviting the false impression that this country is more an extension of the North than the South.

In spite of such defects which any regional reviewer might feel impelled to note, *American Heritage* has produced a vol-

ume of impressive ephemeral, if not permanent, value. Very frankly, it is an effort to sell Americans on their heritage—by means of the “soft sell” method. This reviewer believes this to be a valid motivation and hopes the *Book of Great Historic Places* will be bought by the hundreds of thousands and that it will serve in as many families as a stimulating introduction and guidebook to America’s historic places.

W. S. Tarlton.

State Department of Archives and History,
Raleigh.

American Protestantism and Social Issues, 1919-1939. By Robert Moats Miller. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1958. Pp. xiv, 385. \$6.00.)

This study attempts to discover how the Protestant churches faced up to the most fundamental problems confronting American society during the two decades between the First and Second World Wars. Thirteen major denominations are surveyed with respect to five broad areas of social concern: civil liberties, labor, race relations, war and peace, and the contending merits of capitalism, socialism, and communism.

Churches and churchmen express their attitudes so frequently, so voluminously, and often so contradictorily that the problem of dealing with a subject of this nature is mainly one of selection. Significant and extensive sources available to and used by Professor Miller include official minutes and other records of the national meetings of the thirteen denominations studied, plus the records of the Federal Council of Churches; the religious press; and pronouncements made by leading churchmen in published sermons and articles, books, autobiographies, and polls. Also used were the files of the American Civil Liberties Union, the publications of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and the records of the Socialist Party (at Duke University).

To reduce this vast and complex mass of material into a definitive synthesis that can be encompassed in one volume is

manifestly a task bordering on the impossible. Professor Miller recognizes this fact and freely admits that his study is of a fragmentary nature. He has, however, advanced and ably demonstrated certain definite conclusions: that during the 1920's and 1930's the Protestant churches continued their historical tradition of deep concern with the structure and functioning of society; that this concern was greater in the latter decade when neo-orthodoxy under the leadership of Reinhold Niebuhr provided a theological underpinning which the earlier Social Gospel had pretty much lacked; and that however misguided and unsuccessful many of the churches' crusades were, they nevertheless represented genuine attempts on the part of the churches to remove existing evils. Another virtue of this study is that it supplements and to some extent corrects the familiar histories of modern America which either slight or distort the role of the churches as social institutions.

James W. Patton.

The University of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill.

The Cabinet Diary of William L. Wilson, 1896-1897. Edited by Festus P. Summers. With an Introduction by Newton D. Baker. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 1957. Pp. xxvii, 276. \$5.00.)

By publishing this diary, which clearly was not intended for publication originally, the University of North Carolina Press has put many lovers of history in its debt. The diary is that of one of the ablest men in public life during the 'nineties, and covers the last fourteen months of Grover Cleveland's second administration. It is the only day-by-day record of the time kept by a member of the President's cabinet.

William Lyne Wilson (1843-1900) was a Virginian who grew up in Charles Town and early showed precocity, especially in public speaking. He attended Columbian College in Washington, D. C., and the University of Virginia. During the Civil War he served with the Twelfth Virginia Cavalry.

At Columbian College after the war he taught Latin and also studied law. Wilson practiced law for eleven years in Charles Town (now in West Virginia) and for one year was president of West Virginia University. In the 'eighties and 'nineties he served six successive terms in the House of Representatives, where his uncommon moral and intellectual qualities, his brilliance as a speaker and debater, and his valiant battle for tariff reform made him a national figure. A few months after his defeat in the Republican upsurge of 1894 President Cleveland appointed him Postmaster General. During the last three years of his life he was president of Washington and Lee University.

Wilson's diary is an engrossing personal document. There are glimpses of cabinet meetings at which the threat of war with England or the Cuban revolt was discussed, and of others where "nothing special" came up but which ran the customary two hours anyway; vignettes of Grover Cleveland and his Postmaster General sitting up at the White House until 2 A.M. making difficult decisions on applications for postmasterships; accounts of the discovery of fraud in the postal service and of the beginning of rural free delivery; and panoramas of the social whirl of official Washington and the Bryan-McKinley campaign of 1896. Readers will feel the diarist's discomfort as deadlines for the preparation of speeches and articles approached, his concern for the physical and economic well-being of a large family, and his poignancy on leaving federal service in March, 1897. Wilson, the "scholar in politics," emerges from these pages an upright, attractive man. Completely devoted to Cleveland and his policies, he was a conservative "Gold Democrat" who sincerely—but mistakenly—believed that "free silver" represented a marshaling of "all the elements of socialism, discontent, anarchy, and ignorance against property, decency, and free government."

Professor Summers, whose *William L. Wilson and Tariff Reform* appeared in 1953, has done a thorough but unobtrusive job of editing. He has included a biographical foreword, a glossary of persons, and an index. Newton D. Baker,

who was Wilson's private secretary at the time the diary was written, is the author of a charming Introduction. The volume's single illustration is a photograph of Cleveland and his cabinet complete with autographs.

Stuart Noblin.

North Carolina State College,
Raleigh.

HISTORICAL NEWS

Dr. Christopher Crittenden, Director of the Department of Archives and History, made a talk in Chapel Hill on June 23 to the North Carolina Registers of Deeds Association on the "Preservation, Reproduction, and Disposal of Public Records." On July 3 he lectured in Cambridge, Mass., at the fifth annual summer Institute on Historical and Archival Management which is sponsored jointly by Radcliffe College and Harvard University. He attended meetings from July 7-12 in Cooperstown, New York, and participated as a faculty member in the Seminars on American Culture. He met with the Tryon Palace Commission's Executive Committee in New Bern on July 22 and on July 23 met with the same group and the Advisory Budget Commission. On August 30 Dr. Crittenden presided at the session of the joint meeting of the North Carolina Literary and Historical Association and the Western North Carolina Historical Association.

Mr. H. G. Jones, State Archivist, has announced the appointment of Rear Admiral Alex M. Patterson, U.S.N.(Ret.), to the position of Public Records Examiner. Admiral Patterson, who assumed his duties on August 1, will assist the State Archivist in the over-all program but will be concerned particularly with the County Records Program. He will assist county officials in their records problems and serve as the Division of Archives and Manuscripts' field representative. Admiral Patterson, a native of Raeford, a graduate of the Naval Academy, is a veteran of 33 years in the United States Navy, He has taken graduate work at several other institutions, including graduate courses in history during his tenure as director of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps at the University of North Carolina.

Mr. Jones addressed the Sixteenth Annual Convention of the North Carolina Association of County Commissioners at Carolina Beach on June 23 on the subject, "A State Program for Microfilming County Records." Later on the same day he discussed the same subject at the annual convention of the

North Carolina Registers of Deeds Association in Chapel Hill. Both organizations adopted a resolution favoring the adoption of a proposed program by the 1959 General Assembly. The suggested program, which is being widely supported by county officials, would involve the microfilming of county records declared to have permanent historical value for security purposes, the master negative to be deposited in safety vaults. The text of Mr. Jones's address will be incorporated in the minutes of both associations. On June 27 Mr. Jones spoke to the Kiwanis Club of Raleigh on "North Carolina's Signers of the Declaration of Independence." The text of the speech was published in the July 6 issue of *The News and Observer* (Raleigh) under the title of "Three for Independence." Mr. Jones represented the Department at the annual meetings of the Society of American Archivists and the American Association for State and Local History at Salt Lake City, Utah, August 16-20. On August 18 he served as a panelist at a session on records management.

The Search Room of the Division of Archives and Manuscripts served 824 registered researchers during the three months ending June 30 and answered 670 inquiries by mail. These figures do not include visitors to the State Archivist's office and letters answered directly by him. In addition, 716 photostats were furnished, 110 microfilm prints, 86 typed certified copies, and 363 feet of microfilm.

On June 17-18 Mr. W. S. Tarlton, Historic Sites Superintendent, joined a party of leaders in the Marsh House restoration project at Bath in an architectural inspection of the structure. Plans will be developed by an architect. Mr. Edmund H. Harding, President of the Beaufort County Historical Association, states that the Marsh House is now open to the public on a schedule. Restoration will commence when funds are available. On June 26 Mr. Tarlton visited the James Iredell House, Edenton, to discuss plans for additional restoration work with Mr. Grayson Harding, president of the local organization which administers the project. On the same day he visited the General Isaac Gregory House, Camden County, to study the building in order to recommend restoration pro-

cedures to a local group recently formed to promote this project. Leaders of this organization include: Mrs. L. S. Blades, Jr., Mr. Jack Baum, and Mr. J. F. Pugh of the Elizabeth City area, and Dr. Elizabeth G. McPherson of the Library of Congress staff, Washington, D. C. On June 27 Mr. Tarlton made a visual study of the Owens House, Halifax, to evaluate restoration procedures. On August 7 he again visited Halifax to discuss with project leaders and the contractor restoration needs. Work is scheduled to start on the Owens House at once. On July 22-23 Mr. Tarlton accompanied Dr. Crittenden to New Bern to attend the meeting of the Tryon Palace Commission's Executive Committee and on August 15 he visited Brunswick Town and met with a group of interested citizens and newspapermen on the site of Old Brunswick Town.

On August 1 Mr. Stanley A. South, for the past two years Historic Site Specialist at Town Creek Indian Mound, took up new duties as Archaeologist at Brunswick Town State Historic Site, Brunswick County. Mr. South will be in charge of excavations which will result in determining foundations and other features of the now extinct colonial town.

Mr. Judson R. Mitchell began work on August 1 as Historic Site Specialist at Bentonville Battleground, replacing Mr. George K. Gelbach who has returned to Fork Union Military Academy as a member of the faculty. Mr. Mitchell is a graduate of Wake Forest College and received his M.A. degree from Yale University.

On September 1 Mr. David S. Phelps of Raleigh, a graduate of the North Carolina State College School of Design, began work at the Town Creek Indian Mound as Historic Site Assistant.

The Division of Publications has ready for distribution a mimeographed 64-page book, "Local Historical Societies in North Carolina," which gives the following information (when available): date of formation of local or county societies, meetings, objectives, present officers and terms of office, present membership and classification of members, dues, and county or local histories which have been published or are in

preparation. The information was compiled from questionnaires mailed out in 1955 and 1958. A limited number of these books will be issued free upon request by persons interested in county and local history and local historical societies. Application should be made to Mr. D. L. Corbitt, Box 1881, Raleigh.

The Division has also reprinted in facsimile *The Journal of the House of Burgesses of the Province of North-Carolina, 1749*, a 33-page book bound in marbled-deck paper over cardboard, which was first reproduced by the Department in 1949 in celebration of the two-hundredth anniversary of the establishment of the printing press in North Carolina. The book has an Introduction by Mr. William S. Powell of the University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill, as well as the 14-page journal which is signed by William Herritage, Clerk of the House of Burgesses. The book is priced at \$1.00 and may be obtained by writing Mr. Corbitt at the above address.

Mrs. Joye E. Jordan, Museum Administrator of the Department, made a talk on June 6 on "Tryon Palace" to the Tea and Topics Book Club in Lillington, and on June 19 attended a meeting of the WRAL-TV Fine Arts Council in Raleigh. On July 21 she attended a meeting of the Andrew Johnson Celebration Committee to make plans for the sesquicentennial observance of Andrew Johnson's birth. On August 12 Mrs. Jordan and Mr. Norman Larson, Education Curator, went to Hillsboro to assist in planning the Orange County Museum; and on August 13-14 they were in New Bern making plans for a museum in Tryon Palace.

Mr. Larson and Mr. John Ellington of the staff of the Hall of History, in co-operation with the Division of Historic Sites, recently completed the installation of exhibits in the Harper House which is located on Bentonville Battleground. The exhibits, which consist of murals and maps, tell the story of the battle which occurred there March 19-21, 1865. A number of artifacts found in the area are also displayed.

The Goldsboro clubs of the Tar Heel Junior Historians Association received an Award of Merit from the American Association for State and Local History which met in Salt Lake City, Utah, August 17-20. The clubs which were cited for outstanding work have been sponsored by the Hall of History and under the direction of Mrs. C. W. Twiford of Goldsboro have enrolled the entire eighth grades of the city's school system.

The Andrew Johnson Celebration Committee met on August 21 in the Assembly Room of the Department of Archives and History in the Education Building in Raleigh. Mr. LeGette Blythe of Huntersville is Chairman of this group which has members from all over the State. Plans were made for the celebration of Andrew Johnson Day in Raleigh on October 31.

Dr. Fletcher M. Green, Chairman of the Department of History at the University of North Carolina, sends the following news items: Dr. Carl H. Pegg spent June and July, 1958, at the Hoover Library, Stanford University, doing research on a forthcoming book. Dr. Elisha P. Douglass, who spent the year 1957-1958 as a Fulbright Lecturer in Germany, will in 1958-1959 be the director of the research on American Business Enterprise made possible by a grant of \$40,000 to the Department of History by the Richardson Foundation of Greensboro. Dr. J. Carlyle Sitterson attended an Institute for College and University Administrators at Harvard University, June 2-6. Dr. Peter F. Walker, a recent Ph.D. graduate of Vanderbilt University, has been appointed an Instructor in History for 1958-1959, and Dr. Clifford M. Foust spent the summer in India studying educational programs and practices there. He received a grant from the International Education Exchange Service from the State Department of the United States. The following appointments of 1958 recipients of the Ph.D. degree from the University are noted: Dr. Edward H. Phillips as Associate Professor of History, The Citadel, Charleston, South Carolina; Dr. Robert J. Chasteen as Instructor in History, East Texas State College, Commerce;

Dr. Clifton H. Johnson, Assistant Professor of History, East Carolina College, Greenville; Dr. Oliver H. Orr, Jr., Instructor in History, North Carolina State College, Raleigh; Dr. John R. Jones, Instructor in History, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Virginia. Teaching appointments for the following, all of whom are doctoral candidates, are announced: Mr. Diffie W. Standard as Assistant Professor of History, North Texas State College, Denton; Mr. David N. Thomas as Professor of History, Lander College, Greenwood, South Carolina; Mr. Leo Bilancio as Assistant Professor of History, Oglethorpe University, George; and Mrs. Willie Grier Todd as Professor of History, Tift College, Forsyth, Georgia. Appointments for graduates with the M.A. degree include Mr. Maung Soe Min as Assistant Professor of History, University of Mandalay, Burma; Mr. Hiram S. Scates, Jr., as Assistant Professor of History, King College, Bristol, Tennessee; Mr. Max R. Williams as Instructor in History, Western Carolina College, Cullowhee; Mr. James R. Anderson, teacher of History, Lakewood (Ohio) High School; and Mr. Charles G. Jackson, Assistant Professor of History, Presbyterian Junior College, Maxton.

The Department of History and Social Studies at North Carolina State College announces that Dr. Marvin L. Brown, Jr., Associate Professor of History, has been appointed as Editor of the newly-established journal, *French Historical Studies*. The first issue of the publication, official organ of The Society of French Historical Studies, is due to appear in the fall of 1958. Dr. J. Leon Helguera spent the summer of 1958 in Buenos Aires and Caracas in connection with his research on Manuel Ancizar. While he conducted research, he also delivered some guest lectures at the National University in Caracas.

On September 1 Mr. Keith Arnold Hitchins became an Instructor in European History at Wake Forest College. He is a graduate of Union College, Schenectady, New York, and received his M.A. degree from Harvard in 1953. He spent the past year as a Fulbright Scholar at the University of

Paris and expects to receive his Ph.D. degree from Harvard in 1959. Dr. Henry S. Stroupe spoke at the marker unveiling on August 5 designating the site where the Western Baptist Convention of North Carolina was founded.

Dr. Lillian Parker Wallace, Chairman of the Department of History at Meredith College, acted as the consultant in World History for the T-V In-School Experiment which was conducted as a workshop under the auspices of the University of North Carolina, August 4-15. On August 26-30 she attended the Phi Beta Kappa Triennial Council in New York and presided over the session on Phi Beta Kappa associations.

Mr. C. T. Leinbach, Chairman of the Board, announces that Dr. Donald M. McCorkle, Director of the Moravian Music Foundation, Inc., has been awarded the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in musicology by Indiana University.

The sixth annual joint regional meeting of the North Carolina Literary and Historical Association, Inc., and the Western North Carolina Historical Association was held at Blue Ridge Assembly on August 29-30. The two-day program included talks by Dr. Robert H. Spiro, Jr., President of Blue Ridge Assembly, on the "History of Blue Ridge Assembly," and Dr. Francis B. Dedmond of Gardner-Webb College on the "Problems of Writing a College History." Other speakers included Mr. O. L. Brown of Burnsville who spoke on "John Preston Arthur, Western North Carolina Historian"; Dr. Ina Van Noppen of Appalachian State Teachers College who talked on "Stoneman's Raid through Western North Carolina"; Mrs. Thomas S. Sharpe of Blue Ridge who talked on "Sidney Lanier, A Universal Poet"; and Mrs. Margaret W. Freel of Andrews who spoke on "Fort Butler and the Cherokee Departure for the Indian Territory." Members of the Department of Archives and History staff who attended the meetings were Mrs. Memory F. Blackwelder, Mr. D. L. Corbitt, Dr. Christopher Crittenden, and Admiral Alex M. Patterson. Dr. D. J. Whitener of Appalachian State Teachers

College is President of the Literary and Historical Association and Dr. Rosser H. Taylor of Cullowhee is President of the Western North Carolina Historical Association.

On July 13 the North Carolina Society of County and Local Historians sponsored a tour of Catawba County which began at Mackies Motel in Conover. Places of interest visited on the tour were the Bunker Hill Covered Bridge over Lyles Creek and part of historic Island Ford Road, built in the 1760's; the pioneer house of Henrich Weidner (Henry Whitener), first settler in the region; Old Smyrna Church, the first building of which was constructed with logs in 1834 and is still standing; Rehobeth Church, where legend states that the first camp meeting in America was held (1794); and many other interesting historic sites. The group which participated met for the usual picnic lunch.

The summer meeting of the Carteret County Historical Society was held on July 26 at the Ennett Cottage on Bogue Sound and following the program and business meeting, the group participated in the third annual watermelon-cutting as guests of Mr. A. D. Ennett and Mr. John S. Jones. Mr. F. C. Salisbury, President, presided at the meeting and appointed the following to serve as a nominating committee to present a slate of officers at the October meeting: Mrs. W. A. Mace, Mrs. Lucille Smith, and Mr. A. D. Ennett. Mrs. Inez Lina of Davis gave a paper on the early history of Davis, Davis Island, and the township. She is a descendant of the first family of Davises to settle along Core Sound. Plans for the October meeting in Beaufort were made and six new members joined the society. Mr. D. L. Corbitt of the State Department of Archives and History was a special guest and made a short talk in which he traced the progress of the society since he assisted in the organizational meeting four years ago.

The Perquimans County Historical Association held its first meeting on June 20 with thirty persons joining the group as charter members. Officers were elected to serve for one

year with Mr. Nat S. Fulford of Hertford as President. Members were appointed to serve on committees for finance and auditing, projects and publicity, and constitution and bylaws, with the entire association acting as a membership committee. Objectives for the society were discussed and the next meeting was scheduled for September 29.

On August 5 the North Carolina Baptist State Convention unveiled and dedicated a monument at the site of the organization of the Western Baptist Convention in 1858. The ceremony took place on the Kanuga Road at the present site of the Faith Tabernacle with Dr. Henry S. Stroupe of Wake Forest College reading a historical paper, and Dr. Charles E. Maddry of Raleigh making a talk. The State Highway Commission co-operated with the Convention by placing a large boulder from the Hickory Nut Gorge section as a base for the bronze plaque.

On July 1 the Conestee Historical Marker was presented to the Dunn's Rock community with the following persons participating in the ceremony: Mrs. Sadie Smathers Patton, representing the Western North Carolina Historical Association; Mrs. Ralph Ramsey, Jr., and Mrs. Robert N. Hill, III, of the Daughters of American Colonists; Mrs. Mary Jane McCrary of the Transylvania Historical Association; Mr. Earl Parker, President, and Mr. Robert K. Van Deusen, Secretary of the Dunn's Rock Community Club; and Miss Kay Forester and Master Donald Roberts of Dunn's Rock.

"The History of Gaston County, North Carolina," by Mr. Robert F. Cope, Stanley, is being published serially in *The Gastonia Gazette* (Gastonia). Mr. Cope covers formation of the county with the early settlements and their accompanying hardships, including brief biographical sketches of prominent individuals; early church histories; early industries, history of the county's textile industry; and a statistical picture of the Civil War period. A complete listing of Gaston County men who served in the Confederate Army is also given. Sixteen chapters were published by August 22, with others to follow,

and the history may be issued in book form. The publisher of the *Gazette*, Mr. James W. Atkins, warns that back copies of the newspaper will not be available after the current supply is exhausted. Authentic new information or new manuscript material pertinent to the history is sought by Mr. Cope whose mailing address is Route 1, Stanley.

The Department has received a reprint of "Thomas Lenoir's Journey to Tennessee in 1806," by Dr. James W. Patton, Director of the Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. The article originally appeared in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly*, XVII (June, 1958), and begins with a brief biographical sketch of Thomas Lenoir. The journal includes statements relative to the amount of cash Lenoir had at the beginning of his journey, comments on the towns, ferries, a jail (and its inmate), farms, the weather, roads, and "A Bill of Expenses and . . . an account of Distances from one Stage to another as well as other noted places creek Rivers etc --." Thomas Lenoir was the son of General William Lenoir, Revolutionary officer and one of the largest landholders in the history of North Carolina. Thomas married Seline Louisa Avery, daughter of Colonel Waightstill Avery, and this journal was preserved with the Lenoir family papers at Fort Defiance until it was acquired some time ago as part of an addition to the Lenoir Papers housed in the Southern Collection.

Shepard K. Nash of Sumter, South Carolina, has presented the Department with a copy of his privately printed pamphlet (1954) on the family of Abner Nash, of whom he is a descendant. Written solely as information for the line of Shepard Nash and Annie McDonald Laws (no collateral lines are traced) the publication includes pictures of Abner Nash and Frederick Nash with biographical notes on both of these men as well as Frederick Kollock Nash and Shepard Nash. Also included is an account of the funeral of Abner Nash (from the *New York Gazetteer*, December 6, 1786) with the "Order of Procession" and a list of the pall bearers, one of whom was Alexander Hamilton. A list of genealogical

descendants of Shepard and Annie McDonald Laws Nash is given at the end of the book.

The United States Navy Department has announced plans to collect and publish the much scattered documents relating to the naval and maritime history of the American Revolution. Mr. William Bell Clark of Brevard will edit the work. The Navy Department states that a major contribution to the success of the project can be made by anyone possessing or knowing of unpublished letters, diaries, reports, ships' logs, and other Revolutionary War documents for the years 1775-1785, and who will make such material or information available to the Director of Naval History, Navy Department, Washington 25, D. C. Material submitted will be on a loan and will, of course, be returned.

The Institute of Early American History and Culture of Williamsburg, Virginia, has announced the establishment of the second annual Institute Manuscript Award which will be presented in May, 1959. Five hundred dollars will be paid to the author of the best unpublished work in early American history and the winning entry will be published by the Institute. Manuscripts by mature scholars are invited and a doctoral dissertation will not be eligible unless it has been accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Ph.D. degree and is accompanied by a recommendation of the thesis director. Judges are Dr. Dumas Malone, University of Virginia; Dr. Louis B. Wright, Folger Shakespeare Library; and Dr. Max Savelle, University of Washington, who will serve as chairman of the group. Manuscripts should be addressed to Dr. James M. Smith, Editor of Publications, Institute of Early American History and Culture, Box 1298, Williamsburg, Virginia.

The 1958 Institute Manuscript Award was presented to Dr. Lawrence H. Leder, Assistant Director of Research and Publications at Sleepy Hollow Restorations, Tarrytown, New York, for his biographical study of Robert Livingston (1654-1728).

At the annual meeting of the Council of the Institute held in Williamsburg on May 2-3, four new members were elected to serve terms of three years on the Council: Dr. I. Bernard Cohen, Harvard University; Dr. Verner W. Crane, University of Michigan; Dr. Dumas Malone, University of Virginia; and Dr. Louis B. Wright, Folger Shakespeare Library. Mr. Alfred A. Knopf of New York City was re-elected for a term of three years.

The American Historical Association is preparing a Guide to Photocopied Historical Materials in the United States and Canada, under a grant from the Council on Library Resources, Inc. The Guide will be a desk reference book, paralleling the *Guide to Historical Literature*, that will tell where to find important bodies of microfilmed and other photocopied materials and how to procure and use them. It is expected to be published late in 1959.

The Association's Committee on Documentary Reproduction, with the assistance of an Advisory Committee of experts from the Library and Archival fields, is supervising the collection of materials and editing. In this work the Archives section of the Canadian Historical Association is co-operating. The Guide will locate photocopied holdings of historical manuscripts by standard union list practices, according to traditional subject and period fields of history. This information is now being collected through co-operation with archives, libraries, and historical societies in both countries. Duplication of effort is currently avoided through exchange of reports with the Union List of Microfilms. The method of preparing the text anticipates the possible issuance of supplements.

The Editor, Dr. Richard W. Hale, Jr., solicits the aid of historians in both countries in the discovery and accurate description of holdings of photocopied manuscripts wherever they may be. He welcomes information that will assist him in making the Guide as complete as possible. Please address correspondence to his at Boston University, Copley Square Campus, 84 Exeter Street, Room 401, Boston 16, Mass.

The third annual Francis Parkman Prize, to be awarded for a book published within the calendar year 1958, has been announced by the committee of Award of the Society of American Historians, Inc. The prize of \$500 to be awarded during the winter of 1959 will be given for a book dealing with any aspect of the colonial and national history of what is now the United States. Colonial history would admit of a treatment of the English, French, or Spanish background if definitely connected with the colonies. Literary, religious, economic, political, scientific and technological, legal and constitutional history, and the history of foreign relations would fall within the field. The award is made to stimulate the writing of history as literature, thus emphasizing literary distinction in historical writing. Members of the Committee of Award of the Society are Dr. Willard Thorp, Chairman, Princeton University; Dr. Merle Curti, University of Wisconsin; and Dr. Michael Kraus, The City College, New York. For further details write Dr. Rudolf A. Clemen, Executive Vice-President, The Society of American Historians, Inc., Princeton University Library, Princeton, New Jersey.

The Department has received the following books during the last quarter: Randolph G. Adams, *Political Ideas of the American Revolution: Britannic-American Contributions to the Problem of Imperial Organization, 1765 to 1775* (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1958); Sara Bertha Townsend, *An American Soldier: The Life of John Laurens drawn largely from correspondence between his father and himself* (Raleigh: Edwards and Broughton, 1958); Harry Golden, *Only in America* (Cleveland, Ohio and New York: The World Publishing Company, 1958); J. H. Easterby and Ruth Green, *The Colonial Records of South Carolina. The Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, September 10, 1746-June 13, 1747, Volume VII, Series I* (Columbia: South Carolina Archives Department, 1958); William T. Hastings, *Comrade Webb of Hampstead* (Providence, Rhode Island: Brown University Press, 1958); Richard B. Harwell, *Cities and Camps of the Confederate States* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1958); Forrest McDonald, *We the People: The*

Economic Origins of the Constitution (Chicago, Ill.: The University of Chicago Press, 1958); William G. Haag, *The Archeology of Coastal North Carolina* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1958); E. Merton Coulter, *The Journal of William Stephens, 1741-1743* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, for the Wormsloe Foundation Publications, number 2, 1958); John H. Davis, *St. Mary's Cathedral, 1858-1958: A History of St. Mary's Episcopal Church, Memphis, which became the Cathedral of the Diocese of Tennessee in 1871* (Jackson, Tennessee: The McCowat-Mercer Press, 1958); Thomas P. deGraffenried, *The deGraffenried Name in Literature* (New York: The William-Frederick Press, 1950) and *History of the deGraffenried Family from 1191 A.D. to 1925* (Binghamton and New York: The Vail-Ballou Press, 1925); and John Duffy, *The Rudolph Matas History of Medicine in Louisiana, Volume I* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1958).