THE NORTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XXXII JANUARY, 1955 NUMBER 1

THE CHURCH ESTABLISHMENT IN NORTH CAROLINA, 1765-1776

By PAUL CONKIN

The near myth about religious freedom has given an attractive halo to the popular conception of American colonial history, although such freedom, had it existed, would have been almost inexplicable. Most of the immigrants to America brought with them the current European ideas of a state church. Puritans in New England and Anglicans in North Carolina alike desired a privileged legal status for their religion. In many of the colonies, and particularly in North Carolina, liberalizing influences tended to change the form of the established religion from that found in Europe. In North Carolina religious toleration, which was initially offered as an inducement to settlement, and the almost complete religious freedom found on the unassimilated and constantly retreating frontier left a heritage of local religious independence which was hardly reconcilable with a strong establishment.[1] In the period from 1765 to 1776 many people in North Carolina, both those who were for and those against the English political rule, persistently resisted the efforts of the royal authorities, the Anglican clergy, and sometimes the local officials to secure an effective church establishment of the English type. Because it paralleled a most important period of political unrest and because it represents the climax of one of the several state-wide struggles for religious freedom, this religious discontent reveals a significant phase in the development of the American mind and the institutions which are its concrete manifestations.

[1] Evarts B. Greene, *Religion and the State* (New York, New York University Press, 1941), 47-73.

The Episcopal Church was always, or at least nominally, the official religion of colonial North Carolina, although the Anglican clergy had no regular and certain establishment until the Vestry and Orthodox Clergy Acts of 1765.[2] Though the English Church was recognized as the legal or state church in the early proprietary charters, the proprietors were given permission to, and did, grant freedom of conscience.[3] Several vestry acts were passed in the colony, the first in 1701, but there is little evidence that they were ever strictly enforced. After the arrival of the first royal governor in 1730 with instructions to secure an adequate religious establishment, it was eleven years before an apathetic colonial Assembly passed a vestry act. This law proved inadequate to the purposes of the clergy and the Crown, and a more effective act was passed in 1754. When this act was disallowed by the Crown in 1759 because it gave too much power to the local vestry, a five year legislative struggle ensued before the Assembly was persuaded to pass a vestry law that met the demands of the English Government.

While in 1759 there was a common sentiment in North Carolina that the Protestant religion should be legally established, there was a wide difference of opinion as to the form the Establishment should take. The source of the legislative struggles after 1759, as well as much of the later religious dissention, was the Crown's insistence on a stronger establishment than that desired by either the dissenters or Anglicans. The Crown wanted a centralized ecclesiastical system which could be strictly enforced by the colonial governor. The dissenters wanted to retain almost complete religious freedom within an establishment that would do little more than definitely exclude Catholics. The Anglicans desired the establishment of their own church, yet at the same time, wanted to retain a firm local control over their own ecclesiastical affairs. The various vestry acts passed between 1754

[2] William L. Saunders, editor, *The Colonial Records of North Carolina* (Raleigh: Josephus Daniels, 1890), VII, 490. Hereafter cited as Saunders, *Colonial Records*.

[3] Stephen B. Weeks, *The Religious Development in the Province of North Carolina (John Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science*, Tenth Series, Baltimore, 1892), 14*n*.

and 1765 exhibited both the latitudinarian ideas of the dissenters and the independence of the Anglicans.

The Vestry Act of 1754 left the right of presentation of clergymen in the hands of the local vestry. This situation was unsatisfactory to Governor Dobbs who, since it merited the disapproval of the Bishop of London, secured its disallowance in 1759.[4] The problem of presentation, more than any other issue, created a division of interests between the Crown and staunch Anglicans. According to English practice, the Crown had the authority to induct, or appoint, ministers into parishes, although in practice always on the advice of the church officials. In North Carolina the general practice had been for the local vestry to hire its own minister, if one were available. In the absence of an American bishop, the governor was the supreme representative of both the Crown and the Church and was ready to claim his prerogative and induct ministers into parishes as he wished. Until the Revolution this problem of presentation or induction remained a source of friction.

When the fate of the Vestry Act of 1754 was known in North Carolina, Dobbs asked for a new act, this time giving the Crown its right of presentation. The Assembly expressed its official sorrow that the last act had met with royal disapproval, complained of its lack of representative in London to explain the peculiar circumstances of the colony, and promptly passed twin church laws, a Vestry and an Orthodox Clergy Act, which were even more obnoxious to the Crown than the act of 1754.[5] Not only was the right of presentation definitely retained in the vestry, but also other unsatisfactory conditions were affixed. In keeping with the desire of the dissenters for a lax establishment, these acts required that a prospective vestryman take an oath that he would *not oppose,* instead of the usual *conform to,* the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England. The Bishop of London avowed that this oath could be taken by a Jew or pagan.[6] Furthermore, the acts excluded the minister from member-

[4] Saunders, *Colonial Records,* VI, 15-16.
[5] Saunders, *Colonial Records,* VI, 139.
[6] Saunders, *Colonial Records,* VI, 714-716.

ship in the vestry, contrary to English church practice.[7] The men of North Carolina had already found it advantageous to discuss their minister's salary and conduct without his disturbing and embarrassing presence. Finally, if a minister were immoral or committed a crime, he had to face trial in the local or secular court instead of in an English ecclesiastical court.[8] Needless to say, these vestry laws of 1760 were disallowed.[9]

In 1762 the Assembly passed two more church laws, each retaining the same objectionable features as the last ones. Governor Dobbs immediately vetoed the Vestry Act, but reluctantly approved the Orthodox Clergy Act in order that the ministers might have a salary. At last, in the legislative sessions of 1764-65, Governor Dobbs, ill, tired, and already planning to relinquish his job to William Tryon, succeeded in pushing through the Assembly two church laws which satisfied both him and the Lord Bishop of London. These remained in operation until the Revolution. Perhaps significantly, the first of these laws, the Vestry Act of 1764, was passed by an Assembly greatly dwarfed by the absence of all but four of the ordinarily recalcitrant northern members.[10]

The Vestry Act of 1764 provided for the support of the clergy, for education, and for poor relief. On every third Easter Monday twelve vestrymen were to be elected in each parish by the qualified voters. Each year before November 1 the sheriff was to collect a poll tax of not more than ten shillings from each taxable to support the Parish. If he could not collect the tax in a period of five days, he was empowered to sell a compensatory amount of the goods and chattels of the defaulting person. The vestry was liable for all damages to an underpaid minister in accordance with the fees and salary set by law.[11] Most important in later controversies, the act provided that any dissenter, and later by amendment any

---

[7] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VI, 720-722.
[8] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VI, 714-716.
[9] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VI, 723.
[10] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VI, 1035.
[11] Walter Clark, editor, *The State Records of North Carolina* (Winston, M. I. and J. C. Stewart, 1895-1906), 106-107. Hereafter cited as Clark, *State Records*.

one at all, who refused to qualify when elected a vestryman was subject to a fine of three pounds.[12]

The Orthodox Clergy Act of 1765 provided the parish minister a salary of £133.6.8 proclamation money, and a glebe of 300 acres or a compensating £20 extra salary. He was to receive twenty shillings for a marriage by license, five shillings for a marriage by banns, and forty shillings for a funeral.[13] Although complete religious jurisdiction was given to the Bishop of London, the governor was empowered to suspend an indicted minister while awaiting the verdict of an English ecclesiastical court. The minister could preach out of his parish only with the consent of his vestry. Most significant, the right of presentation was not mentioned.[14] As a result, both the governor and the Bishop of London interpreted the act as giving the right to the crown by implication.[15] With these two acts, North Carolina now had as strong a legal establishment as any other colony.

Unfortunately for the Establishment, Governor Dobbs left the Church little more than two strong vestry acts in 1765, for the church was, if anything, weaker than it had been in at least a decade. There were only six ministers to serve twenty-nine county-wide vestries in a colony with a white population of about 100,000;[16] of these six ministers only four were doing good work. The lack of ministers is revealed by the fact that when Governor Dobbs died unexpectedly in 1765 he had to be buried without benefit of clergy in southerly Brunswick County. In the whole colony there were only ten Anglican church buildings, with a few outlying chapels.[17] On the credit side, a few of the counties had functioning vestries, which were helping to support the clergy. The church was also strengthened by aid from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts[18] which sponsored most of the ministers as missionaries.

---

[12] Clark, *State Records*, 759-760.
[13] Clark, *State Records*, 583-585.
[14] Clark, *State Records*, 660-662.
[15] Arthur Lyon Cross, *The Anglican Episcopate and The American Colonies* (New York, Longmans, Green, and Co., 1902), 243.
[16] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VI, 1027, 1039-1041.
[17] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VII, 102-104.
[18] Hereafter to be abbreviated as the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

A more personal view of the Established Church can be had from the letters of the North Carolina Clergy to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in the years just before 1765. With some exaggeration they reveal the trials of a minister in the sinful wilds of a small but growing colony. From Craven County, James Reed, one of the most famous colonial ministers, reported extreme difficulty in collecting his salary, deplored the many dissenters and infidels in his parish, and constantly begged for religious pamphlets to combat the "New Lights." Their "crying-out, . . . falling down as in fits, . . . awakening in extacies, . . . and impulses, visions, and revelations;" [19] their "preaching the inexpediency of Human Learning & . . . the great expediency of Dreams Visions & immediate Revelation" [20] must have shocked the dignified and literate Reed. In Beaufort County, Alex Steward worked hard and seldom complained, although he was sincerely worried over the lack of ministers in neighboring counties. By 1765 he was living in the first glebe to be furnished a minister in North Carolina. He desired pamphlets to fight the rash doctrines of the Anabaptists and blushingly admitted that in order to retain for the church some of the more dupable members he had baptised one man by immersion.[21] In Chowan County, Daniel Earl performed his duties, was influential in education, but reputedly divided his love between his ministry and his herring fishery. James Moir was preaching occasionally in various counties, always deploring his inability to accumulate a fortune, and at every opportunity criticising Governor Dobbs and the whole ecclesiastical system.[23] The most tragic story of hardship was told in the letters of James McDowell of Brunswick County. Though his parish contained the largest church constructed

[19] G. W. Paschal, "Morgan Edwards' Materials Toward a History of the Baptists in the Province of North Carolina," *North Carolina Historical Review*, VII (1930), 383. Hereafter cited as Paschal, "Morgan Edwards' Materials."

[20] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VI, 565.

[21] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VI, 315-316, 734-735.

[22] Bennett H. Wall, "Charles Pettigrew, First Bishop-Elect of the North Carolina Episcopal Church," *North Carolina Historical Review*, XXVIII (1951), 17.

[23] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VI, 1051.

in colonial North Carolina[24] and also the leading families, including Governor Dobbs, McDowell complained of the capricious weather, the long, hard trips to outlying chapels, his financial misery, his exclusion from vestry meetings, and the fact that he had only two slaves while other ministers in the province had twenty.[25] When his wife died in childbirth and the roof of his big, new church fell in, McDowell was ready to leave the colony in despair. In 1763 he died while still a minister in Brunswick.

The most recurrent complaint of the ministers was about the dangerous growth of dissenting denominations. James Reed's listing and evaluation of these groups is a classic of brevity: "The Anabaptists are obstinate, illiterate & grossly ignorant, the Methodist [really New Light Baptists], ignorant, censorious & uncharitable, the Quakers, Rigid, but the Presbyterians are pretty moderate except here & there a bigot or rigid Calvinist."[26] This is a fairly complete list, for, other than the German denominations, these four dissenting groups were alone significant in colonial North Carolina. The Moravians, by acts of Parliament and the North Carolina Assembly, were given equal rights with Anglicans and had a separate parish.[27] Beginning about 1750 a heavy German migration from Pennsylvania brought the Lutheran and German Reformed churches into the Piedmont region, notably along the Yadkin. These two German speaking denominations received many special religious privileges and, in return, were always completely law abiding.[28] Quakers had been among the earliest settlers in North Carolina and in 1765 were very numerous in the Northeast, particularly in Perquimans and Pasquotank counties. They were exempt-

[24] The Brunswick church was seventy-six feet and six inches long, fifty-three feet and three inches wide, and was twenty-four feet and four inches high. It had eleven windows, three large doors, and brick wall three feet thick. Marshall D. Haywood, *Governor William Tryon, and His Administration in the Province of North Carolina,* 1765-1771 (Raleigh: E. M. Uzzel, Printer, 1903), 24. Hereafter cited as Haywood, *Governor William Tryon and His Administration.*

[25] Saunders, *Colonial Records,* VI, 236-237, 729-730.

[26] Saunders, *Colonial Records,* VI, 264-266.

[27] Adelaide L. Fries, "The Moravian Contribution to Colonial North Carolina," *North Carolina Historical Review,* VII (1930), 14.

[28] William K. Boyd and Charles A. Krummel, "German Tracts Concerning the Lutheran Church in North Carolina During the Eighteenth Century," *North Carolina Historical Review,* VII (1930), 81.

ed from military service and all oaths, yet were sometimes strongly in opposition to the Establishment.[29]

The largest dissenting elements were the principal Baptist sects and the Presbyterians. After 1751 the Particular or Regular Baptists, strongly Calvinistic and the predecessors of the present day Primitive Baptists, absorbed most of the earliest Baptist group, the General or Free Will Baptists, and in 1765, the year of the strong vestry acts, united their several churches in the Kehukee Association. After 1755 an extremely Arminian sect, the New Light Baptists, began to gain many adherents whose extreme emotionalism rendered them anathema to the Anglicans. They were most numerous in the western counties of Orange, Guilford, and Rowan, where they were organized in the Sandy Creek Association.[30]

The Presbyterians were almost as influential in colonial North Carolina as the Anglicans. Claiming all the privileges of the Scottish Church, many Presbyterians refused to consider themselves dissenters. Except for a small colony in Duplin County and about four congregations in Cumberland County, the Presbyterians were mostly in the, then, western counties of Orange, Mecklenburg, Rowan, Tryon, Guilford, Bute, Wake, Surry, and Granville. They were largely Scotch-Irish immigrants who had filtered down from Pennsylvania or had come up from Charleston. They made outstanding contributions to education and furnished a good share of the political leadership.[31] Living in frontier counties, these Presbyterians had been accustomed to an almost complete religious freedom before 1765 and were quick to devise ways of evading the church laws whenever they were about to be enforced in their midst.

It is difficult to give even an approximate statistical breakdown of the religious picture in North Carolina in 1765. The colony was growing rapidly; the total white and colored population rose from about 120,000 in 1759 to between

[29] William L. Grissom, *History of Methodism in North Carolina* (Nashville, Publishing House of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, 1905), 9-11.

[30] Paschal, "Morgan Edwards' Materials," 371.

[31] William H. Foote, *Sketches of North Carolina* (New York, Robert Carter, 1846), 188-189. Hereafter cited as Foote, *Sketches of North Carolina.*

200,000 and 250,000 by 1771.[32] With the growth in population, the dissenting denominations were rapidly increasing, both by immigration and conversions. The German Reformed and Lutheran groups contained only 3,000 families in about twenty congregations in 1771. The total German population, including the Moravians, could not have exceeded 20,000 in that year; it was without doubt less in 1765.[33] After the Revolution the Quakers scarcely numbered over 5,000. If Morgan Edwards, a Baptist minister visiting North Carolina in 1772, is correct, the Baptists had sixteen churches as early as 1754 and by 1772 had thirty-two churches plus several more meeting places. In the latter years he estimated that 39,750 people worshipped in Baptist congregations.[34] There are few clues as to the number of Presbyterians in North Carolina in 1765. They were probably almost as numerous as the Baptists and in some western counties were in a heavy majority. Always growing rapidly with the influx of Scottish immigrants, the Presbyterians had approximately thirty churches by the time of the Revolution and perhaps a dozen ministers, some of whom were very famous. Despite the more rapid growth of some of the dissenting groups, the Anglican Church remained the largest denomination in the colony until the Revolution. In the eastern and north-central counties the Anglicans were well established; even in Orange and Rowan counties there were substantial congregations. The small number of churches and ministers in 1765 belies the potential strength of the established religion, for there were numerous congregations, sometimes several in a single county, worshipping in small chapels or homes and only occasionally receiving the sacraments from a visiting clergyman.

Though Governor Dobbs gave the Anglican Church a strong legal basis, Governor William Tryon tried to make the Establishment a living reality. With his administration

---

[32] Evarts B. Greene and Virginia D. Harrington, *American Population Before the Federal Census of 1790* (New York, Columbia University Press, 1932), 158-159.

[33] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 630-632.

[34] Paschal, "Morgan Edwards' Materials," 369, 394-395.

a new era in ecclesiastical affairs began.[35] Tryon was not a bigot in any sense; but he was very closely connected with the Episcopal Church, himself becoming a member of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. Recognizing the great need for ministers in the colony, he used his influence to get young ministers to come to North Carolina. By April, 1767, he could report in one of his many succinct and literary communications to the Society, that there were now thirteen ministers instead of six.[36] By 1771 there were eighteen ministers, meaning that fully half the parishes had a full time parson. But Tryon, in his determined support of the Establishment, inevitably encountered the opposition of the dissenters and the more independent Anglicans.

The fact that North Carolina had a decentralized ecclesiastical system before 1765 very much influenced the reaction to a Crown-enforced establishment under Tryon. The vestry laws passed before 1765 had, it is true, embodied many of the restrictive clauses of the acts of 1765, but they had not been universally enforced, as only part of the parishes had been active or even organized. In addition, the direction of church affairs had been in the hands of the local vestry. When Tryon personally took over the direction of ecclesiastical affairs and began sending ministers into more and more counties, some times against the wishes of a majority of the inhabitants, the Establishment seemed very oppressive to many groups. It should be kept in mind, how,-ever, that despite the limitations on personal freedom and the economic burden resulting from the Establishment, complete freedom of conscience was always granted to all Protestant groups in North Carolina. Anyone could worship as he pleased even though he were forced to fulfill certain obligations to the state church, such as paying his vestry tax.

There were two types of resentment against the Establishment in North Carolina, each resulting from a different feature of the vestry laws. First, the vestry acts were passed by the North Carolina Assembly and the Establishment was

[35] Joseph B. Cheshire, "The Church in the Province of North Carolina," in *Sketches of Church History in North Carolina*, edited by Joseph B. Cheshire (Wilmington: William L. DeRosset, Jr., Publisher, 1892), 75. Hereafter cited as Cheshire, "The Church in the Province of North Carolina."

[36] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VII, 456-458.

a North Carolina institution, favored, it seemed, by at least a majority of the province's leading citizens. Thus, among many dissenters, the burden of an established clergy could be blamed largely on the predominantly Anglican aristocracy within the state, or the office holding classes. But the Establishment was also a policy of the Crown. It was the governor, who as an agent of the Crown, pressed for, and finally was granted by a reluctant Assembly, an establishment which gave the Anglican clergy and the governor himself privileged positions. It was the British governor who enforced the Establishment and who assumed the power of inducting ministers into vacant parishes. It was the British Crown that persistently disallowed more liberal religious laws and which refused to recognize the peculiar circumstances of the colonial church. Thus a great amount of the resentment against the Establishment among the dissenters, and almost all the resentment among the Anglicans, was directed against the English Crown, represented in most cases by the governor.

Tryon assumed that the Orthodox Clergy Act of 1765, by not mentioning the right of presentation, gave him the authority to induct ministers into vacant parishes, and began to distribute the newly arrived clergymen into the most needy parishes. He early met difficulties. For a long time there had been a growing resentment of British rule in the eastern, predominantly Episcopal counties. The people of North Carolina felt that they had certain well established rights which were being encroached upon by the British Parliament. One of these rights was taxing themselves; another was choosing their own minister. The governor's usurpation of ecclesiastical power not specifically granted him was ranked along side the hated Stamp Act as another example of increasing British tyranny. For this reason Tryon, instead of inducting a certain Cosgreve into Pitt County, sent him on a three months probation, an action which he apologetically explained as follows to the Lord Bishop of London:

> This probation I think for the interest of the cause of religion in these parts. the inhabitants seeming as jealous of any restraint put on their consciences as they have of late shewn for

that on their property: Many persons have industriously spread among the parishes and vestries that as the patronage to livings is not specified in the above Act, the Crown cannot claim the patronage; some delicacy therefore your Lordship I hope sees is necessary in the establishment of the clergy here, where the minds of the larger body of inhabitants thro' the want of the means of culture are incapable of entertaining generous principles of public utility.[37]

In January, 1766, Tryon reported that a new minister, the Rev. Barnett, had taken up duties in Brunswick County.[38] There the vestry promised him the regulation salary, but two years later Barnett remained in Brunswick only by the vestry's wishes, never having been officially inducted. In June, 1768 he wrote to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel explaining his plight:

The people of this Parish do still so violently oppose the presentation of the Crown to the Living, that I believe it will be found necessary for me to remove to another part of the province. . . . Permit me Sir to assure the Venerable Board that the people are so desirous of my stay with them on the usual terms, of an annual reelection as I have been informed, to be willing to make some addition to my former salary. . . .[39]

Governor Tryon was prepared to force induction of Barnett against the vestry's wishes, but Barnett, not wishing to stay in the county under those conditions, removed to Northampton. He was followed in Brunswick by a certain Cramp, whom Tryon proposed to present to the vestry. Cramp was fearful that he would starve if he were inducted, for, as he reported to Tryon, "none like the inducted parson." [40]

Tryon had similar troubles in Duplin and New Hanover counties. He reported to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel that he feared the Rev. Briggs, whom he inducted into Duplin, would find his residence most disagreeable because of the resentment to inducted ministers.[41] When he sent a certain Wills to New Hanover County, preparatory to

[37] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VII, 261.
[38] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VII, 158.
[39] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VII, 789-790.
[40] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 12-16.
[41] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 12-16.

induction, the vestry sent him a letter of protest, praising Wills as a "gentleman worthy of his sacred Function" but denying the right of presentation on the part of the governor, on the grounds that the Act of Assembly did not specifically grant him that power.[42] This time Tryon proceded to induct in spite of their protests, but begged the parish to extend good services to Wills until a new Clergy Act clearly granting the right of presentation could be passed.[43] Thus, in four or five instances at least, the people most heartily in favor of an establishment, the churchmen themselves, refused to give up their cherished right of choosing and dismissing their own minister even at the expense of having no minister at all.

A stronger opposition of a different type greeted the Establishment in the western counties where in a predominently Presbyterian and Baptist region, the Vestry Acts were never effectively enforced. The Rev. Eli W. Caruthers, biographer of David Caldwell, aptly summarized the religious situation in that area before the Revolution:

> Presbyterian ministers, and probably others too, were celebrating marriages without asking leave of the parish minister, and building churches, holding meetings, and administrating ordinances without consulting the Bishop of London, or obtaining license from any human authority; the people, without any serious apprehension of consequences, were setting at naught the enactments of arbitrary power, by electing for vestrymen such men as they know would not serve, or by staying away from the polls and electing no vestrymen at all; and in some counties . . . they were compelling the Assembly to rescind their vestry acts.[44]

The citizens of Mecklenburg County did not want an established minister. In 1766 Andrew Morton arrived in New Bern, planning to go on to Mecklenburg as a minister and missionary of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. Tryon persuaded him against continuing his journey, doubting if he would get any favorable reception or any hearers among the many Presbyterians in Mecklenburg, who always managed to elect vestrymen from their own number,

---

[42] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 119.
[43] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 219-220.
[44] Eli W. Carruthers, *A Sketch of the Life and Character of the Rev. David Caldwell, D.D.* (Greensborough: Swain and Sherwood, 1842), 75.

only to have them disqualify.[45] After changing his plans and going to Northampton County, Morton wrote the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel that the people in Mecklenburg

> . . . had a solemn league and covenant teacher settled among them That they were in general greatly averse to the Church of England—and that they looked upon a law lately enacted in this province for the better establishment of the Church as oppressive as the Stamp Act and were determined to prevent its taking place there, by opposing the settlement of any Minister of the Church of England.[46]

In 1769 the citizens of Mecklenburg sent a petition to the governor setting forth their religious position. According to it, 1,000 loyal freemen in the county held to the Church of Scotland and were entitled to all the rights and privileges of any British subject, either English or Scottish. In Scotland the Presbyterian Church was the state church with privileges similar to the Church in England; moreover, they claimed additional rights granted by the original North Carolina Charter. In view of these rights they felt it a burden to be taxed to support an Episcopal clergy, especially when they had two Presbyterian ministers to support and when only one twentieth of the people were Episcopal. They petitioned that each group be allowed to worship God according to conscience, and that each pay its own clergy. They stated that an inducted minister would be useless, that ten shillings per taxable was an enormous sum to put under the power of the vestry, being more than it took to run the county government, and that the vestry law, as a whole, was curbing settlement in the back country and would always remain a grievance.[47] Many of the immigrants to the region were virtual refugees from the stricter religious conformity of Virginia, and were very fearful of losing the early freedom they found on the frontier. Actually, the people were never forced to support an established clergyman; none ever came to Mecklenburg, and with reason.

---

[45] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VII, 241-242.
[46] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VII, 252-253.
[47] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 1015-1017.

A unique petition arrived in New Bern in 1769 from the huge frontier county of Rowan, then stretching an indefinite distance westward into the Smokies and the Cherokee country. A small number of Episcopalians in Rowan were aggrieved because the vestry acts were not being enforced in their county. They complained that Rowan contained people of every nation and creed and that the many dissenters elected as vestrymen such of their own number "as evade the Acts of Assembly and refuse the oaths whence we can never expect the regular enlivening beams of the Holy Gospel to shine upon us." [48] In another petition they asked Tryon to appoint their list of vestry candidates even though they were defeated in the election. They also asked him to induct their newly arrived minister, the Rev. Theodorus Swaine Draige, into their parish, which had no active vestry.[49]

It can be wondered why Governor Tryon, who would not give Andrew Morton leave to go to Mecklenburg County, would allow Draige to go to neighboring Rowan as an established clergyman. Here, among numerous dissenters and virtually on the frontier, poor, gentle Draige became a self-styled martyr to the cause of his church and to the laws of his country. He tried to allay the alarm caused among the dissenters by his arrival, by conceding them the right to continue performing marriages and funerals without giving him all the fees as required by the Vestry Act. He asked only that they receive his permission before performing the ceremony. Much to Draige's distress, the dissenting ministers and the magistrates continued to marry and bury as before, without permission from anyone. It finally became clear to Draige that he was not wanted in Rowan by more than a small minority of the inhabitants, he explained his situation as follows:

> They say not in words only but wishing that as they have opposed England in endeavoring to intrude on their civil rights, they also shall, and have a right to oppose any intrusion on their religious rights, a Maximum I presume dangerous in itself not with respect to this county and the neighboring counties, but to the whole Back Frontier of America, principally settled

[48] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 219.
[49] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 154-155.

with Sectaries, and is deserving of the attention of Government, before power is added to inclination.[50]

Draige had no vestry in Rowan and could not secure the election of one. At each vestry election the dissenters made use of a very common method of nullifying the law. Since they were a majority, they elected dissenters as vestrymen; then the elected list of dissenting candidates would refuse to take the prescribed oath and automatically disqualify themselves, leaving no vestry. To disqualify they had to pay a rather stiff fine of three pounds each, but in Rowan the dissenters did not mind this. They had built up a permanent fund from which to draw the disqualification penalties by informing against law violators and collecting one half of the fine.[51] In the vestry election of 1770 the dissenters effectively used this tactic despite Draige's attempts to persuade a majority to vote for his list of candidates. Helpless to do anything more himself, Draige misrepresented the conditions in Rowan while begging Tryon to intervene. He continued a short time in the county on voluntary contributions, handled by an unofficial or rump vestry made up of the defeated list of candidates.[52]

In Guilford County, which was strongly Presbyterian and Baptist the same method of evasion was used as in Rowan. In 1772 the Assembly at the insistence of the Presbyterian delegates dissolved a vestry in Guilford on the grounds that it was illegally elected, probably somewhat like Draige's rump vestry.[53] In Wake County, another strong dissenting area, the same situation occurred. When the Assembly became cognizant of these several effective evasions of the vestry law, it passed different local bills, each permitting a special vestry election in a designated county. In the special election the Anglicans had another chance to get a qualified vestry. At least the dissenters had to pay more fines for disqualifying. The Presbyterian members of the Assembly later had these local bills annulled on the grounds of illegal discrimination. Presbyterians in the counties specified by the

[50] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 180.
[51] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 179-181.
[52] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 202-204, 205-210, 502-506.
[53] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, IX, 661.

acts were put at a disadvantage as compared with their brethren in such counties as Rowan, where evasion of the vestry act remained legal and effective. Governor Martin, who followed Tryon in 1771 and who lacked his respect for the Presbyterians, avowed that he would pass an act universally excluding Presbyterians from vestries.[54]

The Quakers and Baptists joined the Presbyterians in opposing the Establishment. Tryon explained the reason that the Rev. Fiske could not collect his pay in Pasquotank County in 1769 as follows:

> I am told his parish is full of quakers and anabaptists, the first no friend, the latter an avowed enemy to the mother church. It is certain the preeminence the Church of England has obtained over the sectaries by legislative authority has drawn upon her their jealousies.[55]

In 1771 the vestry of Pasquotank refused to serve and the Assembly had to pass a special act to provide for the poor. The Quakers were also intransigent in Perquimans County just before the Revolution. The Rev. Pettigrew reported that they would neither hear nor contribute to the established minister. As a result the Perquimans Vestry decided to pay Pettigrew by voluntary contributions rather than by trying to extort anything from the Quakers.[56] From 1765 until 1776 there were almost constant evasions or criticisms of either the vestry acts or the governor's interpretation of them. When enforced against the will of the people, these acts were part of the bitter fruits of an established church.

The vestry acts were not the only oppressive aspects of a state religion. Certain privileges were given to the Anglican Church and denied other denominations. The two most important were the right of performing marriages and the right to operate chartered schools. The marriage provision was incorporated into the Marriage Act of 1741 and in later amendments to it. By this act only orthodox clergymen or, in their absence, magistrates could perform the marriage ceremony.

---

[54] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, IX, 341.
[55] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 14.
[56] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 496.

Perhaps, as the Rev. Joseph B. Cheshire pointed out, there were few organized dissenters in North Carolina in 1741 and no dissenting minister who claimed any authority to perform the marriage ceremony.[57] Certainly the picture had changed by 1765. Foote believed that one of the reasons the Rev. Alexander Craighead, first Presbyterian minister in western North Carolina, removed from Virginia to Mecklenburg County was to get away from the intolerant church laws of Virginia and to a place where, remote from all authority, he could marry his people in conformity with Presbyterian practice.[58] Presbyterian ministers were well known to be performing marriages according to their own customs throughout western North Carolina. The Governor's Council proposed a cruel amendment to the Marriage Act in 1762 because of this breach of the law. It would have placed on any "dissenting minister whatsoever" who performed a marriage, a fine of fifty pounds proclamation money recoverable by anyone suing for same.[59] This harsh amendment was blocked by the more tolerant Assembly, probably averting much trouble.[60]

In 1766 the Assembly faced up to what could have been an embarrassing *fait accompli*. Legally or not, many couples in North Carolina had been married by dissenting clergymen, primarily Presbyterians. An amendment to the act of 1741 provided that, as the Presbyterians did not believe themselves included in the marriage act and had endangered the validity of their marriages by marrying without license or banns, all such marriages performed before the first of 1767 would be recognized as legal. Thereafter all marriages performed without a license or banns were to incur a fifty pounds penalty. As a special boon to Presbyterians they alone among dissenters were granted the right of performing marriages, but only with license and on the condition that the whole fee be given to the orthodox minister if he demanded it.[61]

---

[57] Cheshire, "The Church in the Province of North Carolina," 68-69.
[58] Foote, *Sketches of North Carolina*, 186-187.
[59] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VI, 881.
[60] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VI, 884.
[61] Clark, *State Records*, XXIII, 672-674.

Although the amendment was passed partly as a favor to them, the Presbyterians were quick to resent its wording and intent. In a petition of 1769 the citizens in Mecklenburg declared that the act scandalized Presbyterian clergymen and tended to promote immorality by obstructing the "natural and inalienable right" of marriage.[62] The citizens of Tryon County condemned the amendment for not allowing Presbyterians to marry by banns. They declared this a privilege never heretofore denied in America.[63] But the strongest petition came from Orange and Rowan counties:

> And may it please you to grant us a Repeal of the Act, prohibiting Dissenting Ministers from marrying according to the Decretals, Rites and Ceremonys, of their Respective Churches: a priviledge they were debarred of in no other part of his Majesty's Dominions; and as we humbly conceive, a priviledge they stand entitled to, by the Act of Toleration, and in fine, a priviledge granted even to the very Catholics in Ireland, and the Protestants in France.[64]

For once the grievances of the Presbyterians were heard. In the Regulator troubles of 1769-71, the higher echelons to the Assembly remained loyal to Governor Tryon in his extreme measures to suppress the revolts. As a reward for this loyalty, and to appease some of the Regulators, he approved two very lenient acts passed by the Assembly in 1770 and 1771. One was an amendment to the marriage law; another was a charter to Queen's College. The former act modified the marriage law to allow Presbyterians to perform marriages in their own way and without any fee to the established clergy.[65] Another act to allow Presbyterians to wed without license was vetoed by Tryon because it was directly against his instructions from the Crown.[66] His veto was unimportant anyway, for the Crown refused to accept even the first concession because of its encouragement to dissenters and because of its possible weakening effect on the Establishment. The Rev. James Reed wrote to the Society for the Progagation of the Gospel that, should the act receive Royal consent,

---

[62] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 1015-1017.
[63] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 80b.
[64] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 82-83.
[65] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 322.
[66] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 469.

"it would be a fatal blow to the Church of England." [67] On the further recommendation of the Board of Trade, the law was disallowed in 1771, leaving a deep grievance among Presbyterians.[68] It is notable that one of the first acts passed after the adoption of the State Constitution of 1776 was one to permit any regular minister of any denomination to perform marriages.[69]

Only a small bit of favoritism to the Anglican Church carried over into the field of education in North Carolina. Pre-revolutionary education in the province was almost entirely private and church sponsored. The Presbyterians were pre-eminent in education and conducted their schools without restraints of any kind. Only in a few state-chartered schools was there any discrimination in favor of the Anglicans; New Bern Academy is one example. In 1764 a certain Tomlinson from England began teaching school in New Bern, mainly because of the efforts of the Rev. James Reed. Tomlinson was himself an Anglican and annually received fifteen pounds from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel for his academic labors.[70] In 1766, by an act of assembly, the state virtually adopted New Bern Academy, giving it a charter and providing for additional revenue. The act required the master of the school to be a member of the Church of England. To provide extra revenue it permitted a tax to be placed on all rum entering the Neuse River, thus, in a sense, taxing dissenters as well as churchmen for an Anglican school. It should be noted that the school was begun by an Episcopal master in a strong Anglican area and was well established before receiving state help and continued to receive aid from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel. After the Revolution the master continued to be an Episcopalian without any requirement to that effect. Finally, as the school had a religious as well as a secular purpose, there was very little room for objection by the dissenters, or actually, even by the rum drinking dissenters.[71]

---

[67] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, IX, 6.
[68] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, IX, 7, 284-285.
[69] Clark, *State Records*, XXIII, 997.
[70] Charles Lee Raper, *The Church and Private Schools of North Carolina* (Greensboro: N. C., Jos. J. Stone, Book and Job Printer, 1898), 25.
[71] Rev. Robert B. Drane, "Colonial Parishes and Church Schools," in *Sketches of Church History in North Carolina*, 177-178.

In 1770 the North Carolina Assembly passed an act chartering an academy at Edenton. Reluctantly, and only after a veto by Tryon of a former act, the members of the Assembly agreed to pass this act though it required the master of the school to be an Episcopalian. As it received no aid from the state, Edenton Academy remained a private school for all practical purposes.[72]

The most ambitious educational project in colonial North Carolina was Queen's College in Mecklenburg County. The forerunner of this college was a school taught in 1767 at Sugar Creek, a few miles from Charlotte, by Joseph Alexander, a Princeton graduate. When the citizens of Mecklenburg decided to enlarge the scope of Sugar Creek School, Queen's College became its successor and answered a real need for an institution of higher learning in central and western Carolina.[73] In addition to his concessions to the Presbyterians in the form of a better marriage law, Tryon also approved an act for establishing Queen's College. By the terms of the act the president of the college had to be of the Established Church,[74] but it was presumed that all the other masters and the trustees would be Presbyterian, as it was in a Presbyterian region and received most of its support from that denomination.[75] The college was to be financed by private endowments and by a duty of six pence per gallon on all rum and spirituous liquors brought into and disposed of in Mecklenburg County for a period of ten years.[76]

Governor Tryon urged the Board of Trade to accept the act in view of the Presbyterian's assistance in the Regulator controversy, but his appeal was in vain. The Board of Trade felt that the act should be disallowed because it favored Presbyterians and hindered the Establishment at a time when the King could not safely give encouragement to toleration. The act was disallowed in the same year, 1771.[77] A later act

---

[72] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VII, 591, 632-633.

[73] Charles L. Smith, *History of Education in North Carolina* (Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1888), 32-33. Hereafter cited as Smith, *History of Education in North Carolina.*

[74] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 448.

[75] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, VIII, 525-527.

[76] R. D. W. Connor, "The Genesis of Higher Education in North Carolina," *North Carolina Historical Review*, XXVIII (1951), 5.

[77] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, IX, 249-251, 284-285.

for the same purpose was also disallowed, leaving a cause for bitterness against the Crown on the part of the people of Mecklenburg.[78] About 1775 the name Queen's College was changed, perhaps, spitefully, to Liberty Hall Academy. Also in 1775 the citizens of Mecklenburg were leaders in the struggle for American independence.

Since the resistance to North Carolina's religious establishment paralleled a series of events leading to the Revolution and since the Establishment ended in the constitutional changes accompanying the revolution, the connection between the political and religious discontent might be assumed to be very close. The simplest and most logical story would have the Revolution beginning with the Regulator troubles and resulting from both political and religious oppression.[79] A close study of available evidence shows the great complexity of this period in North Carolina's history and indicates the following conclusions: first, the Regulator trouble was not directly related to the Revolution and was primarily caused by economic and not religious grievances. Secondly, the Revolution was only slightly influenced by religious oppression. Thirdly, the ending of the Establishment in 1776 was as much an accompaniment of the political disturbances as the result of a long series of struggles for religious freedom.

The Regulator revolt, beginning in 1768 and ending with the Battle of Alamance in May, 1771, was not a revolt against the form of government but against certain unfair agents who administered the constitution. It was not a movement for freedom, but a popular upheaval, or a yoeman's revolt. It was suppressed by North Carolina soldiers under many of the same officers who later led the colonial troops in the Revolution. Most important for this study, the Regulation was not a religious movement; the primary grievances were purely economic. Those grievances were excessive taxes in a time of scarce currency, dishonest sheriffs and other county

---

[78] Smith, *History of Education in North Carolina*, 33.

[79] This general explanation is implied in Stephen B. Weeks, *Church and State in North Carolina* (John Hopkins University Studies, Series XI, 1893), 46.

officials, including judges, and the extortionate fees extracted by unscrupulous lawyers and officials.[80]

Nor can it be said conclusively that religious grievances did not have any bearing at all on the Regulators. Certainly the Marriage Act of 1766, by requiring a license costing ten shillings for any marriage performed by a dissenting minister, worked an added economic hardship in the predominantly Presbyterian and Baptist regions of Orange, Rowan, and Anson counties. In his *Impartial Relation,* one of the better first hand accounts of the Regulators, Herman Husbands denounced an establishment or any other organized religion which joined the magistracy to become lords over the people.[81] Although the Regulators did not complain about vestry dues, this added tax, if it were collected in any of the Regulator areas, must have seemed an added burden. Other than petitioning Tryon to allow their ministers to marry according to forms prescribed by their respective churches, the Regulators were usually complaining about intolerable economic conditions, which they felt to be directly ascribable to the dishonesty of their own county and state officials.

All the organized religious groups denounced the methods of the Regulators. The area around Orange and Rowan included four leading Presbyterian ministers—Hugh McAden, James Creswell, Henry Patillo, and David Caldwell. These ministers addressed a letter to all Presbyterians, pleading for obedience to law and order.[82] They also pledged their loyalty in a letter to Tryon.[83] These ministers knew that many Presbyterians were in the ranks of the Regulators and were themselves sympathetic with the cause of the Regulators, only denouncing their use of force. Dr. Caldwell tried to negotiate some peacful settlement up to the very day of the Battle of Alamance. The German churches denounced the Regulators in accordance with their belief in subordination

---

[80] John Spencer Bassett, "The Regulators of North Carolina," *Annual Report of the American Historical Association for 1894,* 142-150; also see Haywood, *Governor William Tryon and His Administration,* 78.

[81] Herman Husbands, "An Impartial Relation of the First Rise and Cause of the Recent Differences in Public Affairs," *North Carolina Historical Review,* III (1926), 302-303.

[82] Saunders, *Colonial Records,* VII, 814-816.

[83] Saunders, *Colonial Records,* VII, 813-814.

to the state. The Quakers were as usual pacifists.[84] The Sandy Creek Baptist Association resolved that: "If any of our members shall take up arms against the legal authority or aid and abet them that do so he shall be excommunicated &c." [85] Although the Regulators included men from every denomination, the New Light Baptists, largely representing a low economic class, probably furnished more than their proportionate share. This is indicated by the fact that, according to Morgan Edwards, all but eight of the members of Great-Cohara Church moved away from North Carolina because of the Regulator troubles. Sandy Creek Church dropped in membership from 606 to 14 when many families, despairing of better times after the rout at Alamance, left the province.[86]

Another indication that the Regulators were not revolting against the Establishment is the fact that many Regulators were Anglicans. Husbands said the most trusted Regulators "were of the Church of England Communion." [87]The established ministers naturally opposed the Regulators. When Tryon first brought troops westward in 1768 to quiet the first series of disturbances, the established clergyman in Orange County, old Parson Micklejohn, preached a fiery sermon to the assembled troops, using Romans 13: 1-2 as a text—a text obviously aimed at the Regulators:[88]

> Let every Soul be subject unto the higher powers; for there is no Power but of God; the powers that be are ordained by God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation.

Not to be outdone in loyalty, the Rev. James McCarty, newly arrived clergyman in Granville County, preached a sermon to the second expedition on the text: "He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one." [89]

---

[84] Haywood, *Governor William Tryon and His Administration*, 189.
[85] Paschal, "Morgan Edwards' Materials," 396.
[86] Paschal, "Morgan Edwards' Materials," 381, 385.
[87] Haywood, *Governor William Tryon and His Administration*, 189.
[88] William K. Boyd, "Some North Carolina Tracts of the Eighteenth Century," *North Carolina Historical Review*, III (1926), 462.
[89] Haywood, *Governor William Tryon and His Administration*, 102.

In the Revolution the same group of men, lawyers, sheriffs, and officeholders, who had been oppressing the regulating groups in the West were the leaders in the fight against England, while the name Regulator became almost synonymous with Tory.[90] The Regulation was primarily a yeoman's revolt; the Revolution was more a revolt of the middle class. The Regulators were desperately fighting for relief from impoverishing internal conditions. The leaders of the Revolution were debating lofty political principles and resisting a restrictive and annoying British authority. As much as the Regulators had religious grievances, they were directed against a class of men within the colony who enforced, and sometime profited from, the vestry and marriage laws. To the extent that the Revolution was fought because of religious grievances, the enemy was always the British Crown.

The earliest settlers in North Carolina lent that province a distinctively independent attitude—an attitude which often vented itself in turbulence. Under the guise of beautiful words, the Assembly had a long history of opposition to the Crown. The delegates had always been quick to drag up their old Charter as a virtual bill of rights. After 1765 this independence was further awakened by a series of events. The Stamp Act was abhorred in North Carolina; the agent was made to swear he would not attempt to execute the law. Governor Tryon, with his royal bearing and pompous display, was well liked by the aristocratic elements in the state, but he left a legacy of trouble for Governor Martin. His extravagance in building a £15,000 palace, in leading a costly expedition to survey the Cherokee boundary, and in his ostentatious expeditions against the Regulators had left a huge debt. When Tryon left North Carolina the bond between the governor and ruling class was broken, for Governor Martin was plain, blunt and obviously in sympathy with the Regulator class. The break between Martin and the Assembly was soon complete. Martin tried to collect several special taxes, some to redeem paper currency issued as far back as 1748. He proposed to carry out, at the people's expense,

[90] Haywood, *Governor William Tryon and His Administration*, 166, 177.

the Crown's advice on the boundary dispute between North and South Carolina, which deprived North Carolina of much valuable land. Finally, when he arrogantly refused to accept any Court Bill which included a foreign attachment clause, the Crown government was virtually at an end. The lawyers, out of a job when the Assembly refused to pass any Court Bill at all, became the leaders of the revolutionary movement.[91] Sympathy for other colonies bolstered North Carolina's determination to resist British authority. Committees of Safety were formed all over the state. In the midst of all these happenings, the religious questions became secondary considerations. The governor's insistence on the right of presentation was one of the many past grievances which had added to the growing dissatisfaction. In one location, Mecklenburg County, the seedbed of the Revolution in western North Carolina, the royal disallowance of the charter of Queen's College and of the Marriage Act of 1771 undoubtedly had a great influence in driving these Presbyterians to open rebellion.[92]

The evidence indicates that the early dissatisfaction with British rule did not grow out of opposition to the idea of an Anglican establishment, however it did partly spring from what was believed to be a usurpation of ecclesiastical power by the governor. Many of the leaders of the Revolution, if not most, were Anglicans and many of the vestries went along with the colonial policy. For example, in June, 1776, the Vestry of Chowan County subscribed to the revolutionary oath, swearing support to the Continental and Provincial congresses.[93] In Pitt County the Committee of Safety decided to sell at public auction any fire arms taken from Negroes and give the money to the parish.[94] When the Committee of Safety of New Bern ordered a day of "fasting, humiliation and prayer," the Episcopal minister, James Reed, was asked to perform divine services.[95] On the other hand, most of the

---

[91] Enoch Walter Sikes, *The Transition of North Carolina from Colony to Commonwealth* (John Hopkins University Studies, Series XVI, 1898), 7-41.
[92] Charles Lee Raper, *North Carolina—A Study in English Colonial Government* (New York, The MacMillan Company, 1904), 227.
[93] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 612.
[94] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 63.
[95] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 115-116.

Royalists were from the back country and were largely dissenters. The newly arrived Scottish Presbyterians supported England all through the war. Most revealing of all, in 1774, the men who were soon to assume the leadership in the Revolution and were already defying Governor Martin on the important court issue, re-enacted the Vestry Act for ten more years.[96] The old act had expired two years before and Governor Martin begged that it be extended. If the members of the Assembly had desired the Establishment to end in 1774, they would surely have taken this perfect opportunity to neglect to renew the act. Certainly, with the ill feeling between Martin and the Assembly, the act was continued only because the delegates wanted it continued.

If there was still enough sentiment to continue the Establishment in 1774, why did it end with the State Constitution of 1776? In the first place, the Episcopal Church declined under Martin. The political controversies hurt the church and without any court law of any kind the minister could not force the payment of his salary.[97] The dissenters were growing rapidly; the Methodists were beginning to become important in the state. Much more important was the fact that the largest share of the established ministers, several still receiving annual stipends from the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, remained loyal to the British.[98] If the leadership of the Anglican Church had firmly supported the Revolution, the sentiment against the Establishment at the Constitutional Convention in 1776 might not have been sufficient to overthrow it. With the relaxing of the vestry laws, and with the ignominious arrest and suspension of several of its clergymen, the Anglican church, stigmatized alike by name and origin, did not have the strength to survive the political changes of 1776.

It is impossible to gauge the exact amount of sentiment that had long been forming against the Establishment. The numerous complaints and evasions among the dissenters indicate the oppressive nature of favoritism to one church and one clergy. It is clear that the majority sentiment, per-

[96] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, IX, 861.
[97] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, IX, 1251.
[98] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, IX, 1003-1004.

haps even among Episcopalians, was against a rigid marriage law and narrow educational restrictions. Although the Church achieved its maximum growth under Tryon, the establishment was not a success. The Vestry Act gave so much power to the governor that even Anglicans protested. The Vestry and Orthodox Clergy Acts remained so incapable of enforcement that many parishes paid their minister by voluntary contributions. When the revolt became a movement for complete independence, many people who, while approving an establishment of the Protestant religion, detested the restrictive and unfair aspects of the current ecclesiastical system. At last they had their opportunity to overthrow the *English* Establishment which they accomplished.

To their delegates to the Provincial Congress, which took over the government in 1775, Mecklenburg County gave instructions to support an establishment of Protestantism, with a confession and profession of that religion to be necessary for any person holding public office. Other than this, the delegates were advised to "oppose to the utmost any particular church or set of Clergymen being invested with power to decree rites and Ceremonies." They were also to "oppose the establishment of any mode of worship to be supported to the opposition of the rights of conscience." [99] In 1776 Mecklenburg instructed its delegates to the Constitutional Convention to see that

> In all times hereafter no professing Christian of any denomination whatever shall be compelled to pay any tax or duty toward the support of the clergy or worship of any other denomination.[100]

After the adoption of the State Constitution the Mecklenburg delegates were to urge the passing of two laws, one to abolish all vestry and marriage acts, and the other to allow any minister to perform marriages after publication of banns.[101] The only other set of instructions came from Orange County, and on religious matters, closely paralleled those of Mecklenburg.

---

[99] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 241.
[100] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 870d.
[101] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 870e.

The State Constitution of 1776 embodied the same religious principles as the above instructions. Article XIX of the Bill of Rights read: "That all men have a natural and unalienable right to worship Almighty God, according to the dictates of their own consciences." Articles XXXIV of the Constitution further clarified the religious question:

> That there shall be no Establishment of any one religious Church or Denomination in this State in Preferance to any other, neither shall any person, on any pretense whatsoever, be compelled to attend any Place of worship contrary to his own Faith or judgment, or be obliged to pay for the Purchase of any Glebe, or the building of any House of Worship, or for the maintenance of any Minister or Ministry, contrary to what he believes right, or has voluntarily or personally engaged to perform, but all persons shall be at Liberty to exercise their own mode of Worship. Provided, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to exempt Preachers of treasonable and seditious Discourses, from legal trial and Punishment.[102]

The idea of a lax Protestant establishment, already embodied in the Mecklenburg instruction, was hotly debated in the convention and finally accepted in a mild form in Article XXXI. The Rev. David Caldwell is reputed to have authored and defended this clause:

> That no person who shall deny the Being of God, or the truth of the Protestant Religion, or the divine authority either of the Old or New Testament, or shall hold religious Principles incompatible with the Freedom and Safety of the State, shall be capable of holding any office, or Place of Trust or Profit, in the civil Department within this State.[103]

An effective religious establishment came late to North Carolina. In the strong form that it assumed as a result of a consistent but unrealistic Crown policy, the Establishment met various types of opposition from both Anglicans and dissenters. This opposition was neither an important issue in the War of the Regulators nor a major cause of the Revolution, though it did reflect, along with the many political controversies, a determined insistence by North Carolinians on local autonomy. This dislike of centralization was to be

---

[102] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 1011.
[103] Saunders, *Colonial Records*, X, 1011.

again reflected in North Carolina's failure to ratify the Federal Constitution in 1788. The religious provisions of the State Constitution of 1776 can be explained by this desire for local religious autonomy, coupled with the steady growth of dissenters and the unpopular role played by the Anglican clergy in the Revolution. It was unfortunate for the Anglican Church that the Establishment became stronger and more fettering at the very time the colony was in the mood for asserting its own independence, for with the ending of political support the church was so helpless that it barely survived. It was another generation before the Episcopal faith could live down the stigma of having been the state church, or could, on the other hand, become strong enough to prosper without the state's help.

THE ELECTION OF 1836 IN NORTH CAROLINA

By William S. Hoffmann

The election of 1836 was one of the most significant in the history of the United States. Though generally neglected by historians it is unique in American history. It is the only election in which a political party deliberately ran more than one presidential candidate. The Democrats had a national candidate, Martin Van Buren, who was not especially popular in any section of the country; the Whigs had three sectional candidates, Hugh Lawson White, William Henry Harrison, and Daniel Webster. White ran only in the South; Webster, in parts of New England, and Harrison, in the remainder of the East and Northwest. Supporters of each of the Whig candidates could appeal to the people of each region and tell them that the Democratic candidate was an enemy of their section. They hoped to keep Van Buren from securing a majority of the electoral vote, so that the House of Representatives, voting by states, could elect one of the Whig candidates as president. Had their plan succeeded such strategy would probably have continued, and presidents would have been chosen by the House instead of by the people.

The presidential contest of 1836 was not a national election, but a series of state campaigns. As 1836 dawned the two parties had about equal strength. In North Carolina, as in the United States, the people were about evenly divided between the two parties.

In the state, as in the nation, the great personal popularity of Andrew Jackson gave the Democrats an important advantage.[1] Since 1815 the people of North Carolina had demonstrated their hero worship of the victor of New Orleans, and in 1823 when a few leaders of the state asked the voters to support Jackson they found a ready response.[2] A group

[1] Willie P. Mangum to David L. Swain, December 22, 1833, Henry T. Shanks (ed.), *The Papers of Willie Person Mangum*, (Raleigh, State Department of Archives and History), II (1952), 52. Hereafter cited as Shanks, *Mangum Papers*.

[2] Albert R. Newsome, *The Election of 1824 in North Carolina, The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science* (Chapel Hill, XXIII, 1939), 20-39 and *passim*. Hereafter cited as Newsome, *Election of 1824*. Also see William S. Hoffmann, "Origins of the Jackson Party" (unpublished thesis, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1950), 17.

of politicians originally supporting South Carolina's John C. Calhoun had formed an organization called the People's party. When events outside of North Carolina caused the South Carolinian to postpone his presidential aspirations and seek the vice-presidency, the leaders of the People's party pledged themselves to support Jackson and Calhoun. The dominant politicians in the state supported William H. Crawford of Georgia for the presidency, but the electoral ticket of the People's party was victorious. It defeated the Georgian's ticket by 20,214 votes to 15,621.[3] Between 1824 and 1828 most of Crawford's supporters somewhat reluctantly shifted to Jackson primarily because they considered him a lesser evil than John Quincy Adams.[4] In the election of 1828, Jackson received 37,875 votes while Adams received only 13,918.[5] During Jackson's first term his popularity increased among North Carolinians. The former supporters of Crawford enthusiastically applauded the Maysville veto and Jackson's other state rights pronouncements and became loyal members of the Democratic party.[6] In 1832 Jackson won his greatest electoral victory in the state, receiving eighty-four and one-half per cent of the total vote. An electoral ticket for Jackson and Van Buren received 21,007 votes, one for Henry Clay and John Sergeant received 4,563 votes, and one for Jackson and Phillip Pendleton Barbour of Virginia received 3,855.[7] Although Jackson lost some supporters during his second term the admiration which the majority of people felt toward him continued. The Democrats realized that they could transfer some of Jackson's popularity to Martin Van Buren, but their chance of victory was not so great.

The Whigs had many factors in their favor. Many respectable leaders of the state, especially former Federalists, had

---

[3] Newsome, *Election of 1824*, 48-89 and *passim*.

[4] William S. Hoffmann, "North Carolina Politics in the Jackson Period, 1824-1837" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1953), 21-42. Hereafter cited as Hoffmann, "North Carolina Politics."

[5] *Yadkin and Catawba Journal* (Salisbury), December 9, 1828.

[6] Hoffmann, "North Carolina Politics," 65-91; William S. Hoffmann, "Andrew Jackson: State Rightist: The Case of the Georgia Indians," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (Nashville, December, 1952), XI, 329-334.

[7] *North Carolina Journal* (Fayetteville), November 7, 1832.

supported Adams in 1828 and were the nucleus of the Whig Party.[8] In 1831, as a final act in the controversy concerning Peggy Eaton's social position, Jackson had asked for the resignation of Secretary of the Navy, John Branch. The ousted Secretary returned to North Carolina and declared open warfare on Martin Van Buren. He found many followers who were secret enemies of Jackson, who worked with him in organizing a new political party.[9] They promised to support Jackson for president and Barbour for vice-president. Sectional prejudice was aroused against Van Buren, and in the spring and early summer of 1832 this appeared to be the strongest group in the state. Due to Barbour's belated withdrawal and to their own association with nullification a very poor showing was made in the election.[10] They remained together as an effective political organization, and their private hatred for the President was increased when Jackson took a strong nationalistic stand during the nullification controversy.[11] Although most of them had opposed the national bank on constitutional grounds, when Jackson transferred federal funds from the national bank to state banks it served as a signal to join openly the anti-Jackson ranks. Together the Branch group and the original anti-Jackson men had more party journals than their rivals, and more important political leaders supported their cause. North Carolina was considered a doubtful state, and in many respects the state campaign was typical of the nation.

Since early 1834 the North Carolina newspapers had been filled with discussions of partisan issues. The Whig politicians and editors raised their voices in righteous indignation at Jackson's removal of deposits from the national bank.[12]

---

[8] Hoffmann, "North Carolina Politics," 45-50.

[9] Hoffmann, "North Carolina Politics," 92-110; John Branch to "A Gentleman in this City," *New Bern Spectator and Literary Journal* (New Bern), May 21, 1831; John Branch to James Iredell, Washington, March 31, 1832, James Iredell Papers, Duke University Library, Durham, North Carolina.

[10] Hoffmann, "North Carolina Politics," 111-133.

[11] Hoffmann, "North Carolina Politics," 134-154.

[12] *Raleigh Register*, October 1, 22, 1833, quoting the *Carolina Watchman* (Salisbury); *The Star* (Raleigh), September 27, 1833; Lewis Williams to Edmund Jones, Washington, December 8, 1833, Edmund Jones Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill.

When the Senate censured the President for his actions the Whigs praised the body for its "courageous stand against executive usurpation" and Democrats denounced the Senate as supporters of a "monstrous institution."[13] When Jackson answered the censure with an official protest many Whigs likened this "additional usurpation" to a tyrant's message from the throne, but Democrats applauded and agreed with Jackson that the Senate had no constitutional right to pass the resolution of censure.[14] The opponents of Jackson compared his tyranny to that of George III and occasionally took the name, Whig, to signify their opposition to executive tyranny.[15] Generally, both parties continued to call themselves Republicans, and both insisted that they were defending Republican principles.

The national bank called in loans and this seems to have been one factor in bringing on a depression. The Whigs denounced Jackson for not restoring the deposits and thereby ending the depression. The North Carolina Democrats denied that any depression existed and declared that the state had never been more prosperous.[16] The Whig voice was loud, and Democratic Senator Bedford Brown declared:

> Every day the accents of distress . . . sounded . . . Different kinds of distress prevail. . . . Not among the least distressed was that class of politician . . . distressed because their opponents were *in* power, and they themselves were *out* of power.[17]

Brown's support of the President's policy caused the Whigs to try to secure his removal. Mass meetings were called which instructed Brown to support restoration of the de-

---

[13] *Western Carolinian* (Salisbury), March 15, 1834; *Free Press* (Tarboro), April 13, 1834.

[14] *Western Carolinian*, May 17, 1834; *Raleigh Register*, April 29, 1834; *Miners and Farmers Journal* (Charlotte), May 3, 1834; *Free Press*, May 4, 1834.

[15] "Sidney" in *Raleigh Register*, December 23, 1834.

[16] *Western Carolinian*, March 22, 1834; Nathaniel Macon to Martin Van Buren, May 23, 1834, Elizabeth McPherson, "Letters from North Carolinians to Martin Van Buren," *North Carolina Historical Review* (Raleigh), XV (January, 1938), 174; Bedford Brown to Martin Van Buren, September 24, 1834, William K. Boyd, "Some Selections from the Correspondence of Bedford Brown," Trinity College Historical Society, *Historical Papers* (Durham), VI (1926), 88.

[17] Brown's speech in the Senate, *Raleigh Register*, January 21, 1835.

posits or resign from the Senate. Whig Senator Willie P. Mangum presented one such resolution to the United States Senate and referred to it as the voice of North Carolina. Brown declared that he would obey the real will of his constituents or resign. He pointed out that the meeting had been called by a disappointed aspirant and that only a handful of partisans had been present. The Whig press called Brown's statement a denial of the right of instructions and declared that his refusal to obey made him unfit to hold public office. During the legislative elections of 1834 the Whigs urged all men who believed in the "Republican principle of instructions" to vote only for legislators who opposed Brown's re-election.[18]

The Democrats could also play the game. They in turn urged the voters to cast their ballots only for candidates who pledged themselves to support Brown.[19] The Democrats gained a slight majority and succeeded in re-electing Brown.[20] After a bitter debate the legislature passed a resolution declaring that a Senator should support instructions from the legislature or resign. They then instructed the two Senators to support a resolution expunging the Senate's censure of Jackson.[21] Brown, of course, already favored the expunging resolution and needed no instructions. Mangum refused to obey, and fearing that his resignation would give the Democrats control of the Senate he refused to retire.[22] He declared that a Senator should obey instructions from the people or resign, but he denied that the legislature was the proper body to speak for the people.[23] Until Mangum finally resigned and was replaced by Robert Strange— three months before his term expired the Democrats constantly attacked the "disobedient" Senator for his action.[24] The

---

[18] *Miners and Farmers Journal,* March 1, July 12, 1834; *Carolina Watchman,* March 8, 1834; *Raleigh Register,* February 25, March 18, April 15, 1834; Copy of Burke County Resolutions, March 27, 1834, Shanks, *Mangum Papers,* II, 54.

[19] *North Carolina Standard* (Raleigh), November 7, 14, 21, 1834.

[20] *Raleigh Register,* November 25, 1834.

[21] *Raleigh Register,* January 27, 1835.

[22] Willie P. Mangum to William A. Graham, Washington, December 17, 1834, William Alexander Graham Papers, State Department of Archives and History, Raleigh North Carolina.

[23] Mangum's speech in the Senate, *Hillsboro Recorder,* March 20, 1835.

[24] *North Carolina Standard,* June 11, 1835, and *passim.*

Whigs, forgetting the origin of the instruction fight, declared that the instructions were part of the "Jacksonian reign of terror" to put down all who differed with them.[25] Neither side gained or lost much support because of the instruction battle, but it kept partisans on both sides active and aroused.

In 1835 the Whigs shifted the emphasis in their attack. National land policy had long been a minor issue. In 1833 Jackson vetoed a bill calling for annual distribution of the proceeds from federal land sales to all the states, but this caused only a feeble protest from the anti-Jackson men.[26] At that time Mangum had not openly broken with Jackson and had twice voted against the measure. Realizing that distribution would be popular in North Carolina and would embarrass the Democrats, he wrote Governor David L. Swain urging that the legislature instruct him to support the measure. He could therefore change his vote in obedience to instructions and not be condemned for inconsistency.[27] Although Mangum was destined to receive instructions of another nature, Swain did his part well.

In his inaugural message of 1834, Swain called distribution a panacea for all of North Carolina's ills, and the Whigs became ardent champions of the measure.[28] In January, 1835, the lower house of the legislature passed a resolution in favor of distribution, but the Democratic majority in the Senate refused their assent.[29] The Whigs constantly denounced the Democrats for blocking the distribution resolution, and Whig leader William J. Alexander issued a circular averring that the action of the Democrats had cost the people of the state five-million dollars annually.[30] At the next session of the legislature the house again assented to a Whig resolution favoring distribution, while the senate pass-

[25] Samuel Fleming's speech in the state legislature, *Raleigh Register*, December 23, 1834.

[26] *New Bern Spectator and Literary Journal*, March 15, 1833; Abraham Rencher's "circular" in *The Star*, May 10, 1833; Lewis Williams, *To the Citizens of the Thirteenth Congressional District of North Carolina*, Washington, February 12, 1833, 14. Hereafter cited as Williams, *Citizens of the Thirteenth District*.

[27] Willie P. Mangum to David L. Swain, December 22, 1833, Shanks, *Mangum Papers*, II, 54.

[28] Swain's inaugural address, *Hillsboro Recorder*, November 28, 1834.

[29] *North Carolina Standard*, January 16, 1835.

[30] *Raleigh Register*, March 10, 1835, quoting extracts from Alexander's circular, *Western Carolinian*, January 24, 1835.

ed a resolution which favored the distribution of an "unavoidable surplus" only.[31] The Whigs again condemned the Democrats for refusing to consent to annual distribution and repeated the arguments of the preceding year.[32] Distribution was popular in North Carolina, especially in the western part of the state. As Whig leaders pointed out, it would give the state millions of dollars annually which could be spent for much needed roads, schools, and railroads and would not cost the people one cent additional taxes. Whigs claimed that the Democrats were going to give the lands outright to the western states in order to bribe those states into voting for Van Buren.[33] The Democrats fervently denied this and could argue that distribution was unconstitutional and that the federal government instead of distributing surplus funds should lower the tariff.[34] They could make little headway, however, against the popular Whig advocates. Democratic opposition to distribution greatly aided the Whigs in the national campaign.

The Whigs of North Carolina considered many presidential candidates. Henry Clay was the favorite of the original anti-Jackson men, but national party strategy kept Clay from entering the race.[35] Nullifiers led by Charles Fisher wanted to nominate John C. Calhoun, but Willie P. Mangum succeeded in convincing them that Calhoun's unpopularity would throw North Carolina into the Van Buren camp.[36] In the fall of 1834, the *Raleigh Register*, organ of the original anti-Jackson

---

[31] *Raleigh Register*, December 22, 29, 1835.

[32] *Raleigh Register*, February 2, 1836, quoting the *Fayetteville Observer*, Williams, *Citizens of the Thirteenth District*, May 17, 1836.

[33] Williams, *Citizens of the Thirteenth District*, Washington, February, 18, 1835, 2-5; Abraham Rencher, *To the Citizens of the Tenth Congressional District*, Washington, March 6, 1835, 1-2; Edmund Deberry, *To the Freemen of the Counties of Anson, Richmond, Cumberland, Moore, and Montgomery*, Washington, February 28, 1835; Edmund Deberry Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill; Swain's annual message, *Raleigh Register*, November 24, 1835.

[34] *North Carolina Standard*, February 6 and December 15, 1835, quoting Richard Dobbs Spaight's inaugural address; Thomas Hall, *To the Qualified Voters of the Third Congressional District*, Washington, March 6, 1835.

[35] *Raleigh Register*, October 22, 1833; *New Bern Spectator and Literary Journal*, March 15, 1833.

[36] Willie P. Mangum to John Beard, Philadelphia, October 7, 1834, Fisher Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill.

men, and the *Carolina Watchman* (Salisbury), both urged that a state convention nominate a "Southern candidate" for president. The *Western Carolinian* (Salisbury), organ of the nullifiers, and the *New Bern Spectator and Literary Journal* warned that such a nomination might divide the party, so a convention was not held.[37] The *Western Carolinian* seconded the nomination by a New York paper of North Carolina's own, Willie P. Mangum, and the *Fayetteville Observer* declared that another North Carolinian, William Gaston of New Bern, was the ideal candidate.[38] James Graham, a Whig Congressman from Rutherford County, wanted the state to support a Democrat, Thomas Ruffin, Chief Justice of the State Supreme Court. He believed that if Ruffin could secure an appointment as Secretary of the Treasury, the North Carolinian would be able to defeat Van Buren and become President of the United States. For different reasons the state's Democratic manager, Romulus M. Saunders, was working to secure the appointment for Ruffin, but Jackson named another man for the position.[39] The one candidate who won general approval from the state Whigs was Hugh Lawson White of Tennessee.

White was acceptable to all factions of the party. In September, 1834, the *Western Carolinian* commented favorably on his nomination.[40] In January, 1835, the Alabama legislature nominated White, and soon the Whig press was filled with praise for the Tennessee Senator. On April 3, 1835, citizens of Statesville held the first White meeting in North Carolina. They declared that a southerner should be president and recommended White highly.[41] Similar meetings followed in other towns. The *Raleigh Register* suddenly dropped its nationalistic tone and declared, "The cause of

---

[37] *Raleigh Register*, September 2, 1834, quoting the *Carolina Watchman*, September 20, 1834.

[38] *Western Carolinian*, September 30, December 6, 1834, quoting the *Fayetteville Observer*.

[39] James Graham to William Alexander Graham, Washington, January 5, 1834, William Alexander Graham Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill; Romulus M. Saunders to Thomas Ruffin, October 15, November 4, 1833, J. G. de R. Hamilton, *The Papers of Thomas Ruffin*, 4 volumes (Raleigh: North Carolina Historical Commission, 1918, 1920), II, 98, 105-107.

[40] *Western Carolinian*, September 27, 1834.

[41] *Raleigh Register*, February 2, April 14, 1835.

Judge White is the cause of the South."[42] On December 22, 1835, Whig legislators and others held a meeting at Raleigh and officially nominated White.[43] As 1836 opened, Whigs in almost every county were holding meetings and selecting delegates to name electors pledged to White.

The Democrats also began the contest early. In February, 1835, the *North Carolina Standard* (Raleigh) the leading Van Buren organ, called on all Democrats to support the candidate of the national convention.[44] As in 1832, the enemies of Van Buren assailed the national convention. It was called a "caucus of officeholders," and the phrase became a greatly overworked cliché.[45] The Democrats defended the convention, and sometimes in county and district conventions which met to select delegates to the convention, they also named presidential electors.[46] The venerable Nathaniel Macon was named to their electoral ticket, and his name was an advantage to the party.[47] The Democrats were not going to lose the election through lack of energy.

Most of the state's Van Buren men preferred William C. Rives of Virginia as candidate for vice-president. In late 1834 the *North Carolina Sentinel,* a Democratic paper in New Bern, named Rives as its choice.[48] Romulus Saunders and Robert Strange, leaders of the state delegation at the Baltimore Convention, both favored the Virginian. At the convention Strange in an attempt to defeat the favored candidate, Richard M. Johnson, proposed that a two-thirds majority be required for a nomination. The convention assented to Strange's motion, and he and Saunders persuaded the minority of the North Carolina delegation to vote for Rives on the first ballot. Saunders and Strange promised

---

[42] *Raleigh Register,* December 22, 1835.
[43] *Raleigh Register,* December 29, 1835.
[44] *North Carolina Standard,* February 13, 1835.
[45] *Western Carolinian,* May 16, 1836. The phrase appears four times on one page of the May 16 issue.
[46] *North Carolina Standard,* May 15, 1835.
[47] Clarence C. Norton, *The Democratic Party in Ante-Bellum North Carolina, 1835-1861,* volume XXXI of *The James Sprunt Historical Studies* (Chapel Hill, 1930), 86. Hereafter cited as Norton, *The Democratic Party.*
[48] *North Carolina Standard,* January 2, 1835, quoting the *North Carolina Sentinel* (New Bern).

to support the nominee of the convention. On the first ballot Johnson received four votes more than the necessary two-thirds and won the vice-presidential nomination. Saunders made a speech and admitted that he, personally, preferred Rives but urged all Democrats to support the Van Buren-Johnson ticket. Although North Carolina Democrats continued to say nice things about Rives they gave Johnson wholehearted support.[49]

The state meeting which had nominated White had failed to name a vice-presidential candidate. Shortly after North Carolina Whigs made their nomination, Maryland Whigs also nominated White and named John Tyler as his running mate. Tyler accepted the nomination, and North Carolina Whig leaders added his name to their ticket. Many Whig meetings passed resolutions praising Tyler. Meanwhile Rives' friends had gotten control of the Virginia legislature and instructed Tyler to support the expunging resolution. Tyler refused, but, unlike Willie P. Mangum, he accepted the doctrine of instructions and resigned. Weston Gales, editor of the *Raleigh Register,* called Tyler's resignation "the strongest rebuke to Whig principles," and he called on those who approved Mangum's course to revoke Tyler's nomination.[50] The *North Carolina Standard* stated that Tyler was to be dropped at the "mandate" of the party organ and commented that Gales' reasoning proved that Whig principles meant ignoring the will of constituents.[51] The *Star* (Raleigh), organ of the states rights branch of the Whig Party, supported Tyler, and although many Whigs hoped that the Virginian would withdraw, few were willing to follow the *Register's* suggestion and revoke the nomination. Even Editor Gales, calling Tyler's resignation an honest error, acquiesced in the Virginian's continuance on the ticket.[52] The vice-presidency was not very important.

---

[49] *North Carolina Standard,* June 5, 1835, quoting the *North Carolina Sentinel,* June 5, 1835.

[50] *Raleigh Register,* March 8, 1836; Weston R. Gales to Willie P. Mangum, January 22, 1836, Shanks, *Mangum Papers,* II, 381.

[51] *North Carolina Standard,* March 10, 1836.

The North Carolina Whigs were more concerned with selecting a popular candidate for governor than for vice-president. The State Constitution had been amended the previous year, and in 1836 the governor for the first time was to be elected by the people. Four Whig candidates were prominently mentioned for the position. The *Examiner* (Oxford) suggested that Mangum be the party's candidate, but he was vulnerable on several accounts and did not make the race.[53] The *Carolina Watchman* named ex-Federalist William B. Meares of New Hanover County, but the Whigs of that county felt Edward B. Dudley would be a stronger candidate.[54] The National Republican wing of the party preferred Meares, but realized that his Federalism would make him vulnerable and accepted Dudley as a stronger candidate.[55] Thomas Polk of Salisbury was the choice of the Western Whigs, but he made a plea for party unity and stepped aside in favor of Dudley.[56] The *Register* called for a state meeting of White supporters to make a nomination for governor, and the assemblage unanimously named Edward B. Dudley as its candidate.[57]

Dudley accepted the nomination and showed that he intended to make sectional opposition to Van Buren the chief issue of the campaign. In his letter of acceptance he declared: "Mr. Van Buren is not one of us. He is a Northern man . . . in soul, in principle, and in action." [58] He said that Van Buren was an abolitionist who had supported the anti-slavery provisions of the Missouri Compromise and had granted Congress the power to abolish slavery. Dudley had been a member of the Branch group in 1832, and he repeated the charges made during the ill-fated Barbour campaign.

---

[53] *Raleigh Register*, March 22, 1836; James Simmons to Willie P. Mangum, March 9, 1836; Robert Gilliam to Willie P. Mangum, April 1, 1836, Shanks, *Mangum Papers*, II, 403, 417.

[54] *North Carolina Standard*, December 15, 1835.

[54] *North Carolina Standard*, March 10, 1836; *Raleigh Register*, November 3, 1835, quoting the *Carolina Watchman*.

[55] Weston R. Gales to Willie P. Mangum, January 22, 1836, Shanks, *Mangum Papers*, II, 381.

[56] *Western Carolinian*, January 16, 1836.

[57] *Raleigh Register*, January 26, February 9, 1836.

[58] Edward B. Dudley to Weston Gales and others, February 17, 1836, *Raleigh Register*, February 23, 1836.

He was advised to tour the state, tell anecdotes concerning his own service in the War of 1812, and avoid controversial issues.[59] He traveled widely, spoke at public banquets, and carried on an active campaign. His early championship of state internal improvements and his campaign pleas for public education aided his candidacy.[60]

The Democrats attacked Dudley on several counts. Lauchlin Bethune, a former Congressman from Fayetteville, called a meeting and denounced Dudley's letter of acceptance as "illiberal, anti-republican, unconstitutional in spirit, and insulting to the pride and patriotism of the state."[61] The Democrats charged Dudley with deliberately stirring up sectional hostility.[62] Democratic editors published a letter Dudley had written in 1830 opposing forceful removal of two thousand Cherokees from North Carolina. They twisted his words and averred that Dudley "thought it the duty of all poor men in North Carolina to give their daughters in marriage to the Indian savage." [63] Only Democratic partisans could believe such an absurd charge, and Dudley was not harmed by his defense of the friendly Indians.

The Democrats had little choice in naming their candidate for governor. Their party in the legislature had just selected Richard Dobbs Spaight for governor, and they were virtually forced to recommend his re-election. In March the *Standard* endorsed his nomination as "springing spontaneously . . . from the Democracy of the state." [64] Spaight was a poor campaigner. He refused invitations to public banquets and did not travel extensively over the state: he was trying to create the illusion that he would neither seek nor decline public office.[65] Most candidates tried to make their entrance

---

[59] James Graham to William A. Graham, Washington, February 7, 1836, William Alexander Graham Papers, University of North Carolina.

[60] *Raleigh Register*, June 30, 1836, quoting the *New Bern Spectator and Literary Journal.*

[61] *Fayetteville Observer*, March 24, 1836.

[62] *North Carolina Standard*, March 3, 1836.

[63] "One of the People" in *Raleigh Register*, September 6, 1836 quoting the *Carolina Gazette* (Rutherfordton); John I. Wright to David S. Reid, Rockingham Springs, July 30, 1836, David S. Reid Papers, State Department of Archives and History, Raleigh.

[64] *North Carolina Standard*, March 10, 1836.

[65] *North Carolina Standard*, March 31, 1836.

into a campaign appear as a reluctant willingness to serve, but in the case of avid, office-seeker Richard Dobbs Spaight it was most ineffective.

Spaight was extremely vulnerable in the congressional district which was composed of Rutherford, Buncombe, Burke, Haywood, Macon, and Yancey counties. He was linked with David Newland, the unsuccessful candidate in the congressional election of 1835. Newland had lost the election by only fourteen votes.[66] The state law required voters to cast their ballots in the county of their residence, and Newland secured depositions to prove that many of the votes for the successful candidate, James Graham, came from people voting outside their county. Newland carried his evidence to Washington. He had once announced his support of White but intimated that if the presidential election was to be decided by the House of Representatives he would vote for Van Buren. Many people believed that Webster, Harrison, and White would receive enough electoral votes to throw the election to the House and that Graham's vote could keep Van Buren from becoming president. The Democrats had a majority in the House and voted to unseat Graham.[67] Their action appeared to Whigs and non partisans as an unjust political decision made only to aid Van Buren's presidential ambitions. If the election had gone to the House, a pledge to vote with his district by Augustine H. Shepperd, a popular Whig Congressman from a Democratic constituency, would have caused North Carolina's vote to be given to Van Buren.[68]Although they had voted to unseat Graham, a majority of congressmen would not vote to seat Newland, and they requested the governor to call a special election to fill the vacancy. Instead of calling it immediately Spaight issued a call to make the special congressional election coincide with the next general election. The people of the district

[66] *North Carolina Standard*, August 20, 1835.
[67] *Raleigh Register*, March 8, 1836.
[68] *Free Press*, September 3, 1836; Ebenezer Pettigrew to John H. Bryan, March 24, 1836, John H. Bryan Collections, State Department of Archives and History, Raleigh, volume, III.

blamed the Democratic governor because they had no representative.[69]

The Democrats had made a strategic error. The Whigs charged that Newland had persuaded Spaight to delay the election. They asserted that Newland realized he had no chance to win immediately, but if the election was deferred the aid of the Democratic party would give him a better opportunity.[70] Newland's action was very unpopular in the district, and the Democrats suffered by linking their cause with his. Some Democrats promised Graham their vote because they said they could not "stand a turncoat." [71] Newland realized his own unpopularity and considered withdrawing, while Graham's popularity increased with four months of strenuous campaigning.[72] Graham won the election by a majority of 1,614 votes, and in that district Spaight received 1,491 fewer votes than Dudley.[73] In 1835 the district had sent a Democratic majority to the legislature, but in August, 1836 elections the people elected ten Whigs and only four Democrats.[74] A part of the shift was caused by the revision of the constitution which increased the representation in the Whig strongholds of Burke, Rutherford, and Buncombe counties. The roles of Newland and Spaight in the contested election nevertheless, had proven a major disaster for the Democrats.

Though his greatest victory was in the mountain area, Edward B. Dudley showed great strength throughout the state. He defeated Spaight by approximately five thousand votes. He trailed in the East by about three thousand votes,

---

[69] James Graham to William A. Graham, Washington, April 4, 1836, William A. Graham Papers, University of North Carolina Library; *North Carolina Standard*, April 14, 1836.

[70] *Raleigh Register*, September 6, 1836, quoting the *Fayetteville Observer*.

[71] James Graham to William A. Graham, Rutherfordton, May 7, 1836, William A. Graham Papers, University of North Carolina Library.

[72] Joseph W. D. Graham to William A. Graham, Elm Wood Farm, April 21, 1836, James Graham to William A. Graham, Washington, May 7, 1836, William A. Graham Papers, University of North Carolina Library.

[73] *Raleigh Register*, August 23, November 22, 1836.

[74] James Graham to William A. Graham, Rutherfordton, August 20, 1836, William A. Graham Papers, University of North Carolina Library.

but had an eight thousand majority in the West.[75] The Whigs considered Dudley's victory a great party triumph, but it was due in large part to personal popularity and active campaigning.[76] Edward B. Dudley ran well ahead of his party.

In the contests for the state legislature almost every candidate campaigned on national issues. Personal popularity still played an important part, but comparatively few men won elections in counties which disapproved of their national stand. Both parties had put forth great efforts to acquire a majority in the legislature. County meetings named candidates as friends of White or Van Buren, and every effort was made to get the strongest candidates to make the race.[77] The campaign was arduous, and there were few men able to sit back and win on their reputations. James Graham even demanded that his highly respected brother cut short his honeymoon and "go among the people." [78] If the old constitution had not been amended the Democrats would have won by a sizable majority, and the provision which gave each county at least one member of the House of Commons still left them a slight advantage. The Whigs won a majority of two in the Senate, while the Democrats had the same majority in the House.[79] The August elections indicated that the Whigs had a slight majority in the state, but by no means gave a clear indication that the people of the state strongly opposed Martin Van Buren.

The Whigs, nevertheless, claimed that Dudley's victory was positive proof that Judge White would carry the state. They placed more emphasis on Dudley's charge that Van Buren was an abolitionist and consequently lessened their association with distribution. The Democrats were more accurate in their analysis of the campaign. Bedford Brown

[75] *Raleigh Register*, November 22, 1836. The *Register's* figures give Dudley a majority of 5,007. The official returns give him a majority of 4,043, but three counties were not counted in the official returns. The returns from the three counties would have resulted in a majority of 4,729, *Free Press*, December 17, 1836.

[76] *Raleigh Register*, September 6, 1836.

[77] *Hillsboro Recorder*, February 29, August 16, 23, 30, 1836; Lewis Williams to William A. Graham, Washington, April 1, 1836, William A. Graham Papers, University of North Carolina Library.

[78] James Graham to William A. Graham, Vesuvius Furnace, May 15, 1836, William A. Graham Papers, University of North Carolina Library.

[79] *Free Press*, August 27, 1836.

wrote Van Buren that Spaight's defeat was due in part to local causes, in part to Democratic opposition to distribution, and especially due to "the gross falsehoods spread abroad as to the motives of Democrats who unseated Graham." Brown had high hopes for victory in November and promised: "our party . . . will go to the contest, without that sanguine expectation of success, which often proves fatal . . . and at the same time without despondence, which discourages exertion." [80]

The Whigs tried their utmost to portray Van Buren as an enemy of the South. They charged that the one principle upon which "he has always acted was opposition to Southern interests." [81] They declared that he had supported DeWitt Clinton instead of James Madison in 1812. They pointed to his vote on the tariff of 1828 and called him a champion of protection. They pointed to his vote to extend the Cumberland road and called him an advocate of federal internal improvements. They declared he had supported free Negro suffrage in New York.[82] The Democrats answered that Van Buren was a moderate on the tariff issue and was an enemy of internal improvements. They charged that Judge White was a friend of the free Negro and in 1823 had placed his arms around one and led him to the ballot box.[83] The Democratic organ insisted that Van Buren had worked to curtail free Negro voting, and all of his views were "in accordance with the interest of slaveholders." [84]

The Whigs declared that on the subject of slavery a candidate "must not only agree with us," but "be above suspision." [85] To prove that Van Buren was not above suspicion they wrote letters asking the two candidates to state their position on abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia. White, as expected, declared that Congress had no right to

---

[80] Bedford Brown to Martin Van Buren, October 11, 1836, McPherson, "Letters to Van Buren," 770.

[81] *Raleigh Register*, August 2, 1836, quoting the *Miners and Farmers Journal.*

[82] *Raleigh Register*, February 16, 1836, quoting the *Miners and Farmers Journal; Hillsboro Recorder*, October 26, 1836.

[83] *North Carolina Standard*, November 10, 1836.

[84] *North Carolina Standard*, July 10, 1835.

[85] *Raleigh Register*, August 2, 1836, quoting the *Miners and Farmers Journal.*

abolish slavery.[86] Van Buren called abolition in the District inexpedient and declared that it would violate the spirit of the agreement between the federal government and the states of Maryland and Virginia. He wrote, "The slave question must be left to the slave holding states themselves without molestation . . . from any quarter." [87] He would not say that Congress had no power to interfere. The Whigs used the negative phrase to declare that Van Buren conceded the power to emancipate and asserted his views differed none from "Tappan, Garrison, and Company." [88]

The Whigs charged Van Buren's running mate with a sin worse than abolition. It was well known that Johnson lived with a Negro mistress, but the Whigs were not satisfied merely to charge him with immorality. They constantly denounced him as an amalgamationist. At a banquet in Onslow County a Whig partisan offered this toast:

> . . . Martin Van Buren, an abolitionist and Richard M. Johnson, an amalgamationist. . . . It would be more congenial to their habits and conformable to their principles—the one to preside over the destinies of Liberia, the other to multiply and increase his subjects.[89]

Toward the close of the campaign Starling Gunn of Caswell County issued a circular emphasizing Johnson's private life. He charged that Johnson's moral character was

> . . . stained by the deepest and blackest vices known to moral law. For while others merely insist in theory upon the equality of blacks with the whites and the propriety of amalgamating the two races, he has reduced their principles to practice by taking to his embraces a NEGRO WENCH, and making her the wife of his bosom and the mother of his children.[90]

The circular made the rounds of the press but did the Democrats little harm. The Whigs had failed to learn that excessive personal abuse does the dispenser more harm than good, and the voters of Gunn's county would cast 1,067 votes for

---

[86] Hugh Lawson White to John Timberlake and others, May 2, 1836, *Raleigh Register*, June 14, 1836.

[87] Martin Van Buren to Junius Amis and others, March 6, 1836, *Free Press*, March 26, 1836.

[88] *Raleigh Register*, July 5, 1836, quoting the *Halifax Minerva*.

[89] *Raleigh Register*, September 20, 1836, quoting the *New Bern Spectator and Literary Journal*.

[90] Starling Gunn, "To the Voters of Caswell County," *Hillsboro Recorder*, October 21, 1836.

Van Buren and Johnson and only 116 for White and Tyler.[91] In North Carolina the questionable sex life of the vice-presidential candidate cost the Democrats few votes.

While the Whigs were doing their utmost to arouse sectional feelings against the "abolitionist and the amalgamationist," the Democrats were preaching unionism. They tried to associate the Whigs with the nullifiers, and almost every well known North Carolinian who had sympathized with nullification was supporting White. The Democrats asserted that White's supporters wanted a pretext to dissolve the union.[92] Bedford Brown urged the voters to oppose the sectional candidate and defeat the opposition's scheme of dividing North and South. He declared that only through Republican ascendancy had the "Union been preserved," and he pleaded with all loyal citizens to support the national candidate.[93]

The Democrats had one important issue in their favor. In 1836 gold mining ranked second to agriculture among North Carolina's industries.[94] In 1834 Democrats secured passage of a law to mint gold dollars, an act that was very popular in North Carolina. The Democrats declared that the law showed that the administration had provided more stable currency than the "rag currency" of the national bank.[95] The Whigs asserted that gold coinage was less practical than United States bank notes, yet they admitted that the act would uphold the price of North Carolina gold.[96]

In the winter of 1835 Thomas H. Benton introduced a bill to establish three mints in the South, one to be at Charlotte, the center of the state's gold mining region. This would mean much to the people of the area; gold could be sold directly to the mint with less danger of theft; transportation expenses would be lessened; and a ready market would always be available. When the bill was before Congress the

[91] *Raleigh Register*, November 22, 1836.
[92] *North Carolina Standard*, November 12, 1836.
[93] Bedford Brown to James Rainey and others, September 17, 1836, *Free Press*, September 21, 1836.
[94] Fletcher M. Green, "Gold Mining: A Forgotten Industry of Ante-Bellum North Carolina," *North Carolina Historical Review*, (January, April, 1937), XIV, 1-19, 135-155.
[95] *North Carolina Standard*, February 11, 1836.
[96] *Carolina Watchman*, July 12, 1834.

Standard told readers that Democrats were trying to secure passage of the bill but Henry Clay and the Whigs were trying to defeat it.[97] Both Willie P. Mangum and Bedford Brown made speeches defending the bill, and it became law.[98] The *Register* insisted that southern Whigs were responsible for passage of the law, and the *Western Carolinian* gave Calhoun the credit.[99] The *Standard* would not let the opposition take credit for the measure and pointed out that in the Senate thirteen of seventeen Democrats supported the bill while only ten of the twenty-five Whigs gave it their vote.[100] As the election drew near the mint was almost ready to begin operation; the Democrats commented favorably on the developments of the institution and reminded readers that their party had brought it to North Carolina.[101]

Toward the close of the campaign the Democrats loudly warned against the possibility of an election by the House of Representatives. In early October they issued a pamphlet emphasizing that if the people of North Carolina voted for White they would be doing "all that is in their power to do towards preventing an *election of President by the people.*" [102] They pointed out that 148 electoral votes were needed to win the election, and even if White should carry every state where he was running he would receive only ninety-four votes. They asserted that the Whigs had no intention of electing White president, and argued that if the new president were elected by the House he would owe his election, not to the people, but to scheming politicians at Washington. Every issue of the *Standard* denounced the "pie-bald party" and insisted that the Whigs had made a "tool" of "poor dottering old Judge White" in order to transfer the election to the House.[103]

During the final month of the campaign Democrats "exposed" a plan of North Carolina Whigs to transfer the vote of the state to William Henry Harrison. Joseph Seawell Jones,

---

[97] *North Carolina Standard*, February 20, 1835.
[98] *North Carolina Standard*, March 6, 27, 1835.
[99] *Raleigh Register*, March 18, 1835; *Western Carolinian*, April 25, 1835.
[100] *North Carolina Standard*, March 27, 1836.
[101] *North Carolina Standard*, January 28, 1836.
[102] William H. Haywood, Jr., and others, "An Address to the Freemen of North Carolina," quoted in the *Free Press*, October 15, 1836.
[103] *North Carolina Standard*, October 13, 1836.

a young Whig, who liked to exaggerate his own importance, was visiting in New York City and attended a banquet honoring Harrison. Jones announced that North Carolina Whigs would support Harrison if White could not be elected. An observer reported his comment to a New York newspaper, and North Carolina Democrats spotted the notice and gave it wide publicity. The *Standard* identified Jones as a historian who had violently denounced Jefferson and hence was good company for "federalist-Whigs." Editor White asked:

> Will the . . . Whigs and Nullifiers of North Carolina thank this . . . representative for letting "the cat out of the wallet"—for blabbing forth over his cups what his fellow Whigs at home are making such efforts to conceal—for revealing the secret that the nullifiers and their allies . . . are ready and willing to go for Harrison, the notorious emancipationist, the tariffite and corruption bank advocate? . . . That Mr. Jones while puffed up with flattery and mellowed with wine has told the truth about his party, every intelligent politician . . . knows full well.[104]

Philo White concluded that Jones' remarks constituted positive proof that the Whig electors intended to vote for Harrison.

The Whig Central Committee denounced the *Standard's* charge as a "Base Calumny, wholly destitute of truth."[105] But the damage was already done. Even had Jones not "let the cat out of the wallet," it was still logical that Harrison would be the second choice of the Whigs, and many intelligent non-partisans realized that to vote for White would increase the likelihood of Harrison or Webster becoming president. The *Free Press* (Tarboro), declared, "The people now see that White has no chance to be elected, and they will not throw votes away on him to help Harrison—a man who longs to see the day when the sun will not shine on a negro slave." [106] Although Harrison was no more of an abolitionist than Van Buren he too, was a northern man, and the political effect of the sectional prejudice which the Whigs had tried so hard to arouse was greatly lessened. The Democrats had presented convincing arguments that White could

[104] *North Carolina Standard,* November 3, 1836. Jones was the author of *A Defence of the Revolutionary History of North Carolina from the Aspersions of Mr. Jefferson* (Raleigh, 1834).
[105] *Raleigh Register,* November 8, 1836.
[106] *Free Press,* November 5, 1836.

not be elected, and many men who favored him stayed away from the polls.

Almost ten thousand fewer people voted in November than had voted in August. By a vote of 29,910 to 23,626 the people of North Carolina voted for Van Buren electors.[107] The Whigs blamed apathy and overconfidence for their defeat and insisted that "party drilling" was responsible for the Democratic victory.[108] The Democrats did have an effective organization, but probably no better than the Whigs. One factor in determining the result was that a large percentage of the voters in North Carolina were unwilling to follow a sectional party; and Van Buren's victory, in a sense, was a triumph of unionism over southern sectionalism. Yet the realization that White could not possibly be elected by the people was primarily responsible for Van Buren's success. In spite of Van Buren's victory there were probably more Whigs in the state than Democrats, and Hugh Lawson White was certainly more popular than Martin Van Buren. In North Carolina, as in the nation, the people had refused to transfer the election of president to the House of Representatives.

---

[107] *Niles Register*, LI, 228. It stated that its figures constituted the "official returns." See also Norton, *Democratic Party*, 86; Herbert D. Pegg, " Whig Party in North Carolina," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, 1932), 154. J. G. de R. Hamilton, *Party Politics in North Carolina, 1835-1860*, volume XV of *James Sprunt Historical Publications* (Raleigh, 1916), 41. Hamilton and Pegg give Van Buren a majority of 9,240. Norton states that Van Buren's majority was 15,240. The *Raleigh Register* gives figures from each county and shows Van Buren with a majority of 3,660. The *North Carolina Standard* publishes less complete returns and gives Van Buren a majority of 3,200.

[108] *Raleigh Register*, November 29, 1836.

"THE GREAT RECONSTRUCTOR:" GENERAL E. R. S. CANBY AND THE SECOND MILITARY DISTRICT

By Max L. Heyman, Jr.

Congress, under Radical leadership, began passing its "Reconstruction" legislation in March, 1867. It divided the ex-Confederate states into five military districts, each of which was to be commanded by a general officer of the United States Army. It set up a procedure by which these states might be restored to the Union, stipulating that constitutional conventions were to be held in each of them. Colored residents were to have a part in choosing delegates to those bodies, but the whites who were disqualified under the provisions of the proposed fourteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution for having supported the Confederacy were to be excluded from voting. The constitutions framed by the conventions were to provide permanently for Negro suffrage, at the same time disqualifying the leaders of the late Confederacy. After the charters had been ratified by a majority of the qualified voters in each state, and after the legislatures elected under those new constitutions had ratified the fourteenth amendment (the fifteenth was added later) and it had become law, the states might then "be entitled to representation in Congress." The generals assigned to command the southern districts were authorized to initiate the movement for satisfying these requirements.[1]

In the second of these military districts, Major General Daniel E. Sickles commanded—but not for very long. His interference with the operation of the United States Circuit Court in North Carolina, over which Chief Justice Salmon P. Chase presided, incurred the Attorney-General's displeasure and impelled the President to remove Sickles and to appoint

[1] The Acts of March 2 and 23, 1867. See *Statutes at Large . . . of the United States*, XIV, 428-429, and XV, 2. Hereafter cited as *Statutes at Large*. "The Great Reconstructor" is the title given General Canby by the *New York Tribune*. See also the *Daily Richmond Whig*, August 3, 1869.

Brigadier General and Brevet Major General E. R. S. Canby in his stead.[2]

In consequence of that action, General Canby was to be intimately involved in the important work of reconstruction in North and South Carolina for the ensuing year. The problems and conditions that he faced in helping to effect the return of the Carolinas to the fold of the Union were the same as or similar to those which confronted the other major generals who commanded districts in the South. His duties under the congressional plan of Reconstruction were primarily "ministerial" in character, but the manner in which he approached and performed them drastically affected the states he was appointed to govern. These states were in no position to prevent the institution of the radical-made requirements for their readmission and, within reason, they were subject to Canby's every command. Although the authorities of North and South Carolina complained vigorously about many of his actions, the Carolinas fared better than did most of the states administered by the other district commanders.

General Canby's arrival in Charleston, South Carolina, was greeted by a thirteen-gun salute and 3.12 inches of rain.[3] That was followed by "close and stifling" weather and the welcoming calls of the mayor and aldermen and various other gentlemen.[4] Meanwhile, Louisa Canby, the general's wife, was receiving "quite a number of the first ladies of the city." They created a "very favorable impression." The municipal authorities went away seemingly "satisfied" with the change in commanders, while the women were reported as

---

[2] Appleton's *American Annual Cyclopedia, 1867* (Washington, 1868), 547-548. (Hereafter cited as Appleton's *Annual Cyclopedia.*) Also see J. G. de R. Hamilton, *Reconstruction in North Carolina* (New York, 1914), 231-232. Hereafter cited as Hamilton, *Reconstruction in North Carolina.* See J. P. Hollis, *Early Period of Reconstruction in South Carolina* (Baltimore, 1905), 70-71. Cited hereafter as Hollis, *Reconstruction in South Carolina.* Also see "Report of the Secretary of War," *House Executive Document No. 1,* Fortieth Congress, Second Session, 23, for General Order No. 80, August 27, 1867, by which the President directed this action.

[3] Canby assumed command on September 5, 1867. See General Order No. 85, Second Military District, "General Orders-Reconstruction," *House Executive Document No. 342,* Fortieth Congress, Second Session, 60. Thirteen guns is a major general's salute. *Charleston Daily News,* September 6, 16, 1867. The rainfall figures are for September 8.

[4] *Charleston Daily News,* September 9, 10, 1867.

being "highly delighted" with the reception Mrs. Canby had accorded them.[5] Otherwise, no one ventured forth onto the "red hot" streets, unless, of course, it was absolutely necessary.[6]

The civic and society leaders of Charleston were not the only ones interested in the new commanding general. Nearly everybody in the two states comprising the Second Military District was curious about him, and the newspapers of North and South Carolina obligingly printed articles relating his history.[7] These were accompanied by comments, that of the *Charleston Mercury* being:

> In his opinions he is said to be a moderate Republican, who takes no prominent part in politics and cares but little to have anything to do with political affairs.[8]

It hoped that this was so.

Nevertheless, the *Charleston Courier* revealed that while he was not a politician or a partisan he firmly believed in the efficacy of the Reconstruction acts and thought that it was the duty of all Southerners to accept the terms which had been offered them. The letter which the *Courier* quoted, supposedly from a personal friend of Canby, concluded on this note: "He will be found just to all, but corruption or

---

[5] *Charleston Daily News*, September 28, 1867. Also see the *Raleigh Register*, September 24, 1867.

[6] *Charleston Daily News*, September 10, 1867.

[7] In 1867 Canby was fifty years old. After graduating from West Point in 1839, he served in the Florida War until 1842, on the Great Lakes frontier, 1842-1846, in the Mexican War (where he won two brevets for gallant and meritorious conduct), in California during the gold rush, on the Minnesota frontier, 1855-1857, in the "Mormon War," and against the Navajo Indians in 1860-1861. In command of the Department of New Mexico, Canby, by then a colonel, repulsed the Confederate invasion of that territory in 1862. Ordered to Washington, he became military assistant to the Secretary of War, an office which he held until May, 1864, except for four months in 1863 when he was in command of the troops that quelled the draft riots in New York City. Appointed a major general of volunteers, Canby was assigned to command the Military Division of West Mississippi, a capacity in which he received the surrender of the last two Confederate armies in the field. Thereafter his attention was directed to the problems of reconstruction, first in Louisiana (under the presidential plan for restoring the southern states to the Union) and subsequently, after this Carolina interlude, in Texas and Virginia (under the congressional plan). Following his service in the South, Canby was assigned to command the Department of Columbia, where on April 11, 1873, he was assassinated by the Modoc Indians during a peace conference. For a study of his life see Max L. Heyman, Jr., "Prudent Soldier: A Biography of Major General E. R. S. Canby, 1817-1873" (doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1952).

[8] *Charleston Mercury*, August 30, 1867.

disaffection in any guise will find him utterly inapproachable."[9]

With that, the "Old Soldier," who had served with Canby at Fort Bridger in the Utah Territory and had submitted the sketch of the general which the *Daily Sentinel* published, agreed.

> Let all politicians, red, white, or green, stay away from him, and he will do justice to all. Certainly I know this; he is firm, he knows no party, and he obeys the instructions and orders of his superiors.[10]

This veteran, for one, was convinced that North and South Carolina were fortunate to have Canby for a military governor.

The *Charleston Daily News* was skeptical. "[I]t may be that Canby . . . will prove less objectionable to the people of the Carolinas than General Sickles. We say all this may be. There can be no certainty on this point."[11] Simultaneously, the *Charleston Courier* was expressing the hope of the Carolinas when it declared:

> He has no other option than to enforce the Reconstruction Acts. It is believed, however, that he will administer these in a spirit of justice and liberality, without prejudice or passion, and with a desire only for the general welfare and for a harmonious restoration.[12]

There can be no doubt, after a careful examination of the record, that the acts were administered with strict justice, without the intense prejudice or passion which is usually associated with the period, and for what Canby conceived to be the general welfare. Whether one thinks that the justice meted out was impartially determined, or that Canby was influenced more by the "radicals" than by the "conservatives," depends mainly upon which side of the fence the reader happens to be.

The *New York Tribune* once remarked that "no one has ever called Canby a Radical";[13] but, after experiencing the

---

[9] *Charleston Courier*, September 3, 1867; *Chronicle* (Washington, D. C.), August 30, 1867.
[10] *Daily Sentinel* (Raleigh), September 11, 1867.
[11] *Charleston Daily News*, August 30, 1867.
[12] *Charleston Courier*, August 30, 1867.
[13] Quoted in the *Charleston Mercury*, August 30, 1867.

general's actions for a while, Governor Jonathan Worth of North Carolina did. That "quiet little old gentleman" of sixty-five, who was as "sharp as a briar," [14] was led to declare that "in giving us Canby for Sickles the Prest. swapped a devil for a witch." [15] He regarded Canby as an "honest man," but "an unostentatious and candid Radical" who cooperated "cordially" with the less vindictive portion of Congress.[16]

On another occasion, he labeled Canby "an extreme Radical," who was incapable of "magnanimous and statesmanlike" views.[17] He considered him "a fool," "more tyrannical" and possessed of "less intelligence and consideration" for the people of the "Tar Heel" State than his predecessor.[18] Indeed, after an interview with the general, Worth advised the governor of Georgia that "Our military comt. is, *com amore*, a Radical." Canby assured him, Worth declared, that "the laws he is appointed to execute, are not only constitutional, but wise." The general, moreover, believed that these measures invested him "with unlimited despotic power" over the laws and constitutions of North and South Carolina. Furthermore, Worth asserted, Canby maintained these views "as a narrow minded conscientious Radical."[19] No other person was so outspoken in his criticism of General Canby as was Jonathan Worth.

Worth's judgment of Canby was, however, very probably influenced by the fact that, from his standpoint, the new district commander was less cooperative than General Sickles had been. Whereas Sickles had favorably entertained his suggestions, Canby, the governor felt, all too frequently ignored him, and even when his views were solicited by the

---

[14] *Charleston Daily News*, October 18, 1867, quoting the *Chronicle* (Columbia).

[15] Jonathan Worth to B. G. Worth, December 26, 1867, J. G. deR. Hamilton (ed.), *The Correspondence of Jonathan Worth* (Raleigh, 1909), II, 1095. Hereafter cited as Hamilton, *Worth Correspondence*.

[16] Jonathan Worth to B. G. Worth, October 25, 1867, Hamilton, *Worth Correspondence*, II, 1061.

[17] Jonathan Worth to John W. Wheeler, October 31, 1867, Hamilton, *Worth Correspondence*, II, 1071.

[18] Jonathan Worth to R. P. Dick, December 13, 1867, and Jonathan Worth to W. A. Graham, January 10, 1868, Hamilton, *Worth Correspondence*, II, 1085 and 1131.

[19] Jonathan Worth to Governor Charles J. Jenkins, January 3, 1868, Hamilton, *Worth Correspondence*, II, 1105-1106.

general they seldom seemed to carry much weight.[20] Besides, from Worth's staunch conservative point of view, Canby's actions appeared radical. It must be remembered that no matter what Canby did in pursuance of orders, the subjected whites under his control (except the radical elements, of course) deemed his actions illegal and unnecessary.

Canby's part in the process known as Congressional Reconstruction was governed by the act of March 2, 1867, and the acts of March 23, and July 19, 1867, supplementary thereto.

By the first of these measures, he was enjoined

> . . . to protect all persons in their rights of person and property, to suppress insurrection, disorder, and violence, and to punish, or cause to be punished, all disturbers of the public peace and criminals. . . .

He was authorized to allow the local courts "to take jurisdiction of and to try offenders," but when, in his judgment, it became necessary, he was empowered "to organize military commissions or tribunals for that purpose. . . . " Thereupon, "all interference under color of State authority with the exercise of military authority" was to be "null and void." [21]

In endeavoring to provide the greatest possible protection for the people of the Carolinas, Canby stationed his force of nearly 3,000 officers and men at points difficult of access, where disturbances were most likely to occur, and from which he might easily meet any unusual situation. In South Carolina, for example, he concentrated eight companies in the seaboard region, six in the central section, two in the comparatively small Savannah River District, and two in the western or mountain country of the state. This arrangement was made on the basis of the ratio of whites to colored people

[20] Hamilton, *Reconstruction in North Carolina*, 240; see Worth to Canby, January 23, 1868, Jonathan Worth Letter Books (North Carolina State Department of Archives and History, Raleigh). Worth compares the actions of the two district commanders in his letter to John H. Wheeler, October 31, 1867, Hamilton, *Worth Correspondence*, II, 1069-1072.

[21] *Statutes at Large*, XIV, 428.

in each of those areas, their attitude toward one another, and the existing means of communication.[22]

James L. Orr, governor of the "Palmetto" State, expostulated against this disposition of the troops. Since the state was not permitted to organize its militia, the army was the sole reliance in case of trouble and Orr felt that the presence of the troops was indispensable to the "certain preservation of peace and order." He contended that a unit ought to be posted at every one of the county seats.[23]

If that proposal were carried out, Canby explained to the governor, it would reduce the military to a simple constabulary force and render it "utterly useless" in event of any serious difficulty between the two races.[24] "I believe that every district in this State wishes to have troops," Canby told General Grant. The people wanted a small guard in each village because it gave them a greater feeling of security and because it dispersed the army payroll among a larger segment of the population. More than that, it relieved the inhabitants of their ordinary police duties.[25] Yet, when a community had troops stationed in it, its residents complained constantly about the soldiers' conduct.[26]

This desire to have the troops everywhere was, of course, merely a manifestation of the uneasiness in some, if not most, sections of the state. Canby was "sorry to see" it, for the excitement tended "naturally and inevitably" to give a "coloring or suspicion of wrong" to perfectly legal and harmless acts on the part of the Negro. The general was satisfied

---

[22] Canby to the Chief of Staff, Headquarters of the Army, December 23, 1867, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 1891, 1867. Canby had thiry-seven companies at his disposal. See Return, February, 1868, Second Military District, Letter Sent, No. 1012, 1868. All the material on the district, unless otherwise indicated, may be found in the War Records Division, National Archives.

[23] Governor James L. Orr to Canby, November 29 and December 18, 1867, Governor Orr's Letter Books, III, 237-239, 329. Governor Orr's Letter Books are located at the Historical Commission of South Carolina, Columbia. Hereafter referred to as Orr Letter Books.

[24] Canby to Orr, December 24, 1867, Letters of Edward R. S. Canby, Historical Commission of South Carolina. Hereafter cited as Canby Letters.

[25] Canby to Grant, December 18, 1867 and Canby to Chief of Staff, December 23, 1867, Second Military District, Letters Sent, Nos. 1826 and 1891, 1867.

[26] See Lt. Louis V. Caziarc, Assistant Adjutant General, to Messrs. T. B. Whaley, I. G. W. Strowmann, and others, Orangeburg, S. C., September 17, 1867, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 696, 1867.

that the freedmen did not want to make trouble. As a matter of fact, he was persuaded that they were "quite as apprehensive as the whites. . . . " But this mutual fear and distrust could lead to disorders.[27] The cry of "negro insurrection" had been used so much for political effect that any incident was greatly magnified out of all proportion to its actual significance.[28]

To forestall any outbreaks of this nature, newspaper reports and complaints registered by individuals were promptly followed up. On October 31, for instance, Governor Orr informed Canby that he had "reliable" information that some 300 freedmen of the Abbeville District in the western part of the state were meeting regularly every other week to drill and "as they say preparing to fight for land." The governor requested the general to take steps to prohibit the Negroes from assembling and to punish the ringleaders as their crimes deserved.[29]

"Complaints of this kind are not at all new," Canby replied. They were frequently made and, upon investigation, it was usually found that the meetings were not unlawful in character or for any illegal purpose. In this case, the special agent whom he had dispatched to the scene reported that the Negroes had been in the habit of assembling there and elsewhere for some time past. Nevertheless, those guilty of violating any police regulations had been arrested and brought to trial before a military commission.

Some of the freedmen were found to be carrying arms, allegedly to protect themselves against attack by the whites. The fact that threats had been made against them was beyond doubt. Whether serious or not, the Negroes believed that they were made in earnest and had prepared to resist any attempt to break up their meetings. Aside from that, Canby assured the governor, there was no evidence that anything was brewing. If a collision did occur, Canby insisted, it would be "without intention on the part of the

[27] Canby to Chief of Staff, November 30, 1867, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 1560, 1867.

[28] Canby to Chief of Staff, December 12, 1867, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 1867, 1867.

[29] Orr to Canby, October 31, 1867, Orr Letter Books, III, 188.

negroes and from provocation on the part of ignorant or unprincipled whites."

He pointed out that the possession of firearms by the Negroes was still a novelty, and that the fears excited were not unnatural. But it seemed unreasonable to him to assume that they were to be used for hostile purposes and that "every assemblage of negroes is to drill preparatory to fighting for land." Dressing in old army clothes was not peculiar to South Carolina or to the freedmen and, the general chided Governor Orr:

> I have known the same complaint of waste of time in attending political meetings to be made of white men, when the question involved did not touch their interests so nearly as those now involved do touch the present and future interests of the negroes.

Of course, Canby mollified him in conclusion, he intended to watch the situation closely, and was ready to control and check immediately any "wrong tendency" that might arise.[30]

On another occasion, Governor Orr sent Canby an article from the *Winnsboro News,* telling of an "incendiary" speech delivered by a colored magistrate in Fairfield County. Again, Orr requested Canby to "depute a decent officer" to inquire into the matter and to remove and punish this military appointee if the report proved correct.[31]

The investigation disclosed that the *News'* version of the speech was, as Canby had suspected,[32] "a great perversion" of what had been said.[33] The governor thereupon became very indignant, maintaining that Canby had prejudged the affair, and he, therefore, childishly refused to forward the evidence which he had in his possession.[34]

That brings up an important point. Much of the evidence available in this period conflicts. The facts were subject to more than one interpretation and there was doubtless some falsification of them. There is no reason to believe, however,

---

[30] Canby to Orr, November 25, 1867, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 1499, 1867.

[31] Orr to Canby, November 27, 1867, Orr Letter Books, III, 230-232.

[32] Orr to Canby, December 18, 1867, Orr Letter Books, III, 331.

[33] Second Military District, Letters Received, J59, 1867, is the report. See also Canby to Orr, December 24, 1867, Canby Letters.

[34] Orr to Canby, December 18, 1867, Orr Letter Books, III, 331-332.

that either the governor or General Canby ever engaged in this misdeed intentionally. They merely took the word of their informants or subordinates to whom they entrusted the investigation of these reports. They could not be everywhere themselves. Canby could not avoid making some mistakes, but, where the evidence does not agree, his information has been given precedence, for that was the basis upon which he acted.

In maintaining order throughout the district, Canby preferred to leave the enforcement of the laws to the local authorities. These officers had been placed, by General Sickles, under the supervisory control of the provost marshal general of the command[35] and "in direct relation and correspondence" with the several post commanders. General Canby continued this policy, but, while defining more clearly and fully that relationship, he counseled non-interference with their activities. Only where those officials refused or failed to act, or "when it became mainfest that from past political action or by reason of prejudice against color or caste, impartial justice would not be administered," did he authorize intervention in the usual mode of procedure.[36]

Canby was especially disturbed by the prejudice shown by various civil functionaries. He discovered that some of the local magistrates were unwilling to investigate "well founded" complaints made by freedmen against white men. They were governed by "traditions of the past . . . instead of the law as it exists." The most effective solution for this, in his opinion, was "the exercise by the community of such moral coercion as will constrain the local authorities to deal as impartially and justly with the negro as with the whites" [37] —but that was wishful thinking.

Over 8,000 arrests were made in the Second Military District between March 2, 1867, and July 24, 1868, and about

[35] Canby to Assistant Adjutant General, Headquarters, October 24, 1867, in "Report of the Secretary of War," *House Executive Document No.* 1, Fortieth Congress, Second Session, 300. Hereafter cited as *Canby Report, 1867.*

[36] Canby to Chief of Staff, Headquarters, August 31, 1868, in "Report of the Secretary of War," *House Executive Document No.* I, Fortieth Congress, Third Session, 338. Hereafter cited as *Canby Report, 1868.*

[37] Canby to Orr, November 25 and 30, 1867, Second Military District, Letters Sent, Nos. 1499 and 1560, 1867.

one-eighth of them were made by the army.[38] These arrests inevitably became the object of protest by the newspapers and the governors of both states, often after the civil authorities had requested the army to take action in the matter. Governor Worth was particularly vexatious in this regard. He considered the power of military arrest "iniquitious" and "most oppressively exercised" in the "Old North" State. He even remonstrated with the President so vehemently about these acts of "*military despotism*" that he thought it would result in his removal, or Canby's.[39]

Neither was removed, but Canby found it necessary to defend himself against Worth's charges. In refuting the accusations that had been made, Canby asserted that he had more than once in years past secured the arrest of criminals and held them in his guard house until the proper authorities were prepared to take charge of them. He saw no grounds for the governor's objection on that score. In other respects, he conceded:

> It is always to be regretted that innocent persons should be arrested or subjected to any restraints or inconvenience from false accusation or unfounded suspicion, but this is an incident of civil as well as military arrests.

"Charges of military despotism are easily made," Canby observed, but military arrests were not made without previous investigation or on "strong evidence of guilt."

> As a general rule [Canby concluded] these complaints are disin[g]enuous in the use that is made of them by being published for political effect with the knowledge that the officer accused is restrained by rules of military propriety from making any public defense or counter statement.[40]

---

[38] *Canby Report, 1868*, 351-353. Arrests made by the military at the request of the civil authorities were not counted as military arrests and are therefore not included in this number. Persons arrested as witnesses, however, are included in this number.

[39] See the *Daily Sentinel*, October 25, 1867; the *Charleston Mercury*, March 4, and November 30, 1867, and January 23, 1868; Worth Letter Book, 1865-1867, I, 578-579, 688-692, and Worth Letter Book, 1867-1868, II, 50-51. Also see Hamilton, *Worth Correspondence*, II, 1069-1070, 1085, 1090-1091, 1095, 1098-1099, and 1101-1103.

[40] Canby to Chief of Staff, November 14, 1867, Andrew Johnson Papers, CXXIV, f. 17833-17854, Library of Congress.

As far as trials by military courts were concerned, only 550 cases were tried before those tribunals in the sixteen months of their existence in the Second Military District. Judge advocates do not and did not take cases into court unless they are or were almost positive of obtaining a conviction. They won 445, or eighty per cent, of the cases tried. And that was a poor showing, undoubtedly due to the fact that they were dealing with civilians for the most part and were obliged to argue some cases which should never have been brought to trial. Besides that, 129 of the sentences passed by these courts were either partially or wholly remitted by the commanding general.[41]

Congress had authorized the use of military courts in the South, while leaving their civil counterparts open. It was not General Canby's fault that this defied the opinion of the Supreme Court in the case of *Ex parte Milligan*. The only question that can seriously be raised against him is: Did he resort to military courts too much, or was it expedient for him to have used them as often as he did?

Many persons asked Canby for military trials, but it is estimated that about ninety-five times out of a hundred he informed them that adequate remedy could be secured in the civil courts. So, too, many individuals emerging the losers in cases tried by the civil tribunals appealed to him for retrials under military auspices, or at least military intercession in the decisions of the civil courts. The records show that these pleas were refused nearly all the time.[42]

According to General Canby's report on the subject, interference with the local courts was permitted only "in the exceptional cases growing out of the rebellion." How many times he annulled, stayed, or dismissed cases is not known, but he took action in three general types of cases.

---

[41] *Canby Report, 1868*, 353. The period actually covered is January 1, 1867, to June 30, 1868.

	Whites	Colored
Tried	368	182
Guilty	303	142
Not Guilty	65	40
Remissions:		
Partial	63	20
Whole	17	29
Conviction	82 per cent	78 per cent

[42] Second Military District, Letters Sent, 1867-1868, *passim*.

The first class were prosecutions for acts committed during the war under military orders. Cases of this sort were quite numerous in North Carolina, where the population had been divided in its allegiance, and when it was established, "by satisfactory evidence," that the animosity engendered by civil strife was the reason for the action, Canby stopped the proceedings.

In the second class of cases, where the local courts attempted to validate or give effect to unexecuted judgments of the late Confederate judiciary, Canby ordered dismissals; while in the third class, he stayed those cases involving a denial by the local tribunals of the right of appeal or removal to the Federal courts as guaranteed by the laws of the United States.[43]

Canby continued to enforce all the orders and regulations that had been promulgated by his predecessor, but, from time to time, he revoked or modified some of them. Of the many changes that were made, the one which perhaps caused the most indignation was the order directing the admission of freedmen to jury duty.[44]

In North Carolina, the qualification for a juror was determined by the possession of a freehold estate; in South Carolina, it was, for all practical purposes, determined by a person's color. Canby therefore decided to change the existing systems in order to "secure representation in the jury box to classes heretofore excluded, and constituting in the two States . . . a majority of the population." It was

> not only a question of abstract justice; but one that the interests of the community required should be so settled as not only to secure the legal rights of all classes, but also to give that sense of security which is the best guarantee of order and subordination to law, and the remedies it affords for the redress of all wrongs.

Canby encountered many practical difficulties in securing this legal right "to all the inhabitants," without at the same time introducing the "dangerous elements of vice and ig-

[43] *Canby Report, 1868,* 339-340.

[44] General Order, No. 89, September 13, 1867, "General Orders—Reconstruction," 61. General Sickles had already made provisions for Negro juries, General Order, No. 32, May 30, 1867, "General Orders—Reconstruction," 46. Also see Hollis, *Reconstruction in South Carolina,* 72; and Hamilton, *Reconstruction in North Carolina,* 234.

norance." He did not for that very reason, extend the jury lists as far as General Grant would have liked.[45] As he finally established it, all citizens who were assessed for taxes and who were qualified to vote were embraced in the jury lists, but the courts were permitted to purge all individuals who were mentally or morally unfit.[46] Color alone, however, was not deemed sufficient reason for disqualification.[47]

For thus modifying the law, Canby was vilified by the press (especially in South Carolina), Governors Orr and Worth objected (it was the former who wrote the President on this occasion), a superior court justice in North Carolina resigned in protest, and Canby was forced to suspend and then remove from office a judge in South Carolina who refused to execute the order.[48]

This power to suspend or remove from office any appointed or elected official, state, municipal, or otherwise, and the authority to appoint some other person or detail a "competent officer or soldier of the army" to fill the vacancies created by such suspensions or removals or by death or resignation, was conferred upon Canby by the Reconstruction Act of July 19, 1867.[49]

Canby made a number of removals, but the exact figure escapes disclosure. In North Carolina, according to J. G. deR. Hamilton, it was only a small number—three sheriffs and seventeen magistrates.[50] In South Carolina, besides the judge who has been referred to above, the mayor of Charleston, his military successor, thirteen members of the board of alder-

---

[45] Canby to Chief of Staff, September 14, 1867, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 676, 1867.

[46] *Canby Report, 1868,* 337-338.

[47] Canby to Adjutant General, October 15, 1867, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 953, 1867. Also see Worth to P. T. Massey, October 17, 1867, Hamilton, *Worth Correspondence,* II, 1054.

[48] *Charleston Courier,* October 3, 14, 15, 16, 1867, 2; *Charleston Mercury,* October 3, 4, 14, 15, 1867. The October 15 issue carries Governor Orr's letter to the President; Worth to Canby, September 10, 11, 30, and October 18, 1867, Worth Letter Book, I, 576-578, 578-579, 590, and 627-628; *Canby Report, 1867,* 304-307; and *Canby Report, 1868,* 338. Also see Canby to Chief of Staff, October 19, 1867, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 1012, 1867.

[49] *Statutes at Large,* XV, 14.

[50] Hamilton, *Reconstruction in North Carolina,* 238. In *Canby Report, 1867,* 312, there is a table showing the appointments and removals made to September 30, 1867, but it does not give any clue as to how many were removed or appointed by Canby. In twenty-five days, it could not have been very many.

men, the mayor of Columbia, and eight of that city's aldermen were removed at the general's behest; and there were others.[51]

Nearly every one of these removals seemed arbitrary and uncalled for to the people, inasmuch as the reasons for them were not usually revealed. But Canby did not make removals unless the officers in question were "disloyal" or obstructed the "due and proper administration" of the Reconstruction Acts.[52] If the word of the press is to be accepted he always acted without cause, due to the pressure brought to bear by the "Republican colored committee," "with no other motive than to punish and humiliate a proud, brave, manly, wrong hating people," or just to satisfy a whim.[53] The *Columbia Phoenix* made the typical comment when it remarked:

> Gen. Canby . . . has made some changes in our municipal government, not because of any grounds of complaint against the duly elected representatives of the people of Columbia, but simply because, as we presume, it seems good to him thus to act in the plentitude of his powers. The sword of the oppressor thus opens the way for the new regime to be tried in South Carolina.[54]

Canby's appointments were also received with disfavor, particularly when he appointed Negroes or "carpetbaggers" to office.[55] As a general rule, however, Canby allowed the governors of North and South Carolina to nominate individuals for office. The responsibility for making the appointments rested with him alone, and he did not always accept their recommendations.[56]

Canby sincerely desired to fill the public offices with "men of unblemished character," and he, therefore, had the back-

---

[51] John S. Reynolds, *Reconstruction in South Carolina* (Columbia, 1905), 70-71. Hereafter cited as Reynolds, *Reconstruction in South Carolina.* Canby to Chief of Staff, February 21, 1868, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 795, 1868. *Charleston Courier,* May 27 and July 7, 1868. See also Special Order No. 191, section I, October 28, 1867, "General Orders-Reconstruction," 94.

[52] Canby to W. W. Holden, September 24, 1867, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 763, 1867.

[53] *Charleston Courier,* May 27, 1868, and *Charleston Daily News,* May 29, 1868.

[54] Quoted in *Charleston Courier,* June 22, 1868.

[55] Canby appointed seven Negroes to serve as aldermen in Charleston. *Charleston Courier,* May 29, 1868; *Charleston Daily News,* May 29, 1868. Also see Hamilton, *Reconstruction in North Carolina,* 328.

[56] Canby to Worth, January 19, 1868, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 263, 1868.

ground of every recommended person investigated.[57] Of course, just what qualities one needed in order to have an "unblemished character" was subject to a difference of opinion. Governor Worth, for example, professed his inability to find a man of "respectable pretensions to fitness" whom he could nominate to succeed the judge who had resigned over Canby's jury order.[58] The general, on the other hand, questioned Worth's "standard of qualification." If devotion to "our holy and lost cause" was the basis on which Worth assessed the worthiness of a man for office, then Canby did not want his nominations.[59]

In several instances, Canby continued in office those officials whose terms had expired, which was, in a way, appointing them to their posts.[60] He did this because the present governments were provisional only until the states were admitted to representation in Congress.[61] When that happened, his appointments would lapse, and he did not wish to embarrass the new administrations by having them find, upon their inauguration, that they could do nothing about the officials who were in office as a result of being elected for normal terms by his orders.[62]

In dealing with the subjects that have been discussed thus far, Canby was abetted by a Bureau of Civil Affairs, which acted as a clearing house for the business of the district. Generally, anything relating to the operation of the Reconstruction acts and to the legal relations of the political communities, civil officers, and individuals in the Carolinas came within its purview. In handling these matters, the bureau framed orders and regulations, which, upon Canby's approval, were promulgated in the district; and it also prepared

[57] Canby to Worth, January 4, 1868, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 42, 1868.

[58] Worth to Canby, January 11, 1868, Worth Letter Book, II, 55.

[59] Canby to Worth, January 19, 1868, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 263, 1868.

[60] For instance, he ordered the town council of Spartanburg, South Carolina, to continue in office. See *Charleston Mercury*, October 2, 1867.

[61] *Statutes at Large*, XIV, 429, Act of March 2, 1867.

[62] Canby to Hon. A. G. Mackey, President of Constitutional Convention, Charleston, May 26, 1868, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 1922, 1868. Also see Caziarc to J. W. Schenck, Jr., Chairman, Republican County Committee, Wilmington, N. C., December 6, 1867. Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 1636, 1867; and *Canby Report, 1868*, 341.

briefs and opinions for his scrutiny, thereby enabling him to act more promptly and presumably more intelligently on questions presented to him for decision.[63]

The registration of voters, as prescribed by the act of March 23, 1867, was managed through the bureau and had been in progress for over a month when Canby arrived in Charleston. It was concluded twenty-five days after he assumed command of the district.[64] This registration was in the hands of officials appointed by General Sickles; consequently, other than a few specific decisions on who could register and the appointment of a couple of registrars to fill vacancies that occurred, Canby's major contribution to this phase of the reconstruction process was the issuance of a rather "liberal" index upon which the revision of the registration lists was based.[65]

When registration was completed, Canby ordered an election, at which the qualified voters in each state were to cast ballots for or against a constitutional convention.[66] They were, at the same time, to select delegates to constitute the convention in case a majority of the voters were in favor of it (and provided a majority of those registered exercised their franchise).[67]

The election was held on November 19 and 20 and, after a preliminary scare that the call for a convention had failed in South Carolina, the voters of both states were found to have expressed their preference in favor of holding conventions.[68] Accordingly, in conformity with the fourth section of the March 23 Reconstruction Act, Canby directed that

---

[63] *Canby Report, 1867*, 310-311. A. J. Willard, who later became chief justice of the State Supreme Court of South Carolina, who was in charge of this bureau. See Francis B. Simkins and Robert H. Woody, *South Carolina during Reconstruction* (Chapel Hill, 1932), 143.

[64] *Canby Report, 1867*, 312. See General Order No. 65, August 1, 1867, "General Orders-Reconstruction," 50-53.

[65] William A. Russ, Jr., "Disfranchisement in North Carolina, 1867-1868," *North Carolina Historical Review*, XI (October, 1934), 278. See Circular of October 31, 1867, "General Orders-Reconstruction," 69-72. Also see *Daily Sentinel*, November 8, 1867.

[66] General Orders Nos. 99 and 101, October 16 and 18, 1867, "General Orders-Reconstruction," 63-64, 65-66. The former is for South Carolina.

[67] *Statutes at Large*, XV, 3, Act of March 23, 1867.

[68] Canby to Grant, November 29, 1867, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 1543, 1867. For the vote, see Canby to the Adjutant General, February 19, 1868, "Registered Voters in Rebel States," *Senate Executive Document No. 53*, Fortieth Congress, Second Session, 3-7.

the delegates chosen at the late election be convened on January 14, 1868, for the purpose of framing constitutions and civil governments for their respective states.[69]

General Canby did not have very much to do with these conventions. In South Carolina, he refused to act upon several resolutions presented to him by that body, although he did issue an order, as requested, temporarily staying, for a period of three months, all executions and sales of property for debt.[70] He sanctioned a similar law, though one of longer duration, for North Carolina.[71] In both states, on the adoption of ordinances for the assessment of taxes to cover the cost of the conventions, Canby directed the treasurers of the respective states to advance money to defray the current expenses of those assemblies.[72] He did this because he believed that the members of the conventions and their creditors should not be compelled to wait for the collection of the taxes when sufficient funds were already in the state treasuries.[73] Other than staying until the end of the convention session the court proceedings in an assault and battery case against the assistant doorkeeper of the North Carolina assemblage,[74] Canby does not seem to have taken any further part in the affairs of either body.

When the conventions adjourned *sine die,* their handiwork and candidates for office in each state had to be submitted to

---

[69] General Orders, Nos. 160 and 165, December 28 and 31, 1867, "General-Orders Reconstruction," 81-92, 84-85. The latter is for North Carolina.

[70] General Order No. 14, January 31, 1868, "General Orders-Reconstruction," 97-98. Also see A. G. Mackey to Canby, January 25, 1868, Second Military District, Register of Letters Received, II (LXVIII), 591; Reynolds, *Reconstruction in South Carolina,* 80; and Appleton's *Annual Cyclopedia, 1868,* 693.

[71] General Order No. 57, April 2, 1868, Second Military District, General Orders, 1868. Also see Hamilton, *Reconstruction in North Carolina,* 262-263; and Appleton's *Annual Cyclopedia, 1868,* 555.

[72] Hollis, *Reconstruction in South Carolina,* 88. General Order No. 17, February 6, 1868, "General Orders-Reconstruction," 98-99, for South Carolina. Hamilton, *Reconstruction in North Carolina,* 260-261. General Order No. 20, February 12, 1868, Second Military District, General Orders, 1868, for North Carolina.

[73] Kemp P. Battle, *Memoirs of an Old-Time Tar Heel* (Chapel Hill, 1945), 213-214. Edited by William J. Battle. Kemp P. Battle was treasurer of North Carolina.

[74] Canby to C. J. Cowles, President of Constitutional Convention, Raleigh, March 14, 1868, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 1052, 1868. On January 17, 1868, he attended a session of the South Carolina Convention to hear Governor Orr address that body. See *Charleston Courier,* January 18, 1868. On February 12, 1868, he sat in on the North Carolina Convention. See *North Carolina Standard,* February 13, 1868.

the voters. So, while the nation buzzed about the impeachment move against President Johnson, Canby proceeded to authorize a second election for the Carolinas.[75]

On learning that there might be attempts by "combinations" to prevent, delay, or hinder persons from voting by force, intimidation, or threats of violence, the general promulgated another order warning that any interference with the election would be punished as provided by law.[76] One thing that bothered him was how to prevent persons from discharging their employees or tenants for not voting as they were told. He sought to forestall this by letting it be known "that the duty of the military authority to secure a fair and free election will be fully performed"; that if laborers and tenants were displaced and became public charges, the county poor wardens would be required to take care of them and an additional tax would be levied for that purpose. Moreover, advances by the Freedmen's Bureau would be withheld from planters who engaged in this practice.[77] How Canby proposed to ascertain positively who dismissed his employees because of the way they voted is difficult to perceive.

Hamilton has asserted that General Canby had the names of the candidates for office in each state placed on the same ballot with the question of ratification of the constitution, thus, by a "piece of entirely unjustifiable partisan politics," preventing all who had been disfranchised under the Reconstruction Acts from exercising their franchise as provided by the newly framed charters.[78] This statement is somewhat misleading. By the fourth section of the Second Reconstruction Act, the proposed constitutions had to be ratified by "the persons registered under the provisions of this [the March 23] act. . . ." [79] Canby merely conformed to the letter of the

[75] General Orders Nos. 40 and 45, March 13 and 23, 1868, "Elections in Southern States," *House Executive Document No. 291*, Fortieth Congress, First Session, 9-11, 4-8. The former was for South Carolina.

[76] General Order No. 61, April 6, 1868, Second Military District, General Orders, 1868.

[77] General Order No. 80, May 2, 1868, Second Military District, General Orders, 1868; see also Caziarc to Colonel W. B. Royal, April 10, 1868, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 1337, 1868.

[78] Hamilton, *Reconstruction in North Carolina*, 285-286.

[79] *Statutes at Large*, XV, 3.

law, which he interpreted to mean that the constitutions just drafted remained inoperative until they were accepted by Congress.[80]

It is true that if Canby had permitted the vote on the question of ratification to be taken first, waited for Congress to approve the new documents, and then allowed a second election for state and country officers, most of those who had been disfranchised by Congress would have had a chance to vote on the candidates for office. But this would have been an involved, costly, and time-consuming process to say the least.

Canby did, however, have the registration lists revised before the poll on ratification was taken and whereas, in North Carolina, the total registration prior to the election on the convention question had been 178,665, it was now raised to 196,873—an increase of over 18,000. In South Carolina, the earlier registration figure was upped 5,139 to 133,195.[81]

Canby did everything possible to get out the vote,[82] even suspending the sessions of the state courts so that all might have an opportunity to exercise their franchise.[83] The election was held April 14 to 16 in South Carolina and April 21 to 23 in North Carolina, and the people of the two states accepted the proposed constitutions.[84]

On June 25, 1868, Congress approved these charters.[85] The states had only to install their new officers, ratify the proposed fourteenth amendment to the Federal Constitution, and the ordeal by Congressional Reconstruction would be over.[86] At this juncture, in order to "facilitate" the organization of the new administrations, Canby removed the provisional officers of both states and appointed the recently elected officials in their stead.[87] This was done by General

[80] See Canby to Orr, May 1, 1868, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 1600, 1868.

[81] *Canby Report, 1868,* 340-341.

[82] See the provisions of General Orders Nos. 40 and 45, March 13 or 23, 1868, "Elections in Southern States," 5, 9-10.

[83] General Order No. 65, April 10, 1868, Second Military District, General Orders, 1868.

[84] *Canby Report, 1868,* 340-341.

[85] The constitutions of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and Louisiana were also accepted in the "Omnibus Bill." See *Statutes at Large,* XV, 73-74.

[86] *Statutes at Large,* XIV, 429, Act of March 2, 1867.

[87] General Order No. 120, June 30, 1868, Second Military District General Orders, 1868.

Grant's direction and was in accord with the desire of the Radicals to be certain that the reconstructed state governments came into existence. There was the possibility that the incumbents would refuse to yield office, and that could be embarrassing, especially if the matter was brought before the courts.

> It is perhaps, useless to speculate upon the considerations, which produced so sudden a change in the mind of the District Commander, as to cause him to modify his first order providing for the inauguration of the *civil* government. There is no accounting for the vagaries of military caprice, especially when the caprice is the result of an utter ignorance of law and of usage in civil affairs.

The *Daily Sentinel* (Raleigh) contended that if General Canby's object was to avoid an "awkward dilemma," then he had "jumped out of the frying pan into the fire," and by his "boggling proceedings" had placed the governor-elect in an "ungraceful" position.[88]

Canby also took this step because many of the candidates-elect in North and South Carolina could not take the test oath of July 2, 1862. Until the ninth section of the Third Reconstruction Act was nullified in each of the states undergoing reconstruction that oath was required of all its appointed or elected officials. It was, unfortunately, a technicality that debarred "many active and zealous friends of the Union and of restoration" from holding office and, Canby maintained, it ought to be dispensed with at once. Indeed, he recommended that course to Congress.

> To continue the disabilities which exclude these persons is to deprive the government still further of the services of intelligent and well-disposed men, whose technical disqualification is their only fault, and whose aid is essentially important to the speedy organization and successful working of the new State governments. The removal of the disabilities, while it will not jeopardize any interest which it is the policy of the government of the United States to conserve and foster, will, in my judgment, not only meet the approval of a large majority of the people of the two States, but will disarm much of the opposition

[88] *Daily Sentinel*, July 3, 1868.

which the new State governments must expect to encounter, and contribute greatly to the permanent success of the work of reconstruction.

Canby thought it would be "inexpedient" to dispense with the requirement which he desired to see relaxed if there were any "personal considerations" prejudicial to the officers-elect, but he did not know of any such objections.[89]

Canby considered it "so important" to organize the new administrations before military control was withdrawn that he went ahead and adopted the recently recognized constitutions of North and South Carolina as the fundamental law of each state.[90] He held that the Congressional approval of the proposed constitutions made them a part of the Reconstruction acts and, to the extent that Congress had directed or authorized action under them in advance of the admission of the states, dispensed with the provisions of any previous laws that conflicted with those charters.

The law of June 25, 1868, approving the constitutions of [North and South Carolina], and authorizing specific action under them [Canby explained], was regarded by me as dispensing with the oath of office prescribed by the law of July 2, 1862, first as to the members of the general assembly, and, after the ratification of the constitutional amendment, to the other State officers duly elected and qualified under those constitutions. This construction, in its first application, did not include the governor and lieutenant governor, but as the organization of the legislature would have been incomplete without the lieutenant governor, and as the legislative action required by the law might have been embarrassed by the action of the old incumbents, the General of the Army directed that they should be removed and the governor and lieutenant governor elect should be appointed in their places.[91]

---

[89] Canby to Chief of Staff, May 4, 1868, "Second Military District," *House Executive Document No. 276*, Fortieth Congress, Second Session, 2-4, the quote being on the latter page.

[90] Canby to Chief of Staff, May 7, 1868, "Letter on the South Carolina Convention," *Senate Executive Document No. 55*, Fortieth Congress, Second Session, 2.

[91] Grant approved Canby's first action. See Canby to B. W. Gillis, June 26, 1869, "Test Oath in Virginia," *House Miscellaneous Document No. 8*, Forty-first Congress, Second Session, 16.

On July 24, 1868, having been notified that the legislatures of North and South Carolina had ratified the constitutional amendment known as article XIV, Canby remitted to the civil authorities of the two states all the power conferred upon and exercised by him under the act of March 2, 1867.[92] The "dominion of arms" was over and the people of the Carolinas turned to face civil radical rule. Nevertheless, the press rejoiced; the *Wilmington Journal,* for example, declaring:

> It gives us pleasure . . . to publish the final order of the Commander of this Military District. We may need the presence of the military to check the revolutionary schemes of the Radicals, and if so, we trust we may be favored with an officer and not a partisan—a soldier full of honor and justice, and not the tool of designing and bad men.[93]

Could the editor have been referring to Canby?

Before making a final analysis of the general's work in the Second Military District, mention must be made of one other service that Canby performed while he was in command of the Carolinas. Except for the first month of his tour of duty there, he was supervisory assistant commissioner of the Freedmen's Bureau for the limits of his district.[94]

It was only natural that this should have come to pass, for it was unquestionably desirable to have under the same direction the bureau officers and the other military personnel who were entrusted with the protection of persons and property by the acts of Congress.[95] The assistant commissioners for North and South Carolina were therefore ordered to report to Canby for instructions, although they continued to

[92] General Order No. 145, July 24, 1868, Second Military District, General Orders, 1868.

[93] Quoted in the *Charleston Courier,* August 10, 1868. Also see the *Charleston Courier,* July 21, 1868.

[94] Commissioner-General O. O. Howard to Canby, November 29, 1867, Freedmen's Bureau, Letter Sent, 1867. The correct title of this War Department agency was the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands.

[95] Commissioner-General O. O. Howard to Canby, October 23, 1867, Freedmen's Bureau, Letter Sent, 1867. Canby to Howard, November 4, 1867, Second Military District, Letters Sent, II, 248-249. Also see Caziarc to General N. A. Miles, October 23, 1867, Second Military District, Letters Sent, II, No. 1044, 1867.

communicate directly with bureau headquarters in Washington.

Canby did not have the time or the inclination to control the administrative details of the Carolina bureaux, hence that was left in the hands of the assistant commissioners.[96] He could not relieve or discharge any bureau agent,[97] but he could and did appoint the several post commanders in the district to be sub-assistant commissioners of the bureau within the limits of their stations.[98] That action created some consternation and jealousy, both on the part of General Nelson A. Miles, the assistant commissioner for North Carolina, and General R. K. Scott, his counterpart to the south. They feared that the commanding general was usurping their rightful duties.[99]

In his role as supervisory assistant commissioner, Canby advised the assistant commissioners and granted or withheld authority in matters pertaining to the freedmen.[100] In particular, however, all during this period, he was especially concerned about the effect on the Carolinas of the failure of the crops and the fall in cotton prices.

It was partially on this account that Governor Orr had protested Canby's consolidation of the troops. He was fearful lest those thrown out of work by this unfortunate turn of events would be forced to plunder and steal in order to keep alive.[101] The possibility of "grave disorders" arising from the fact that the Negroes were unable to find employment or procure food was undoubted, and Canby assured the governor that "serious consideration" had been given to the

---

[96] See Canby to Howard, November 4, 1867, Second Military District Letters Sent, II, 248-249.

[97] The assistant commissioners did that or it was done by Howard. See Howard to Canby, December 13, 1867, and Howard to General R. K. Scott, December 13, 1867, Freedmen's Bureau, Letter Sent, 1867.

[98] General Order No. 145, December 6, 1867, see Caziarc to Commanding Officer, Wilmington, N. C., December 17, 1867, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 1838, 1867. The replaced officers were volunteers and civilians who had been acting as agents. For an account of a bureau agent in Greenville, South Carolina, see John W. De Forest, *A Union Officer in Reconstruction* (New Haven, 1948).

[99] See Scott to Caziarc, December 10, 1867; Howard to Scott, December 13, 1867; and Howard to Miles, December 11, 1867, Freedmen's Bureau, Letter Sent, 1867. Scott became Governor of South Carolina in 1868.

[100] Second Military District, Letters Sent, 1867-1868, *passim.*

[101] Orr to Canby, November 29 and December 18, 1867, Orr Letter Books, III, 238 and 328.

subject and that every precaution was being taken to guard against that danger.[102] He had noticed the increase in pilfering too.[103]

On December 20, 1867, Canby addressed a letter to the chief of staff inviting his attention to the destitution and suffering likely to occur during the coming months unless special ration issues were authorized. He estimated that 30,000 Negroes in the seaboard region of South Carolina alone (and that was the section hardest hit) were without jobs and were consequently without the means of support.

How to avert the difficulties which might be expected to stem from "a population idle from necessity, and impelled by hunger," was a question of the "gravest character."

> If direct issues of food are made [Canby declared], we incur the risk of encouraging idleness, and its attendant vices, and of creating a proletarian population, that will look to the Government for relief, whenever misfortune, want of thrift, or idleness reduces them to want.

If, on the other hand, the government interfered in the employment process, Canby contended that the precedent thus established would be "almost as dangerous."

He believed that no gratuitious issues should be made except to the infirm and helpless, that relief should be given to the poor only and then in amounts necessary to prevent suffering. The issues, moreover, should be in the shape of advances, or loans, which were to be repaid when the next crop was gathered. Furthermore, he felt that these advances ought to be a lien against the crop, "not only to assure the Government against loss, but to impress upon those to whom they are made, habits of industry and thrift, by considerations of interest, as well as morals."

He wanted these advances to be made to the colored people who were cultivating lands for themselves, and only when this was impossible, to planters who, without some help, would be unable to give employment to the freedmen.

---

[102] Canby to Chief of Staff, December 23, 1867, Second Military District Letters Sent, No. 1891, 1867. Also Canby to Orr, December 24, 1867, Canby Letters.

[103] Canby to Chief of Staff, December 23, 1867, Second Military District Letters Sent, No. 1891, 1867.

The prospect was gloomy and Canby was preparing for the worst. He was even thinking of establishing labor agencies to disseminate information and thus diminish the necessity of making either issues or advances.[104]

This doleful account, and others like it, impressed the cabinet,[105] and Commissioner-General O. O. Howard, of the Freedmen's Bureau, was instructed to take action. Rations were issued to refugees and freedmen,[106] and, after February 27, 1868, the advances made to aid the depressed agricultural interests in South Carolina were considered liens upon the property of the persons to whom they were granted.[107] For those destitute individuals who were not included in the ministrations of the Freedmen's Bureau, Canby directed the poor wardens of the two states to apply to their relief the proceeds derived from licenses, forfeitures, and fines emanating from the sale of spirituous or intoxicating liquors.[108]

On August 5, 1868, General Canby relinquished command of the troops in the late Second Military District and returned to Washington, there to resume command of the department he had left almost a year before.[109] He had experienced many vicissitudes during the months of constructive and unconstructive reconstruction in the Carolinas. Accused of radicalism by some, he was certainly not the most lenient

---

[104] Canby to Chief of Staff, December 20, 1867, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 1861, 1867.

[105] John T. Morse, Jr., (ed.), *Diary of Gideon Welles* (Boston, 1911), III, 245-246; and Theodore C. Pease and J. G. Randall, (eds.), *The Diary of Orville Hickman Browning* (Springfield, 1925 and 1933), II, 170. The entry of December 24, 1867 in both.

[106] In April, 1868, 7,357 rations were issued in North Carolina. The average number of persons assisted daily between September 1, 1867 and September 1, 1868 was 1,363. In South Carolina it was 1,944. See Report of the Commissioner of the Freedmen's Bureau for 1868 in "Report of the Secretary of War," *House Executive Document No.* 1, Fortieth Congress, Third Session, 1039 and 1027.

[107] Report of the Commissioners of the Freedman's Bureau for 1868 in "Report of the Secretary of War," *House Executive Document, No.* 2, Fortieth Congress, Third Session, 1041. That was not done in North Carolina, see Miles to Caziarc, May 8, 1868, Freedmen's Bureau, Assistant Commissioner for North Carolina, Letters Sent, No. 778, 1868. Also see Appleton's *Annual Cyclopedia, 1868,* 693.

[108] General Order No. 164, December 31, 1867, "General Orders-Reconstruction," 83. Also see Canby to Worth, March 26, 1868, Second Military District, Letters Sent, No. 1202, 1868.

[109] General Order No. 150, August 5, 1868, Second Military District, General Orders, 1868; and General Order No. 49, August 14, 1868, Department of Washington, General Orders, 1868, 56.

of the military governors. To say, as did John S. Reynolds, that his rule was "as brutish a tyranny as ever marked the course of any government whose agents and organs claimed it to be civilized," is going too far.[110] The evidence belies it.

There is no denying that Canby had complete control over North and South Carolina.[111] As Major Birkhimer has pointed out in his treatise on military government and martial law, "It is difficult to conceive of a more rigid system of martial law" than that which Congress established in the spring and summer of 1867. For "completeness of design and efficacy of measures for carrying them into execution," nothing could surpass the Reconstruction acts.[112] Congressional Reconstruction was, as Governor Worth maintained, a "*military despotism.*"

Having to function as the legislature, executive, and judiciary, all in one, was a great responsibility, but Canby did not shrink from the task. Acting as the agent of Congress, he was guided by the principle that the power conferred upon him by the Reconstruction acts was "limited and determined by the clear intent of those laws as indicated by the duties devolved upon the District Commanders and its exercise must be incident or necessary to the full and proper performance of their duties." [113] When they were not, he "uniformly declined to ratify [the] ordinances or declarations" made by the conventions authorized under the law of March 23, 1867.[114] In addition, he took "particular pains" not to know how the political parties" stood in his district.[115]

It was only natural for the conservative whites of North and South Carolina, like their brethren throughout the South, to complain and to make out the best case possible for themselves in the eyes of the rest of the nation. To that end they

---

[110] Reynolds, *Reconstruction in South Carolina,* 98.

[111] The general of the army had supervisory control over his actions, and in cases where the death penalty was invoked, the President had to give his consent.

[112] Major William E. Birkhimer, *Military Government and Martial Law* (Kansas City, 1914), 482, 485.

[113] Canby to B. F. Flanders, January 23, 1869, Fifth Military District, Letters Sent, No. 289, 1869.

[114] Canby to William G. Hale, February 11, 1869, Fifth Military District, Letters Sent, No. 640, 1869.

[115] See Canby's interview with the reporter of the *New York Sun,* quoted in the *Daily Richmond Whig,* September 2, 1869.

often perverted and misrepresented the facts, construing almost everything that had to do with Congressional Reconstruction in the worst imaginable light. Canby's jury order was a perfect example of that strategem.

It is understandable that they should have used every means at their command to try to throw off the yoke of Congressional Reconstruction as quickly as possible and to resume their former way of life. Since the methods of opposition available to them were extremely limited, they adopted the course of passive resistance. With hindsight, that procedure can be seen to have been undesirable, and to that extent they must therefore share the blame for what happened.

General Canby had little to do with the original registration in the Second Military District. A few Carolinians may have been disfranchised on account of his interpretation of the law, but probably as many were enfranchised by the liberality with which he revised the registration lists. It will be recalled that an increase of 23,000 resulted after this occurred.[116] Even so, by the vote recorded in each of the elections, first on the convention question and then on the ratification of the constitutions, it is evident that it was not he who kept the whites away from the polls. In South Carolina, in particular, it was they who refused to avail themselves of their opportunity. Instead, they preferred to remain quiescent, thus fostering the growth of a myth about how military "satraps" did the bidding of a Radical Congress and foisted off on them constitutions and officials they did not want, but about whom they could do nothing. It is a half-truth. In a moment of compassion, Jonathan Worth once referred to Canby and the other officers who were called upon to carry out the congressional program as "poor devils."[117] How right he was! It was unfortunate for the army that its officer corps had to be made the instrument of radical designs.

Undoubtedly, Canby sympathized with the congressional policy toward the South, but he was not vindictive. No die-

[116] Those who could have registered previously and had failed to do so account for most of this number. See *Canby Report, 1868,* 340-341.

[117] Worth to John Kerr, January 1, 1868, Hamilton, *Worth Correspondence,* II, 1101.

hard radical of the Stevens-Sumner stripe would have ever countenanced an easing of the reconstruction code such as Canby proposed. If anything, Canby's rule was paternalistic, especially toward the Negro, and many of the measures that he initiated were beneficial to the Carolinas. Charles W. Ramsdell's opinion of Canby's administration in Texas is applicable also to his conduct of Carolina affairs. It was "vigorous and firm, but just." [118]

"Wise statesmanship" has been attributed to Canby; [119] perhaps that is too high an evaluation. Integrity he had; conciliatory in spirit and with an understanding of the difficulties that lay before him, he tried to be a good military governor—whether he was or was not is a matter of personal opinion.

---

[118] Charles W. Ramsdell, *Reconstruction in Texas* (New York, 1910), 266.

[119] George W. Cullum, *Biographical Register of the Officers and Graduates of the United States Military Academy . . . 1802-1890* (Washington, 1891), II, 21.

THE FREE AGRICULTURAL POPULATION IN SUMTER DISTRICT, SOUTH CAROLINA, 1850-1860

By Margaret Burr DesChamps

Sumter District, South Carolina, provides an interesting case study in the social structure of the rural South on the eve of the Civil War. The area in which it lay was frequently spoken of as the Middle Country—a name which applied to its geographical position, and rather aptly described the folkways of its people. Akin to both Tidewater and Upcountry, its social life did not partake exclusively of the flavor of either. The district, located between the Fall Line and the Tidewater, was comprised of a variety of soils which formed the basis for a diversified agricultural life. Although most of the country was flat and the soil generally productive, extensive tracts of sand existed throughout the area, especially in the northwest. There lay the High Hills of Santee, a picturesque range which were the refuge of poor whites and a favorite summer retreat for planters from the Low Country.[1]

Whether they resided in the sandhills, in Sumterville, or along the banks of the Black River, the people of the district were predominantly interested in agriculture. Although few of the 6,857 whites and 320 free colored people left written records of their lives and endeavors, the head of each family sketched in profile his worldly accomplishments when he made his brief report to the census enumerator in 1860.[2]

---

[1] For a description of Sumter District see William G. Simms, *The Geography of South Carolina* (Charleston, 1843), 132-135.

[2] In preparing this paper microfilm copies of the Sumter District manuscript census schedules for the Seventh Census (1850) and Eighth Census (1860) were used. Schedules I (Free Inhabitants) and II (Slave Inhabitants), owned by Emory University, were microfilmed by the Bureau of Census, Department of Commerce, Washington. Schedules IV (Productions of Agriculture), V (Productions of Industry), and VI (Social Statistics) were microfilmed for the writer by the South Carolina Historical Commission, Columbia, where the original schedules are deposited. The method used in studying the census schedules is essentially that of Frank and Harriet Owsley who begin with Schedule IV and supplement it with Schedules I and II. The process is explained in Herbert Weaver, *Mississippi Farmers, 1850-1860* (Nashville, 1945), 14-17. Except when noted, all subsequent information about the agricultural population is taken from these schedules.

About seventy-five per cent of the 1508 white heads of families and forty per cent of the 84 free Negro heads of families indicated that they devoted all or a portion of their time to farming.[3] An excellent index to the lives of eighty-two per cent of these agriculturalists is given in Schedule IV of the unpublished census manuscripts, which is entitled Productions of Agriculture. While it is regrettable that a portion of the rural people were not included in this report, it still provides a valid cross section for study. An analysis of the omitted farm population shows that this group included both the poor and the well-to-do.

The southern planter was well represented in the antebellum society of Sumter District. At the top of this group were the Pinckneys, Rutledges, Hugers and friends who annually moved from their Low Country residences to summer homes in Statesburgh, Bradford Springs and other communities of the High Hills.[4] While they composed the top segment of society in the district, about twenty-three per cent of the families reported on Schedule IV as engaged in agriculture were members of the planter class. About one-half of the 16,682 slaves in the district were in the hands of this class. However, only eight per cent were large planters who cultivated as many as 500 acres of land and owned fifty or more slaves.

Although these large slaveholders were found throughout the district, they were especially numerous in Statesburgh and Providence. Typical of the Episcopalian planters in the High Hills was William Richardson. Richardson, who found little of interest in the "dry and monotonous Sand Hills" other than horse racing, depended on overseers to manage his crops and sent his sons to boarding school in Winnsboro. His wife, a devout church member, spent most of her time making jockey outfits that would "answer for Charleston," conferring with overseers, and writing her sons of the evils of drinking, card playing, and cursing. Upon the young boys,

[3] Ten per cent of the white heads and forty-five per cent of the free Negroes did not state an occupation, and fifteen per cent of both groups indicated that they were engaged in some non-farm occupation.

[4] Lawrence F. Brewster, *Summer Migrations and Resorts of South Carolina Low-Country Planters* (Durham, 1947), 46-48, 74-75.

James and Dick, she placed the responsibility of keeping the family in a position of affluence and leadership. Her letters to them reveal the anxiety of an elder generation over the continuance of family prestige.[5]

Among the Richardson's wealthy neighbors was J. A. Colclough. The size of his plantation home is indicated by the inventory of his estate in which the administrator enumerated and described more than fifty chairs and twenty-five mattresses. Among the furnishings illustrative of the Colclough mode of living were glass shades, glass candlesticks, brass fire dogs and fends, a piano cover, a set of dining tables, books, and one lot of silverware.[6] In 1860 the personal property of Colclough's widow was valued at $436,000.

In the Black River section of the district lived well-to-do Presbyterian planters like Samuel McBride. In his will McBride left explicit instructions as to how he wanted his plantation operated after his death. He desired an overseer "of good moral character" to be hired to manage his lands. By sale of the "more inferior, the dirty and immoral ones" and the "unruly or Troublesome," he wished his slaves to be reduced to "not more than Thirty working hands . . . exclusive of House Servants and Mechanicks." These slaves were to receive two suits of clothing and one pair of shoes each year.[7]

Of especial concern to McBride was the education of his son, James, who would some day succeed him as master of the plantation. His friend and neighbor George Cooper was entrusted with the superintendance of James' schooling. The boy was to spend two or more years learning "some useful Mechanical art" before entering college and was to "be allowed much exercise in the country air." But "my greatest desire," stated McBride, "is that he be early taught the great truths of the christian Religion as contained in the scriptures of the old and new Testament, also the catechisms of the Presbyterian church, and that he be

[5] James B. Richardson Papers (Duke University).
[6] Sumter District Wills, 1860-1867, 67-74 (Sumter County Courthouse).
[7] Sumter District Wills, 1839-1862, 330-334.

taught to obey implicitly those who have the rule over him these I prize above all worldly considerations." [8]

Most Sumter planters, of course, did not enjoy the wealth of the Richardsons, Colcloughs, and McBrides. Isaac Lenoir, who owned forty-eight slaves and farmed 300 acres of improved land in 1850, belonged to the small planter group. At his death in 1859 his household furniture was returned as: one set of dining tables, one secretary, one sideboard, one card table, one lot of crockery and glass, one dozen chairs, one rocking chair, and bedsteads.[9] Yet, families like the Lenoirs lived comfortably and exerted considerable influence in community affairs.

The papers of Robert Fraser, small planter on Black River, show how widespread the interests of men of this group might be. In addition to managing his land and slaves, Fraser was at various times: captain in the militia, member of the Society of Vigilance, school teacher, magistrate, president of his temperance society, member of the debater's club, clerk of the session of the Bishopville Presbyterian Church, school trustee, and overseer of the road on which he lived. An avid reader, he subscribed to various periodicals including the *Southern Presbyterian, True Southron, Columbia Hive, Christian World, South Carolina Temperance Advocate,* and *Santee Banner,* and frequently wrote letters to the editors on matters which he believed to be of public interest. Indeed, one wonders how he found time to write so frequently to newspaper editors, friends and relatives who moved west, citizens of Charleston who might give information on his prospective son-in-law, associates in the Sons of Temperance, and even President Lincoln whose aid he sought in receiving payment for taking the census of 1860.[10] In spite of his many activities, Fraser was a successful farmer.

A study of the manuscript census returns reveals that most Sumter District farmers were yeomen who cultivated from one to 199 acres of improved land and about one-half

[8] Sumter District Wills, 1839-1862, 330-334.
[9] Sumter District Inventories and Sales, 1858-1867, 55-57.
[10] Robert Fraser Papers (in posession of Francis J. DesChamps, Bishopville, South Carolina).

of whom owned slaves.[11] One of these plain people who desired to sell his farm in 1850 described it as:

> A highly improved Farm in the vicinity of Sumterville, containing about two hundred acres of land, only fifty of which is cleared the balance being well wooded.—Said Farm has on it a commodious Dwelling House, nearly new, with Stables and suitable Outbuildings all in fine order.—Also a Garden in a high state of cultivation and a fine Fruit Orchard.[12]

While the main crop of the yeomen was cotton, considerable attention was paid to sweet potatoes and corn. These were cultivated with the help of slaves and members of the family who sometimes worked together in the fields.

Among the substantial yeomen in the district was Elisha Spencer who combined subsistence farming with storekeeping at a crossing on Lynch's River. It was no great love of the mercantile business that accounted for Spencer's building a little store in his front yard. Selling a penny's worth of candy, a gallon of sticky molasses, and listening to the idle chatter of the men who stood around his stove, he described as loathsome activity. But he seemed to have little choice of occupation. Possessing no formal education, he could not easily enter a profession, and since he believed that slavery was morally wrong he did not aspire to become a planter.[13] Instead, he became a subsistence farmer who planted seven acres and owned land and buildings valued at $700.

Like many a farmer's wife, Mary Spencer found her days full. She spun cloth, made clothes for her six children—even suits for the boys—, baked cakes for her nieces, and kept an open house for relatives and visiting ministers.[14] Her life was further complicated by the fact that her Connecticut

---

[11] Twenty-one per cent of slaveholders in Sumter District engaged in agriculture owned from one to four slaves, twenty per cent owned from five to nine, twenty-two per cent owned from ten to nineteen. Thus sixty-three per cent of the slaveholders were farmers owning less than twenty slaves.

[12] *Black River Watchman* (Sumterville), September 14, 1850.

[13] "Reminiscences of Mattie Spencer MacDowell" (typed copy in possession of the writer). Mrs. MacDowell, who writes from a remarkably detached and objective point of view, was a grand-daughter of Elisha and Mary Spencer.

[14] Mary Spencer to Mary Fraser, undated letters, in Spencer-Fraser Papers (in possession of Mrs. Mattie S. MacDowell, York, South Carolina).

husband constantly irritated a community whose opinions on slavery, the way of salvation, and the merits of the Southern cause, he did not share.[15] It is well understood why Mary Spencer would exclaim to her mother: "O I have so much on my hands and mind I don't know which way to turn." [16]

In spite of her many household responsibilities Mary Spencer showed concern for the social life of her children. Throughout the fifties she arranged for them to visit their cousins when possible, and children were frequent guests in their home. Such visits were possible because Mary's father gave her two or three slaves to help with the house work and garden. While the children seem not to have had big parties at home, their parents let them attend such festivities as Christmas trees at the local academy.[17]

The Spencer household was marked by economy and piety, yet home life was not drab and sombre. By the sixties their home was in no sense lavishly furnished, but was colorful and comfortable. For example, one daughter had a grey bedroom suite with pink rosebuds painted on it, and the guest who slept under the beautiful pink marseilles quilt was seldom again to find a comparable covering.[18]

While the pleasures of simple living enjoyed by the Spencers did not extend throughout the agricultural population, only a small percentage of the farm operators on or off Schedule IV seem to fall below the status of yeomen. Of the heads of families on this schedule, eighteen per cent owned no real estate, but many of these people owned slaves or cultivated sizeable tracts of land. Among the eighteen per cent of the farm population not appearing on Schedule IV, one would expect to find the under-privileged of the farm group, as it might be assumed that these people did not operate farms which produced $100 in cash crops.[19] Yet, investigation shows that twenty-six per cent of this group owned real estate and ten per cent owned slaves.

[15] "Reminiscences of Mattie Spencer MacDowell."

[16] Mary Spencer to Mary Fraser, undated letter, in Spencer-Fraser Papers.

[17] Mary Spencer to Mary Fraser, undated letters.

[18] "Reminiscences of Mattie Spencer MacDowell."

[19] Only those operators whose farms yielded as much as $100 in cash crops are included on Schedule IV.

Among the thirty-four men who composed the lowest economic bracket, those who owned neither real estate nor personal property, were two paupers and three illiterates; but they were not representative of the group. As a whole these non-propertied people were young men just beginning the business of farming. A number told the census taker that they had married within the previous year and others were unmarried. Some of them bore the names of prosperous yeomen and planter families.

About six per cent of the heads of families engaged in agriculture in 1860 were overseers. In addition to these sixty-five men, there were twenty-four others who lived in the homes of the planters employing them. An overseer living in his employer's home was doubtless accepted by the family and their friends; sometimes he might even be a member of the family. For example, Isaac Richbourg owned 200 acres of improved land and eleven slaves, but two of his sons began their careers as overseers and two as farm laborers. Nor were overseers living in their own homes always the economically downtrodden of the district. James Thornhill, a fifty-year-old overseer who owned no real estate and only $100 in personal property serves as an illustration of this point. The Thornhills probably lived well. A seventeen-year-old son in the family who worked as a farm laborer, owned $12,000 in real estate and $22,100 in personal property. Whether this was the property of his father or mother which they chose to list in his name or a legacy from some deceased relative is unknown.

There were among the farm population of Sumter District many farmers who were poor in comparison to the slaveholdings and land holdings of planters. Some of these were unquestionably poor whites, probably called "po' buckras" by Sumter people of the 1850's, but to determine their number from the census schedules seems to be an impossible task. Slaveholding and land holding alone are not accurate guides for setting apart poor whites from the rest of the population. Although eight per cent of the farm operators on Schedule IV in 1860 did not own slaves and did not state that they cultivated any land, some of these were free

Negroes and others were professional people not dependent on their farms for their livelihood. While eighteen per cent of the operators on Schedule IV did not own land, many of them held slaves or considerable personal property. Even literacy fails as a test for determining poor whites, for many of the seven per cent of the heads of farm families who were illiterate were substantial land owners and slaveholders. Furthermore, as all Southerners know, the decisive factor in applying this term is not always the absence of wealth and education.

By use of a master chart combining information from Schedules I, II, and IV, on occupation, real estate owned, literacy, slaveholding, agricultural productions, and area of residence, some ideas about poor whites in Sumter District can be formed. Small groups of slaveless families appear clustered together in several areas of the district. Many of them were small landowners, and most of them claimed to be literate, but virtually none of them were sending their children to school. Today among the tenant farmers and farm laborers of old Sumter District are people bearing the same family names as these underprivileged people of 1860.

The largest group of these probable poor whites, some forty to fifty families, made their homes in the sandy foot hills of Bradford Springs. It was doubtless this area that the editor of the *Sumter Banner* had in mind when he said that "in an area of three or four miles square in the wealthy and intelligent District of Sumter, there can be found forty-three children of the proper age to be sent to school, who have never seen a school-house, who cannot read or write their names." [20]

Throughout her life Mary Boykin Chesnut lived on plantations in or near the High Hills, and she was well acquainted with the Sandhillers. In the closing pages of her *Diary from Dixie* she reminisced over her life-long acquaintance with a proud, often arrogant, superstitious, and ignorant people. Milly Trimlin she remembered as "a perfect specimen of the Sandhill tackey race." "Her skin," Mrs. Chesnut recalled, "was yellow and leathery, and even the whites of her

[20] *Sumter Banner*, July 27, 1852.

eyes were bilious in color. She was stumpy and lean, hard-featured, horny fisted." In recounting the kindnesses of her family to some of these people Mrs. Chesnut failed to understand why they remained Sandhillers from generation to generation. "Never," she wrote, "were people so aided in every way as these people are!" Regardless of her failure to understand them, she realized that they possessed the same emotions that lie deep within all people. Her mother, she stated, offered a ride to an old Sandhill acquaintance after a big meeting at the church. The woman replied: "No, no! Never mind me. I'm done in this world. Take your namesake. Let 'em all see my girl setting by you in the carriage." [21]

As Mrs. Chesnut's diary illustrates, contacts of poor whites with yeomen and planters were confined to such occasions as political rallies and elections, camp meetings and revivals, and the visits which the Sandhillers made to beg or borrow. But planters and yeomen were brought together through kinship, business, and social organizations. They worked together in the Sumter Agricultural Association, sent their children to the local schools, attended the same churches, staged temperance society parades, joined in debating clubs, and held militia picnics and balls which the whole countryside enjoyed.[22] While the poor whites showed neither independence in voting nor initiative in seeking office, both yeomen and planters manifested keen interest in seeking office, and desired to become officeholders.[23] Good feeling and freedom of association marked the relationships of plain folk and aristocracy.

A considerable number of free Negroes lived in Sumter District in the 1850's.[24] In 1860, five per cent of all heads of families in the district were thus classified. Most of these people lived in the country, although only forty per cent of the free Negro heads of families were engaged in agri-

[21] Mary Boykin Chesnut, *Diary from Dixie* (edited by Ben Ames Williams, Boston, 1949), 542-544.

[22] See *Sumter Banner, Sumter Watchman,* and *Black River Watchman* for the 1850's.

[23] The names of candidates appearing in the *Sumter Banner,* April 12, 1853, were checked on Schedule I (unpublished), Seventh Census, 1850.

[24] In this group were people of uncertain origin and race who were commonly called "Turks" by Sumter citizens.

culture. The forty-five per cent of the free Negro population who did not list an occupation probably supported themselves as domestic servants. For example, Flora, who owned no real estate but had personal property valued at $200, offered "her services to the citizens of Sumter and adjoining Districts in the preparation of bridal feasts, party suppers, &c." [25]

Free Negroes engaged in agriculture seem to have enjoyed a higher economic status than the remainder of the Negro population. Two free Negroes, Richard Gayle and William Ellison, were slave owners in 1860. As Richard Gayle owned neither real estate nor personal property, his eight slaves may have been members of his own family whom he held through legal technicality. William Ellison, however, was a large planter holding sixty-four slaves and cultivating 500 acres of improved land. He and his family lived in the midst of the wealthy families of Statesburgh and occupied a back pew in the local Episcopal church.[26] A gin maker by occupation, Ellison's advertisements appeared frequently in Sumterville newspapers.[27]

Most of the free Negroes lived in groups instead of scattered throughout the population. The largest community, consisting of about twenty-three families, was found at Manchester. It appears that in Manchester and elsewhere free Negroes and underprivileged white families associated with each other—even to the extent of living together. Bill Tab, a free Negro farm laborer who owned no real estate, was listed as the head of the house in which he resided. Living with him was a white man forty years old who gave his occupation as farming and owned real estate valued at $600. An even more striking case is that of Mary Rodgers, a propertyless black woman, with whom a white Baptist preacher, his wife, and two children lived. Scattered among the census enumerator's listing of free Negro families one finds the names of white families who owned little or no property.

---

[25] *Sumter Banner*, March 10, 1852.

[26] Both the house and the pew in the church can still be seen in Statesburgh.

[27] For example, see *Black River Watchman*, May 11, 1850.

With the exception of the Negroes, whose lot in life remained wretched, all groups within the free farm population of Sumter District prospered in the 1850's. A number of persons whose names appeared on Schedule IV of the Seventh Census (1850) were selected at random from scattered sections of the district and their status in 1850 and 1860 compared. They were classified in five groups: large planters, small planters, slaveholding yeomen, non-slaveholding yeomen, and farmers who owned neither real estate nor slaves. In all groups the value of farm implements and real estate rose between 1850 and 1860. Slaveless were becoming slaveholders and small slave owners were increasing their holdings. Of the group of ten landless non-slaveholders whose farming operations were checked in 1850 and 1860, seven became real estate owners during the decade and one became a slave owner. Observing that the "system and science of agriculture in this District is undoubtedly in a state of transition," the editor of the *Sumter Banner* stated in 1854, that with "a little more exertion and attention to stock raising" Sumter farms would be as productive as "the virgin soils of the West."[28]

On the eve of the Civil War Sumter District was, for the most part, composed of a prospering people wedded to the agrarian life. The advantages and blessings of this life were often the subject of local editorials and were most idyllically pictured by the *Sumter Banner*. After stating that the minister had to please his congregation, the lawyer his townsmen, and the merchant and mechanic their community, the editor concluded:

> The farmer says just what he pleases; for it was never yet discovered that it killed his cattle or rotted his potatoes. And the farmer has more leisure time than most mechanics or professional men; or if he has not, it is his own fault. No farmer need be a drudge. His flocks in the pasture and his crops in the field are growing while he sleeps. . . . He relies on nature, who labors for him continually, and on nature's God, who never slumbers.[29]

[28] *Sumter Banner*, July 19, 1853.
[29] *Sumter Banner*, July 19, 1854.

EDITOR HAYNE TO EDITOR KINGSBURY: THREE SIGNIFICANT UNPUBLISHED LETTERS

By Francis B. Dedmond

Theodore Bryant Kingsbury was one of the most distinguished journalists North Carolina has produced.[1] Nothing, however, in his long journalistic career seems to have so elated him as two "notices" he received, perhaps early in 1858, from John R. Thompson and Paul Hamilton Hayne. Fifty-four years later, Kingsbury wrote:

In November, 1857, I began the publication of the Oxford *Leisure Hour*,[2] a literary weekly which achieved considerable reputation. A short time after I received probably two of the best notices of any during my career from two distinguished men of letters, who were editing magazines in the South: John R. Thompson, editor of the [*Southern*] *Literary Messenger*, published in Richmond, Va., and Paul H. Hayne, who was editing, at the same time, *Russell's Magazine*, a monthly containing some ninety pages. He and Mr. Thompson both gave

[1] T. B. Kingsbury was born in Raleigh, N. C., August 28, 1828. He attended the Oxford Male Academy, Lovejoy Military Academy at Raleigh, and the University of North Carolina. According to Kingsbury, the first article he ever wrote for a newspaper was written from Raleigh on July 5, 1845. It appeared in the *Oxford Ledger* and was a report of the address of Duncan K. MacRae at a Fourth of July celebration. For the next fifteen years, Kingsbury wrote articles for several papers. Early in 1858, he became editor of *The Leisure Hour: A Literary and Family News Journal*, which was published in Oxford, N. C. Kingsbury left *The Leisure Hour* in January 1859. On January 9, 1867 he became editor of a new weekly and semi-weekly known as the Warrenton *Indicator*. He left *The Indicator* on May, 29, 1868 to accept a position with the Southern Baptist Convention, apparently at Memphis, Tennessee. By this time Kingsbury was already widely known, and in the same year, 1868, Wake Forest College conferred on him the D.D. degree. In March of 1869, he became associate editor of the *Raleigh Sentinel*. On three occasions, he declined the editorship of the *North Carolina Christian Advocate*. He edited Colonel Pool's *Educational Journal* in 1874-75; and shortly thereafter became editor of Colonel Pool's *Our Living and Our Dead*, the official organ of the North Carolina branch of the Southern Historical Society, a journal published in Raleigh. In 1876, Kingsbury joined the staff of the Wilmington *Morning Star* and served as its editor for twelve years and eight months. In 1888, the University of North Carolina conferred on him the LL.D. degree. He next joined the staff of the Wilmington *Messenger*, working on that paper for thirteen years. For six months, he edited the Oxford *Torchlight*, a popular weekly. He died in 1913.

[2] Kingsbury is in error here. The first issue of *The Leisure Hour: A Literary and Family News Journal* appeared February 4, 1858, with T. B. Kingsbury listed as editor.

me most cordial notices and I have rarely ever had such pleasant references to myself in all my long career since as an editor.[3]

In so far as is known, the "notice" by Thompson did not lead to a correspondence between the two men, but, according to Kingbury, he "had the pleasure of a considerable correspondence" with Paul Hamilton Hayne,[4] the twenty-eight year old editor of *Russell's Magazine*. To judge by Hayne's later procedure, it may be assumed that he carefully preserved his correspondence from Kingsbury. However, at the time of the bombardment of Charleston during the Civil War, Hayne's "beautiful home was burned to the ground, and his large handsome library utterly lost" [5]—and, presumably his carefully preserved correspondence also burned.[6] Only three of Hayne's letters to Kingsbury from their "considerable correspondence" have come down to us, and they are now in the Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina.

The first number of *The Leisure Hour: A Literary and Family News Journal,* a weekly, was published at Oxford, North Carolina, February 4, 1858. The paper was owned by F. K. Strother and was edited by Kingsbury. In the March 4, 1858 number, Kingsbury published a highly laudatory article on Hayne. Hayne is declared to be unsurpassed by no remembered American author as a writer of sonnets, "and we have no doubt but the reader, if animated with a *true poetic taste* and *sympathy,* will agree with us that they [Hayne's sonnets] are among the best in the language. They remind us of Wordsworth and Mrs. Browning, and indicate that his is that tone of mind that 'voluntarily moves harmonious numbers,' " [7]

---

[3] "Farewell Letter by Dr. Kingsbury," in "The North Carolina Review, Literary and Historical Section" of the Raleigh *News and Observer*, September 3, 1911.

[4] [T. B. Kingsbury], "Review of Hayne's *The Mountain of the Lovers,*" *Our Living and Dead,* III (July, 1875), 139.

[5] Margaret J. Preston, "Biographical Sketch," in *Poems of Paul Hamilton Hayne* (complete edition; Boston: D. Lothrop and Company, 1882), vii.

[6] No letters from Hayne to Kingsbury, for example, are to be found in the numerous letters in the Paul Hamilton Hayne Collection of Duke University.

[7] "Paul H. Hayne," *The Leisure Hour* (Oxford, N. C.), March 4, 1858.

In the April 1, 1858 issue, Kingsbury published what he described as a "graceful little poem . . . from the pen of the accomplished Editor of *Russell's Magazine.*" It seems to have been written especially for *The Leisure Hour;* and, so far as is known, has not been republished.

Sunset and Moonshine

I

Here, glancing from this breezy Height,
  Whilst the still Day goes slowly down,
And sombre Evening's shadows brown,
  Close o'er the purple flushing light,

II

I mark the softer radiant rest
  Of the calm moon, till now unseen,
Along the Ocean tides serene,
  Scarce heaving toward the faded West;

III

At first there dawns a ghostly ray,
  Faint as a new-born infant's dreams,
But soon an ampler glory streams,
  And trembling up the lustrous Bay,

IV

Long level shafts of silvery glow
  Lead upward to the quiet skies,
The radiant paths to Paradise
  Revealed when all is dark below.[8]

On April 15, 1858, Kingsbury republished in *The Leisure Hour* Hayne's short tale "The Skaptar Yokul: A Tale of Iceland." Hayne had originally published the tale anonymously in *Russell's Magazine* a year before, but here the tale appeared under Hayne's name and perhaps for the first time. In the next number of *The Leisure Hour,* April 22, 1858, Kingsbury began the republication of Hayne's tale "One Too Many: A Tale of the Equinox." This tale too had been published anonymously by Hayne in *Russell's* for June 1857. Kingsbury continued the tale serially under Hayne's name in the next three issues of *The Leisure Hour,* April 29, 1858,

[8] *The Leisure Hour* (Oxford, N. C.), April 1, 1858.

May 6, 1858 and May 13, 1858. While "One Too Many" was running serially in *The Leisure Hour,* Hayne wrote the following letter to Kingsbury:

Charleston May 4th, 58

My Dear Sir;

Your very courteous letter of the 6th ult was rec[d] in due season, but this is the first opportunity I have had to reply.

Let me thank you for the kind expressions you employ in reference to my vol of Sonnets; if agreeable to you I shall do myself the honor, & pleasure of mailing you another, and more juvenile book of verses which was published by Ticknor, & Fields of Boston in 1854.[9]

The late nos of the "Leisure Hour" have all reached me, & I may say truly that the better acquainted I become with the style of your Editorials, & the general conduct of the journal, the more I am inclined to like it. The literary criticisms are unusually thoughtful & just; in fine, your paper is an excellent one, and I hope it may succeed. I d'ont [*sic*] tell you to be sanguine about success however. Long, & melancholy acquaintances with the temper of the So. peoples has [p. 2] caused me to lose all confidence in their grand professions. I do not believe in them, or in their promises. For 7 years I have worked My Dear Sir, in one field, or another, striving to do all that one man could, to advance Literature, & the Literary spirit among our People. What has been my reward? In no egotistical, & embittered temper, I may declare that I have encountered what to every man of feeling, and courage is infinitely worse than the most savage oppositione [sic]—i. e. systematic neglect, & that terrible species of coldness which embodies itself in quiet sneers, & the taunts of the worldling who despises all efforts which bring not an immediate return in hard cash!

Of course it is absurd to complain. This unlucky indifference can be easily explained on clear philosophical grounds. At the same time the So. literary man must necessarily feel that he occupies a wrong position!

My stories have been very correctly published. The last of them "One too Many" is by no means a favorite of mine. It is too extravagant, and melodramatic, & if I ever republish it in a vol., it shall be materially modified.

Enclosed, you will find an Original Sonnet, which is at your disposal—, a sort of prose-poem or Extravaganza "Within the Veil" from the April Russell, which has proved so popular, (altho not pretending to a spark of originality in conception,

[9] The volume, *Poems* (Boston, Ticknor and Fields), bears the date 1855.

whatever the execution may be—) that perhaps you may like to introduce it to the readers of the "Leisure Hour." I was much annoyed to discover yesterday that Russell's clerk had neglected my instructions with regard to the Magazine; but after this, you may depend upon receiving it. I shall mail you this afternoon the Jan, Feb, & April nos., & when I can procure a copy—the March no. shall be sent also—Pray let me have hereafter 2 copies of Every issue of the [p. 4] Leisure Hour; instead of directing them to this magazine direct them to me personally.

It will afford me pleasure to hear from you at any, & all times; therefore write whenever you feel disposed—.

In haste,—but Truly yrs.
Paul H. Hayne

P. S. Enclosed, (Instead of enclosing this Editorial which, I find increases the bulk of my letter unduly, I refer you to the Editor's Table in "Russell" for May), you will also find an article, extracted from my Editor's Table, [the analysis I mean of Everett's mode of Oratory, & style as an author[10]] which you can make use of, if it so pleases you—. This critique—(if I may dignify it by so big a word) has attracted considerable attention in Charleston. Let me know of the reception of this letter, and the accompanying periodicals, & thereby oblige

Yrs. P.H.H.[11]

Kingsbury did choose to introduce "Within The Veil" to the readers of *The Leisure Hour;* and in the May 20, 1858 number, he republished it under Hayne's name. The tale had appeared anonymously in *Russell's*. Hayne deliberately tried to keep from his reading public the fact that he had published the tale[12]—at least until it had "proved so popular."

Kingsbury did not review the "more juvenile book of verse" Hayne promised to send to him; but in the May 27, 1858 number of *The Leisure Hour,* he did publish a critical notice of Hayne's 1857 volume, *Sonnets, and Other Poems,* which was published in Charleston by Harper and Calvo. Kingsbury wrote: "Among those who are struggling with zeal, ability, and success in the cause of Southern letters is

[10] *Russell's Magazine,* III (May, 1858), 181-183.

[11] P. H. Hayne to T. B. Kingsbury, Charleston, S. C., May 4, 1858. This letter and the other letters published in this article are published with the permission of the director of the Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina.

[12] See note preceding "Within The Veil," *Russell's Magazine,* III (April, 1858), 70.

Paul H. Hayne; perhaps the most successful woer of the Muses that we can lay claim to." [13] Kingsbury declared that only John H. Boner among Americans was a better writer of sonnets than Hayne. Hayne "like a skillful workman, first found out what he was able to do, and then went to work to accomplish in the best way possible the duties which lay before him." [14] Hayne had discussed the sonnet in the preface to *Sonnets, and Other Poems.* He maintained that "for the expression of a single cardinal thought—its elaboration and 'flower-like unfolding—leaf by leaf,'—human ingenuity could not have invented a system more beautiful and effective. . . . A successful Sonnet is among the most unique of imaginative creations." [15]

In the months that followed, Kingsbury published several of Hayne's poems in *The Leisure Hour,* and there is no reason to suppose that their correspondence did not continue. The next letter that has been preserved, however, is dated January 25, 1859. This letter, like the earlier letter printed above, gives us an intimate account of the trials, tribulations, and literary heartaches of editor Hayne.

Charleston Jan 25th 1859

My Dear Sir;

I have just recd. the last number of the "Leisure Hour," containing your discriminating & able notice of the poems of Mr. Grayson.[16] I cannot tell you how truly grateful I am at the appearance of such an article. Mr. Grayson, besides that he is one of my dearest personal friends, belongs to that rare class of men of talent, who, (altho perfectly self-respecting), are so shy & modest, that it takes a good deal to bring them fairly out. His poems, so far, have not recd. the attention at the South which they deserve. Yours, is one of the few comprehensive critiques

[13] *The Leisure Hour* (Oxford, N. C.), May 27, 1858.

[14] *The Leisure Hour* (Oxford, N. C.), May 27, 1858.

[15] Paul H. Hayne, *Sonnets, and Other Poems* (Charleston: Harper and Calvo, 1857), vi.

[16] "Critical: A Southern Poet," *The Leisure Hour* (Oxford, N. C.), January 20, 1859. This was the first installment. Kingsbury continued the article on Grayson in the next issue of *The Leisure Hour,* January 27, 1859. Kingsbury declares that "the versification of Mr. Grayson, is frequently vigorous and impressive, and is almost invariably melliflous and graceful, whilst the currents of his thought run deep and clear." The Grayson referred to was William John Grayson, a South Carolina planter who wrote poetry for a diversion. His most serious effort was "Chicora" written in 1856, *(Library of Southern Literature),* volume V, 2012-2013. In the January 20, 1859, installment Hayne is again praised.

upon them that I have seen. Really, the "Leisure Hour" is doing a good, & noble work. If a journal, so admirable is every respect, is not sustained by the N Carolinians, it will be but little to their credit. If I know myself, this hearty, spontaneous commendation proceeds from [p. 2] no selfish source. You have worked gallantly for the South, & the South, as Dr. Ollapod, hath it, "owes you one!" Apropos of Grayson, let me tell you (in the strictest confidence), that the poem termed "Marion" which is now in the course of publication in "Russell," is from his pen.[17] I think you will agree with me that it is a most spirited performance, & likely to increase the author's reputation greatly. Indeed, parts of this poem are almost worthy of Sir Walter Scott!

Do you ever see among your Exchanges a paper published at N. Orleans, called the "True Delta"? If so, please glance at the last no. but one, & read the attack upon Simms, Russell's Magazine, & one of the unlucky Editors of the latter, viz—myself. The editorial I refer to, is in reply to a few strictures of mine upon some remarks in that journal a month or two ago.[18] Now, if the article meets your eye, [p. 3] pray tell me if anything more provokingly absurd was ever published in a newspaper! Lest you should not see it, permit me to give an abstract of the same. The N. O. True Delta, referring to Dana's "Household Book of Poetry," said that a ridiculous "clamour" had been raised on account of the ommission of Simms' name;[19] & went on to criticise his poetry in most insulting and puerile style. To *this* I replied by citing against the Editor of the Delta, such authorities

[17] The long poem "Marion" appeared in *Russell's* in four installment—IV (December 1858), 212-218; IV (January 1859), 313-321; IV (February 1859), 406-414; and IV (March 1859), 505-507. Hayne gives no hint as to why such secrecy should be maintained. The poem, it seems, as a consequence of this secrecy, was ascribed to Simms. Guy Adams Cardwell, Jr., "Charleston Periodicals, 1795-1860: A Study in Literary Influences, with a Descriptive Check List of Seventy-Five Magazines" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, the University of North Carolina Library) says that the W. C. Courtney set of *Russell's* in the Duke University Library, John Russell's personal set in the New York Public Library, and the F. A. Porcher set in the College of Charleston Library all ascribe the poem to Simms.

[18] The following remarks appeared in Hayne's "Editor's Table," *Russell's Magazine*, IV (January 1859), 373: "The New Orlean's *True Delta*, referring to what the editorial critic of that journal is pleased to call the 'clamor' raised at the south, about the omission of Mr. Simms' name in Dana's 'Household Book of Poetry,' says, there is, really, no just cause of complaint, at least, in this particular instance, because to quote the critics own language: 'Mr. Simms is not a poet, for he lacks the essential elements of the poet—imagination. He has the wish but not the wings to soar. He is simply a tolerable verse-weaver; but he weaves with ordinary shuttle. His is not the golden-threaded shuttle that flashes to and fro in the loom of thought.'"

[19] Hayne reviewed—if indeed this be the right term—Dana's *Household Book of Poetry* in *Russell's Magazine*, IV (January 1859), 348-353. Hayne decried the "entire silence preserved with regard to most of the poets of the southern States." As regards Simms, Hayne wrote: "In regard to Mr.

as Whipple, Poe, Griswold, & Thos Campbell. And how did the fellow rebut this testimony;? Why, by saying that Thos. Campbell must have been idiotic when he praised Simms, that Poe must have been drunk; & that as for Messrs Whipple, Griswold, & Duyckink [*sic*] "their testimony went for little."[20] Did you ever hear of such Cockney impudence?—But eno' of this matter!

Please My Dear Sir, let [me] hear from you as often as possible, & Believe me

Ever Truly P H Hayne[21]

Two days after Hayne's letter was written, Kingsbury's "valedictory," so he entitled it, appeared in *The Leisure Hour:*

With this number my editorial connection with the *Leisure Hour* will terminate. The reason which has induced this course of action it is unnecessary to state. . . . But the *Leisure Hour* has not become a popular paper, nor have I expected it, owing to certain causes which I refrain from giving. I here lay down my Editorial pen, and the probability is, forever. . . .[22]

Kingsbury's reason "which . . . induced this course of action" was that he was planning to study for the ministry, and told Hayne of his purpose. Hayne answered quickly in an intimate letter in which he laid bare his own bosom.

Charleston Feb 3rd 1859

My Dear Mr. Kingsbury;—I perceive with sincere regret that you have abandoned the Editorship of the "Leisure Hour." I cannot say that the intelligence surprises me, because I very well knew that the Journal—, conducted as you have conducted

---

Simms, many words are not necessary. He is the first living writer of the south; known not only here, but in the whole country, and abroad, wherever American literature is known at all. With high heart, he has maintained at all times, and in all places, the honor of his native land; he has conferred honour by his genius on the whole country. His fame rests on solid foundations of real and indisputable merit, and time can but make it more bright."

[20] In *Russell's Magazine*, IV (February 1859), 474, Hayne wrote: "The editor of the *True Delta*, in reply, makes a direct *personal* attack upon one of the editors of this Magazine; displays supreme incapacity of comprehending even the most ordinary forms of poetical expression, and disposes of the critical authorities above-mentioned after this manner: 'If Campbell spoke favourable of Simms, it must have been in his dotage; (Campbell was editor of the *New Monthly* at the time, and about thirty-three years of age; if Poe was pleased with Simms' poetry, it must have been when he was overcome with drink; as to Whipple, Duyckinck and Griswold, their opinions are of little importance.' "

[21] P. H. Hayne to T. B. Kingsbury, Charleston, S. C., January 25, 1859, in The Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina.

[22] *The Leisure Hour* (Oxford, N. C.), January 27, 1859.

it—, could not be popular; therefore could not pay, & therefore (lastly), must sooner or later be given up by one not rich enough to be independent of its pecuniary support. "The Leisure Hour" was & is too intellectual, too critical, too thoughtful to meet the approbation of the unintellectual, uncritical, unthinking people. Perhaps you think me disposed to flatter. Well, my dear Sir, I may be, I must by necessity be, partial to a paper which has during the 14 or 15 months of my acquaintance with it [ ][23] than I ever expect to receive again from any intelligent source in the whole course of my future life!

I wish, (let me frankly say it!) I wish I could believe all you have so generously spoke in my behalf! But my own mind, my self-knowledge tells me that I have weaknesses (in an artistic, & I fear, moral sense), which will, probably, interfere fatally with my success as a poet. With humiliation I confess to one whose great kindness has opened by confidence, & really won my heart, that the same awful infirmity of will, which I have commented upon in the essay on Hartley Coleridge, is forever besetting me, & overturning, or defeating in some manner, my cherished plans.[24] You call me, others have called me, a successful Sonnetteer: Why am I successful in this special sort of versification. Oh! Sir! it is [p. 3] because I have not the persistent strength of wing, or of will, to venture boldly upon more sustained flights!, because I lack as Hartley Coleridge lacked, "a great central purpose in art." You will not think me vilely egotistical, because I write in this curious strain. Altho it has never been my fortune to look upon you "according to the flesh," I feel that you are truly a friend, and as a friend I address you! But eno' of this!

- - - - - - "The Leisure Hour," is, I see, to be continued. Who succeeds you as Editor? No name is mentioned anywhere.

I hope you will sometimes continue your contributions. Do not devote yourself too exclusively to theological studies, but keep up the belle lettres tastes you now possess. They will do you good service in the Pulpit. Our So. preachers are wretchedly deficient (generally) in literary attainments, yet surely, they should be scholars; not merely Hebrew scholars and skilled in polemics, but thorough English scholars, versed in our poetry as well as philosophy.

---

[23] The letter is soiled here and the writing is not legible.

[24] In his essay entitled "David Hartley Coleridge," *Russell's Magazine*, IV (February 1859), 433-442, Hayne wrote: "We have said that Hartley's poems were occasional. He was not gifted with the resolution. the consistent earnestness, or the wide grasp of thought and invention, which are the essential endowments of the epic, or dramatic poet. *He lacked a great central purpose in art, precisely as he lacked a great central purpose in life.*"

Pardon this letter, which I feel to be rather an eccentric, & perhaps a too familiar epistle.

Answer quickly, & Believe me,

Ever truly yrs.

Paul H Hayne[25]

One wonders if Kingsbury answered quickly and, if so, how long this interesting correspondence between these two lovers of literature continued. Kingsbury never ceased to appreciate Hayne's poetry; and eight years later when Kingsbury was once again editor of a literary newspaper, the Warrenton, North Carolina, *Indicator, Devoted to Literature, Religion, Agriculture, and General Intelligence,* he published a poem by Hayne. Since there is nothing to indicate that it was copied from some other source, it may have been written by Hayne for *The Indicator.* The poem also does not appear in the *Poems of Paul Hamilton Hayne* (complete edition; Boston: Lothrop and Co., 1882) and is here, perhaps, reprinted for the first time.

Song

I

My wedded love is fast asleep,
The white lids closed o'er marvellous eyes,
That shine a meaning, pure and deep,
As midnight's far, unfathomed skies.
Her heart upon the tide of dreams
Is heaving like a fairy boat,
And o'er her face the mystic gleams
Of tender thoughts and memories float.

II

My earlier love, I could not wed,
Is slumbering too, but far away—
She sleeps among the tranquil dead,
And couched upon the churchyard clay;
Her lids are closed o'er soulless eyes,
Her pulseless heart is mute and cold—
But thought is busy where she lies,
And memory wakes beneath the mould.[26]

No matter when the correspondence actually ended, one may be sure that Kingsbury cherished the memory of it as long as he lived.

[25] P. H. Hayne to T. B. Kingsbury, Charleston, S. C., February 3, 1859, in the Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.

[26] *The Indicator* (Warrenton, N. C.), December 11, 1867.

A DESCRIPTION OF "CAROLANA" BY A "WELL-WILLER," 1649

Edited By Hugh Talmage Lefler

The following unsigned two-page communication to *The Moderate Intelligencer,* to which no reference is made in the *Colonial Records of North Carolina,* and which, so far as is known, has never been reprinted, is one of the few documents relating to North Carolina between the grant by Charles I to his Attorney-General, Robert Heath, in 1629 and the more effective grant by Charles II to the eight Lords Proprietors in 1663.

The Moderate Intelligencer, one of the most important mid-seventeenth century papers, was a weekly news sheet published in London from June 5, 1649, to February 23, 1654 —a very long life for a periodical in that day. Its founder, owner, and editor, John Dillingham of Whitefriars, was a very controversial figure. A tailor turned publisher, he was involved in many disputes with other journalists and with political and religious leaders. He gave information against Archbishop Laud in 1643, and Dr. Brownrigg was committed to Dillingham's house in 1644. Gilbert Mabbott, a rival journalist, attempted to appropriate the title of his paper, but the House of Lords decided that "Dillingham alone was entitled to the title of *The Moderate Intelligencer.*" Some contempories praised Dillingham's writing and were quite enthusiastic about his idea of a journal in French for the benefit of foreigners in England. One writer referred to him as "the Countryman's Chronicler . . . the citizens' harbinger . . . and the epitome of wit . . . and though he tells lies by the gross, yet he would have the book-turners of this isle believe that he useth moderation." Other critics were less complimentary; one referred to Dillingham as "a Prick louse vermin Taylor"; another condemned "that botching and Moderate Intelligencer," edited by that "learned Scout."

The following interesting and detailed account of "Carolana" may have been a bona fide communication to Dillingham's paper, or it may have been the product of his own

fertile imagination. But it is significant that in 1649, at the time when Oliver Cromwell as Lieutenant General was preparing for his Irish campaign, plans were under way to appoint a governor for the Albemarle Sound region, then considered a part of Virginia despite the Heath patent of 1629. The editor has been unable to discover the identity of either the "well-willer" or the "Gentleman going over Governour into Carolana."

THE MODERATE INTELLIGENCER: IMPARTIALLY COMMUNICATING MARTIALL AFFAIRS TO THE KINGDOM OF ENGLAND

(From Thursday, April 26 to Wednesday, May 2, 1649.)

At the intreaty of a well-willer, the following lines are inserted.

There is A Gentleman going over Governour into Carolana *in* America, *and many Gentlemen of quality and their families with him.*

This place is of a temperate Climate, not so hot as *Barbado's* nor so cold as *Virgina;* the Winter much lake our *March* here in *England.* The Northern latitude begins where *Virgina* ends, at 37, neer Cape *Henry,* and takes in six degrees Southerly; no bounds to the East and West, but the Seas. At Point *Comfort,* neer Cape *Henry,* you enter into a fair Navigable River, called *James* River, about two leagues over: on both sides that River, are the chiefe Plantations in *Virginia,* and their chief Town *James* Town. On the South side of this River, are two Rivers, *Elisabeth,* and *Nansamond,* which convey you into *Carolana;* so that this River is in a haven to both Colonies. This *Carolana,* besides the temperature of the Climate, hath many Native Commodities to feed and cloath the body: Deer in abundance, bigger and better meat then ours in *England,* having two young ones at a time; their skins good cloathing, being better dressed by the *Indians* then ours: Elkes of a large size, admirable meat, having three young at a time; their Hides make good Buffe; besides Hares and Conies, and many other that are good meat: Beasts of prey, that are profitable for their Furres, as Bevers, Otters, Foxes, Martins, Minches, and Musk-Cats, their Cods better sented then those of *East-India,* and more lasting: Fowle of all sorts, Partridges and wild Turkies 100 in a flock, some of the Turkies weighing 40 pounds, Fish there are in great abundance, of all sorts. In the Woods are sundry kinds of Fruits, as Strawberries, Raspices, Gooseberries, Plums, and Cherries; three several kinds of Grapes, large, and of a delicious taste. In

these woods are herbes and flowers of fragrant smels, many kinds of singing Birds, which have varieties of sweet Notes. Though this Countrey be for the most part woody, but where the Indians have cleared, for their Corne and Tobacco, or where fresh marshes and medows are, yet they are pleasant and profitable; pleasant, in respect of the stately growth and distance of the Trees one from the other, that you may travail and see a Deere at a great distance; profitable, being of divers kinds, both for shipping, Pot-ashes, Mulberry trees for Silk-wormes, Walnut trees, and stately Cedars; so that when of necessity you must cut down for Building and other uses, you are recompenced for your labour. You have also many pleasant Ascents, Hills and Valleys, Springs of wholesome waters, Rivers, and Rivolets. Now you see you are plentifully fed and cloathed with the naturall Commodities of the Country, which fall into your hands without labour or toyle, for in the obtaining of them you have a delightful recreation. Now fearing you should out of this abundance, in the excesse take a Surfer, you have many Physical herbs and Drugs, *Allom, Nitrum, Terra Sigillata,* Tarre, Rosin, Turpentine, Oyle of Olives, Oyle of Walnuts, and other Berries; Honey from wild Bees, Sugar-Canes, Mulberries, divers sorts of Gums and Dyes, which the *Indians* use for paint. Within the ground, Mines of Copper, Lead, Tinne, Pearle, and Emroydes. Having the profit and pleasure of the natural Commodities, you shall see what Art and Industry may produce. The Soyle is for the most part of a black mould about two foot deepe, you may trust it with anything. The *Indian* Corne yeelds 200 for one, they have two Crops in six moneths; *English* Wheat, Barley, and Pease, yeeld 30 for one; Hempe, Flax, Rice, and Rape-feed have a large encrease: What *English* Fruits are planted there, improve in quantity and quality. Besides all this is said, we shall shake hands with *Virginia,* a flourishing Plantation, which is not onely able to strengthen and assist us, but furnish us with *English* Provision, Cowes and Oxen, Horse, and Mares, Sheepe and Hogs, which they abound in now, which they and other Plantations were enforced to bring out of other Countries with great difficulty and charge, these are ready to our hands.

If this that hath been said give incouragement to any, let them repair to Mr. Edmond Thorowgood, A Virginia *Merchant, living in* White-Crosse-Street, at the house that was Justice Fosters. *He will informe you of the Governour, from whom you will understand when and how to prepare themselves* (not exceed August) *and what conditions shall be given to Adventurers, Planters, and Servants; which shall be as good, if not better, then have been given to other Plantations.*

Plantations in *America* were first famous in King *James* his time, the arguments to draw people over were the bringing

the Gospel to the Indians, inriching men that went and adventured, and extending Dominion, the fruit whereof is visible, in King *Charles* his time, the persecution of men diffring in opinion revived this undertaking, and thousands went to *New England* whose condition is also known, now their seems to be great designes of this nature which arise out of the discotents at the present state of affairs, alterations, & the wants which the late War hath brought many unto, for which there seems no blame. For censent be advised to make no use of the Merchant farther than transportation, part with nothing, if an adventurer, but what you are willing to loose to accomodate your friend, lay no foundation of a Plantation for your perticular before you go, when you begin to disburst, resolve to go, leave more or lesse behind you in *England* that may supply the first necessities, which will be greatest, and thus much be sure, if the Countrey be healthful to English, its seated as well as any upon which the English are, if not better.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Carolina Charter of 1663. By William Stevens Powell. (Raleigh: The State Department of Archives and History. 1954. Pp. vi, 79. Illus. and bibliography. Cloth $2.00, paper $1.00.)

The full title of this book is *The Carolina Charter of 1663, How it came to North Carolina and Its Place in History with Biographical Sketches of the Proprietors.* The complete text of the charter as reproduced occupies only 15 pages but this is the feature of the volume. To add to its value and interest, however, the author has preceded the actual text with two chapters.

One of these chapters traces in considerable detail the steps taken by the director of the Department of Archives and History of North Carolina to establish the authenticity and provenance of the document and to ascertain whether the London bookseller (who had discovered the Charter in 1947) could offer a clear title to it once the purchase price of $6,000 was raised. A number of scholars and authorities examined the charter. Their reports and correspondence reproduced here in full make interesting reading.

The second chapter, "Origin of the Charter," is an informative account of various grants of land made by British sovereigns prior to 1663, which included the territory later embraced by the Charter. First of these was a grant by Queen Elizabeth, June 1578, to Sir Humphrey Gilbert and renewed in the name of his half brother, Sir Walter Raleigh, in 1584. Raleigh financed several unsuccessful expeditions, among them the famous "Lost Colony." In 1606 a charter was granted to the Virginia Company of London which included a part of what is now North Carolina. This charter was revoked in 1624 and the colony came into the hands of the Crown. In 1629 the King conveyed title to his attorney general, Sir Robert Heath, but he made no organized attempt to establish a settlement. In 1648, however, several Virginians purchased from the Indians large tracts of land, covered by the grant to Heath, along the Chowan River. A

settlement was made here in 1653 and a steady stream of colonists followed.

This activity apparently attracted the attention of some Englishmen who were supporters of Charles II, and after he came to the throne he granted the territory between 31° and 36° north latitude "from sea to sea" to the following proprietors: Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, Lord High Chancellor of England; George Monck, Duke of Albemarle, Master of the King's Horse and Captain-General of all his forces; William Lord Craven, an old friend of Charles II's father who had zealously and ably supported the royal family; John Lord Berkeley, who had defended the Crown in the rebellion and joined the royal family in exile; Anthony Ashley Cooper, Chancellor of the Exchequer and afterward the Earl of Shaftesbury; Sir George Carteret, Vice-Chamberlain of the King's household; Sir William Berkeley, Governor of Virginia, who induced the colony to be loyal to Charles II as their sovereign even while he was in exile; and Sir John Colleton, who had upheld the royal cause in Barbados.

It did not take long for these royal proprietors to discover that the "richest jewel of their new domain of Carolina" was not in their domain at all. Settlements already made in the Albemarle region lay for the most part a few miles north of the line marking the limit of the territory granted to them. So in 1665 they secured a new charter extending the limits one-half degree to the north and two degrees to the south.

Plan followed plan for a scheme of government. Finally, one was approved. This was the Fundamental Constitutions drawn up for Carolina by John Locke under the direction of the Earl of Shaftesbury and adopted by the proprietors on July 21, 1669

The Fundamental Constitutions were designed to serve a landed aristocracy and set forth many orders of rank and privilege which were impractical, to say the least, and were probably responsible for their eventual failure. But even with these limitations they gave the Englishmen in Carolina very broad rights and freedoms. They provided an adequate system of local courts with a guarantee of trial by jury; the English system of town government and the right to elect repre-

sentatives to meet every two years. Provision was made for registration of births, marriages, and deaths and for recording land titles. Many of these provisions were so liberal that in England they were considered to be radical. In Carolina, however, they provided nothing more than was expected by the pioneers who risked their lives to settle the wilderness. But the proprietary rule, set up under the Constitution, was unsuccessful and the colony was taken back by the Crown in 1728.

The other feature of the book is the section containing brief biographical sketches of the proprietors with a full page portrait of all save one of whom no portrait is known. The book is well printed on good stock. It is an interesting and scholarly work. As such it will be a valuable addition to any library.

William D. Overman.

Firestone Tire and Rubber Co.,
Akron, Ohio.

The County Court in North Carolina before 1750. By Paul M. McCain. (Historical Papers of the Trinity College Historical Society, Series XXXI. Durham: The Duke University Press, 1954. Pp. viii, 263. $2.50.)

The county court was the principal institution of local government in North Carolina for almost two hundred years before the adoption of the state constitution of 1868. Provision for a court in each precinct of the colony was made in the Fundamental Constitutions of 1669. Within a short time courts were established in the precincts of Albemarle County and later in those of Bath County. Following the abolition of these two counties in 1738-1739, the precincts became counties. The precinct court was known thereafter as the county court.

In this scholarly volume Dr. McCain traces the development of the county court from its beginnings under the proprietors as a precinct court down to the middle of the eighteenth century, when its organization and powers had become fixed and stable. Originally the court was established to relieve the general court, composed of the governor and

council, from trying petty civil cases and probating routine records. As the colony developed, the authority of the court was expanded until this agency became the chief administrative body of the county as well as its court of justice.

Dr. McCain has presented a clear picture of the operation of the county court before 1750. Four excellent chapters are devoted to the jurisdiction of the court. Specific cases and incidents have been used effectively in illustrating the authority exercised by the justices in criminal and civil actions, probate proceedings, supervision of orphans, and in the regulation of involuntary servitude and slavery. The powers of the court in matters concerning public buildings, county finance, supervision of roads, and the regulation of business have been carefully described in four additional chapters.

From the power and authority which the court exercised in the affairs of the people of North Carolina before 1750, Dr. McCain concludes that the court gave to the inhabitants of the colony an institution of local government adapted to their needs.

Serious students of history will be pleased with this well-organized and readable account of an important segment of the early history of North Carolina.

Rex Beach.

Hall of Records Commission,
Annapolis, Maryland.

A History of Catawba County. Compiled and published by Catawba County Historical Association, Inc. Edited by Charles J. Preslar, Jr. (Salisbury: Rowan Printing Company. 1954. Pp. 526. $5.00.)

Eighteen years ago residents of Catawba County in the upper Piedmont section of North Carolina organized a historical association and began collecting materials from which a history of the county could be written. A publication committee, headed by Dr. J. E. Hodges, president of the association, has now published in a sizeable volume the first general history of the county.

Catawba was not formed until 1842, when Nathaniel Wilson captured John Killian's seat in the House of Commons

and put through a bill to divide Lincoln County. The authors, however, appropriately began with the coming in 1749 of German and Scotch-Irish settlers to the area. The story of the pioneers, the majority of whom were Germans, is adequately told. Heinrich Weidner's (Whitener) experiences during the French and Indian War form the most exciting of the individual narratives.

The writers attempted to include every phase of Catawba's history and current state of development. Accordingly, there are, in addition to the usual political and military discussions, sections on religion, education, transportation, trades, professions, newspapers, post offices, manners, and health resorts. Accounts are given, for instance, of the building in the 1850's of the Western North Carolina Railroad, which helped transform Hickory Tavern into an industrial center, and of social life at Sparkling Springs, an almost forgotten resort center. Even with two railroads (the Chester and Lenoir arrived in 1881), the manufacture of furniture, hosiery, and textiles, which is now the principal activity in the county, amounted to little before 1900. Predominantly agricultural until recent years, Catawba now annually produces manufactured goods valued at $100,000,000, which contrasts sharply with farm products worth $6,000,000. The description of the destructive 1916 Catawba valley flood will convince the reader of the value of the present series of dams on the Catawba as flood control measures, as well as for the production of electricity for the region's industry.

An average county history in over-all merit, this book has, nevertheless, many shortcomings. The literary style is unimpressive and the long lists of names make tedious reading. At times the short unrelated paragraphs do not form connected narratives. There are no footnotes and little documentation in the text. The general tone is excessively laudatory. Some factual and typographical errors escaped the proofreaders. To illustrate, the following inaccurate sentence is not explained: "It was not, in fact, until 1798 that the first English school was opened in North Carolina" (p. 122). Johnston Blakely is presented as two persons. John Bell, the 1860 candidate, is referred to as "Whig John Belle." A blank-

et statement that the Confederate soldier "was not allowed to return home after the cessation of hositilities, as he was detained as a prisoner" (p. 283), illustrates the guesswork in which the writers sometimes engaged.

The faults of this book will detract from the pleasure of reading it, but will not prevent the judicious reader from tracing through its pages the development of a progressive North Carolina county. Several pages of drawings by Philip Moose add variety to the volume. A short bibliography and an acceptable index are included.

Henry S. Stroupe.

Wake Forest College,
Wake Forest.

The Presbyterian Congregation on Rocky River. By Thomas Hugh Spence, Jr. (Concord, North Carolina: Rocky River Presbyterian Church. 1954. Pp. xiv, 293. $3.25)

The present history of the Presbyterian Congregation on Rocky River is written by Thomas Hugh Spence, Jr., and dedicated to the memory of his father, Thomas Hugh Spence, pastor of the Rocky River Church from 1916 to 1931. It covers the entire period from the time of the arrival of John Rodgers, the first settler, according to tradition, in the Rocky River Community, in 1732, to the service of formal recognition of the gift of the Education Building on September 6, 1953. Of especial, general historical interest is the account which Mr. Spence gives of the beginnings of the Presbyterian settlement along Rocky River, stemming out of the migration of the Scotch-Irish from the middle Colonies, especially Pennsylvania and Virginia, to the Rocky River area where land was cheaper than it was in Pennsylvania and, more important, where there was no intereference by civil authorities in the Presbyterian form of worship such as there had been in Virginia, where the Established Church (Anglican) was dominant to a much larger extent than it was in the inland regions of North Carolina.

A large part of the more general appeal of the story which is recounted here arises from the extent to which the Rocky River Congregation—clergy and laymen—have been caught

up in the movement of events beyond their confines and the extent to which its members have participated in these events—in war, in African missions, in civil affairs, and in education.

While those who are associated with the Rocky River Presbyterian Church will have a special interest in this volume, it will also appeal to others who, in one connection or another, have come to know the pastors and lay leaders of this congregation. The biographical material comprises a large portion of the book; it is full of accounts of people whose lives were rich, self-giving, and ennobling.

A lengthy appendix includes lists of the pastors, elders, deacons and other officials of Rocky River, together with statistical reports and lists of the "Patriots and Soldiers of the Revolutionary Period" and "Confederate Casualties." A detailed bibliography is included.

E. Clinton Gardner.

North Carolina State College,
Raleigh.

King's Mountain and Its Heroes: History of the Battle of King's Mountain, October 7th, 1780, and the Events Which Led to it. By Lyman C. Draper, LL.D., with steel portraits, maps, and plans. (Cincinnati, Peter G. Thomson. 1881. Continental Book Company, Marietta, Georgia, 1954. Pp. xv, 612. $10.00.)

The republication of this book for the second time in the three quarters of a century since its original publication should be a distinct encouragement to all those whose writings are poorly received but who firmly believe that they are writing for eternity. It is perhaps an evidence that history does not have to be rewritten by each generation. When old Dr. Ramsey, the Tennessee historian and the prime mover in inducing the dilatory Lyman Draper to write this—his only book—saw the product, he predicted that it would be popular for a century. It was not, to Dr. Draper's great disappointment, popular at the moment. Its sales fell far below his ambitious dreams, and the immediate reception was not good. It came a year late for the centennial celebration of the King's Mountain battle and competed with the flood of

memoirs and battle material relating to the Civil War, which was then pouring from the presses. Nevertheless, it has stood the test of time well, and in recent years even the first reprinting some decades ago has been selling as a collectors' item for about twenty-five dollars. The re-issue in lithoprint by the Continental Book Company is a real service to historians, genealogists, and antiquarians.

The book is a dramatic account of the British in the Carolinas, of the confusion in the upcountry where neighborhoods and even families were divided between royal syncophants and high-minded patriots. Finally, as Cornwallis, Tarleton, and Ferguson terrorized the land, a cry for aid went over the mountains to the men of the Watauga, the Nollichucky, and the fastnesses of the West. Then under Selby, Campbell, Cleveland, Chronicle, and John Sevier, the mountain clans gathered, crossed over the Yellow Mountains, and on October 8, 1780, stormed the heights of King's Mountain, killed Ferguson and many another leader of the Redcoats, captured 600 foul Tories, saved Carolina, and prepared the way for the final surrender of the dastard Cornwallis at Yorktown. It is a dramatic tale, filled with anecdotes of Whig derring-do and the bestial deeds of the Tory hordes.

In addition, the book is a veritable encyclopedia for genealogists and antiquarians. Names, ancestry, deeds, and descendants of scores are carefully, even reverently, recorded; and whole chapters give biographies of Shelby, Sevier, Cleveland, Winston, and others. Appended, too, is the diary of British Lieutenant Allaire, letters of General Gates, Washington's congratulatory order, and Lafayette's comments. And the documents in the virulent controversy, which the Selbys raised, over William Campbell's conduct in the battle are here presented—and the conflict resolved by Draper in a complete vindication of Campbell. It is, withal, a yarn filled with specific, circumstantial accounts. When the *New York Times* reviewed it in 1881, the reviewer remarked that it was exactly such an account as the paper would wish from its correspondent on the scene.

It might well, too, serve as a model for modern battle accounts—cluttered as they are with polysyllabic incantations

about strategy, logistics, and command systems. Amid this mystifying folderol, a clear, balanced, sane, and circumstantial account would be a blessing. Lyman Draper had no knowledge of the high-flown verbiage of modern military science; he thought the patriots won the battle of Kings Mountain because they shot straight. Of course, as he implied in every line, their aim was true because their hearts were pure.

Despite its nineteenth-century style and a distinct patriotic bias in favor of the Whig cause, it is, even today, superb reading. Between the lines is the very human story of plundering, marauding, and murder on a disorganized frontier. It is a picture which Bancroft and other of Draper's contempories failed to portray, and it can be read with interest and profit by students of the Revolution and of the South, even after three quarters of a century.

William B. Hesseltine.

University of Wisconsin,
Madison, Wisconsin.

The Letters of William Gilmore Simms. Volume III—1850-1857. Collected and edited by Mary C. Simms Oliphant, Alfred Taylor Odell, and T. C. Duncan Eaves. (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press. 1954. Pp. xxvi, 564. $8.50.)

The third volume of "The Letters of William Gilmore Simms" reveals anew the complexity of the task which faced the editors of Simms's prolific correspondence. It reveals also the scholarly thoroughness and the editorial skill of Simms's granddaughter, Mrs. Oliphant, and Eaves in making this correspondence available to the public. (Odell, who did much of the early work on the project, died shortly before volume I of the letters was published.) Scholars and students of southern literature will not cease to be grateful for their devoted efforts.

In addition to printing the letters, the editors have included in this volume a list of the depositories or owners of manuscripts, a chronological list of the Simms letters for the years 1850-1857, more than seventeen hundred footnotes, an appendix containing Simms's sensational lecture entitled "South

Carolina in the Revolution," and a temporary index intended for use until the issuance of a complete index in the final volume of the five-volume series.

As for the letters themselves in this third volume, they vary considerably in interest and value for the student of southern or American literature or even for specialists in Simms and his literary work. Simms was a conscientious correspondent who appears always to have felt that when he received a letter, he was in duty bound to answer it, even if it called for no more than a brief expression of thanks for some small favor. Though such notes show Simms as a polite southern gentleman, they do not provide very interesting reading; and one is inclined after a while to skim through these or even to skip over them with a mere glance in order to get to other letters with more meat in them.

The Simms letters are concerned with many things; among them: family matters, routine editorial correspondence relating to the *Southern Quarterly Review,* travel experiences, and the management of the plantation at Woodlands, which required an increasing amount of work from Simms as his father-in-law became progressively feeble in mind and body. Of considerable interest to the present writer are Simms's political opinions and a number of his remarks about his writing.

A decade before the storm of war struck the South, William Gilmore Simms was a secessionist at heart, and he anticipated the explosion long before it came. In November, 1850, he wrote to Evert Duyckinck: "We are all absorbed in politics—the cauldron bubbling up furiously, and about to boil over. That it will do so, some day, you may be certain." A few days later in the same month he was writing to his Virginia friend Nathaniel Beverley Tucker: "Five years at the utmost—unless there be a great revolution in public sentiment at the north—which is scarcely possible—will see the dissolution of the Union." One gets the impression in reading passages like these which appear in many of the letters, that Simms did not bother much to visualize the tremendous struggle which the southern states would be involved in if their secession were challenged by northern arms. He seems

from his letters to have been much more concerned about a grand declaration of southern freedom than about the highly intricate and extremely difficult process by which the southerners might maintain their freedom after they had declared it.

Simms has often been criticized for having written too much, for having spread his talent too thin through his ready flow of words. The letters show that this prolixity was the result partly of Simms's own make-up as a writer and partly of the circumstantial necessity which forced him often to write like a mere drudge. In this latter connection there is a passage in a letter to Nathaniel Beverley Tucker, March 2, 1851, which indicates one of Simms's many difficulties as editor of a magazine that sadly lacked the money to pay the contributors the editor wished to attract. As a result Simms had to depend upon the scribblings of irresponsible substitutes. "My toils [on the *Southern Quarterly Review*] are incessant," writes Simms. "You need not be told that we can seldom rely upon the punctuality of amateur writers, and at the last moment I am frequently compelled to turn in & write doggedly to fill out a number."

In addition to this enforced writing which naturally suffered from being uninspired on the one hand and hurried on the other, there was much that Simms put down on paper because he felt an almost constant urge toward written composition. "With me," he comments to Marcus C. M. Hammond, August 7, 1850, "it is habit to write." Even ill health and near physical exhaustion could not stop him. Writing to John Pendleton Kennedy, April 5, 1852, from Woodlands, to which he had supposedly retired for a rest, he makes clear how difficult this resting was. "I have been making a most laborious effort to be idle," he says. "But my habits of study and composition are so permanently established, . . . that I do not find it easy to obey admonitions of abstinence, however serious may be the necessity." Like Thomas Wolfe in our own century, Simms appears to have been unable to cease from pouring the words out. Whether an increase in polish and conciseness through slow, careful revision would have compensated sufficiently for a possible loss in natural

vigor and warmth of expression in the novels of either Simms or Wolfe is the sort of question that helps to keep literary critics endlessly employed in debate.

H. G. Kincheloe.

North Carolina State College,
Raleigh.

The St. Augustine Expedition of 1740: A Report to the South Carolina General Assembly. Reprinted from the Colonial Records of South Carolina with an Introduction by John Tate Lanning. (Columbia: South Carolina Archives Department. Pp. xxviii, 182, map, index. Paper, $3.50.)

Spanish and English history in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries include a confusing number of colonial wars. A resurgent Spain fought to destroy the English South Carolina settlements while Great Britain was determined not only to protect them, but also to extend her Atlantic colonies. The clash of national interests motivated many expeditions, one of the most interesting of which was led by James Oglethorpe.

In May, 1740, his army of Carolinians, Georgians, and Indians occupied Fort George Island at the mouth of the St. Johns River, marched down the coast to capture Fort Diego, and by June occupied three strategic places (Fort Moosa, Point Quartell, and Anastasia Island) north and east of St. Augustine. With gunboats blockading the harbor and the Matanzas River, the reduction of the strong, and heretofore impregnable Castillo de San Marcos seemed certain. But Oglethorpe diddled, refused to capture and destroy St. Augustine, thus forcing its inhabitants into the Castillo, and weakened his force by dividing it. A Spanish sally defeated the companies occupying Moosa, winds enabled Spanish ships to break the blockade, and illness in Oglethorpe's camps spread at an alarming rate. The siege was lifted and Florida evacuated.

Almost immediately a committee of the lower house of the South Carolina Assembly investigated the cause of failure. Before its findings were published, James Kilpatrick began a pamphlet war of Carolina and Oglethorpe apologists. Three editions of the committee report appeared in

the 1740's and fragments of the report were published in the nineteenth century, but only a few copies of the complete report are extant.

The St. Augustine Expedition of 1740 contains an excellent interpretative introduction by Lanning, an explanatory bibliographical note, the report, and an appendix of 139 letters, statements, and accounts. Although the report and appendix are reprinted from the multi-volumed *Colonial Records of South Carolina* now in progress, edited by J. H. Easterby, this volume is of sufficient importance to stand alone. Rarely does one find an eighteenth century report with such a wealth of detail combined in a unified account and presented with impartiality. This source volume is essential for students of the British and Spanish colonial periods.

Rembert W. Patrick.

University of Florida,
Tallahassee, Florida.

Reconstruction at Sewanee. The Founding of the University of the South and its First Administration, 1857-1872. By Arthur Benjamin Chitty, Jr. (Sewanee, Tennessee: The University Press, 1954. Pp. 207. $3.50.)

This extremely readable volume traces the early history of the University of the South at Sewanee, Tennessee, from its ambitious founding in the prosperous years before the Civil War through its first administration in the trying Reconstruction period. It is a story of large-scale planning, bitter disappointments, and modest fulfilment under devoted leaders. The University, as envisioned by its founders, Bishops Otey, Polk, and Elliott, was to be a great regional adventure controlled by the Episcopal Church, though mainly sponsored by ten Southern dioceses. The plans called for an isolated mountain domain and a magnificent campus which would become the center of a community receiving its tone from the University. The curriculum would embrace the major fields of knowledge, and it was expected that Sewanee would shortly rival the best universities in the country. The war crushed these plans, but the ideal was not abandoned. Church support was reaffirmed and desperate

efforts were made to obtain funds. Bishop Quintard, later the first vice-chancellor, even went to England for help, returning with £2,500 and grants of books from Oxford and Cambridge.

In 1868 Sewanee opened its first session with four professors and nine students—"the paltriest beginnings and the total absence of any means at all." But it was a start, and in spite of poverty the early period was one of growth which set an enduring pattern that reflected the traditions of Oxford and Cambridge, classical scholarship, the cadet military system, the civilization of the Old South, and the Episcopal Church. From the beginning Sewanee had been "striving toward a clearly drawn pattern rather than moving from experiment to experiment." Its goal remained "the training of youth in Christian virtue, in personal initiative, in self mastery, in . . . intellectual integrity."

Mr. Chitty has told his story well. It is thoroughly documented, with copious notes, bibliography, and photographs, much of the material coming from valuable unpublished diaries, letters, and University records. The many quotations give lively insights into the personalities of the founders, while references to southern history and to other universities give perspective to the central story. This book should be of value to anyone interested in the growth of American education, for it is the story of an institution now standing "among the nation's high one percent in scholarly achievement of graduates."

Porter Williams, Jr.

North Carolina State College,
Raleigh.

Tobacco Dictionary. By Raymond Jahn. (New York: Philosophical Library, 1954. Pp. 199. $5.00.)

This little volume will be useful indeed to those who, knowing little or nothing about the tobacco industry, regard the plant as romantic. It is a pioneer work in so far as the industry of the United States is concerned.

Perhaps Mr. Jahn has only followed current American convictions in omitting names of farmers who have con-

tributed so notably to the development of the tobacco industry. He includes countless manufacturers and even names of individuals connected with the redrying and storage of leaf tobacco. Nor does he omit William Fitzhugh, "one of the prominent members of the planter-class of the Chesapeake Bay region," who amassed "54,000 acres and over fifty slaves." But, apparently unconcerned with the important work of various small farmers in the less distant past, he omits all reference to that pioneer breeder of tobacco seed, Robert L. Ragland; to Dr. Davis G. Tuck, originator of the flue; and to Samuel C. Shelton who devised the methods and rationale of curing single leaves of tobacco. It is on the work of such men as these that the great cigarette industry of today is based. That amazing entrepreneur, James B. Duke, grew up in their midst.

In general, *Tobacco Dictionary* contains clear and accurate statements, although exception might be taken to the implication that Sir Walter Raleigh took Virginia tobacco "back to Europe with him." Some few definitions—notably "trash" and "fighting brands"—are perhaps too narrow and a number of varieties of tobacco have not been included. It was John J., not P. Arthur Adcock, who developed the Adcock variety. Moreover, this volume which is designed also to bring pleasure to the farmer contains "weeding" but does not include "wed" which, as any son of Virginia or North Carolina recognizes, is the past tense of "weed."

Nannie M. Tilley.

East Texas State Teachers College,
Commerce, Texas.

The Fremantle Diary. Editing and Commentary by Walter Lord. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 1954. Pp. xv, 304. $4.00.)

Civil War readers have long been aware of young Colonel Fremantle, whether sharing a fork with Joseph E. Johnston, peering at the field of Gettysburg from high in a tree over Lee's command post, or making observations on southern life and society. Few have known him, however, except as quoted by others. His diary printed in London in 1863, is now reprinted, and made available for the pleasure of many.

In the winter of 1863 Lieutenant Colonel James Arthur Lyon Fremantle, of Her Majesties Coldstream Guards, took leave from his regiment to see the great war in this country, and the southern gallantry and determination he so much admired. Landing in early April at the mouth of the Rio Grande, he worked his way east and north, seeing everything and everybody worth his attention, and making careful notes in his diary. He was deeply impressed by the American cocktail, by the custom of personal violence, by the need of shaking hands. He was friendly with many, among them Generals Beauregard, Hood, Johnston, Bragg, Polk, Lee, and Longstreet who years afterward remembered him with liking. Their friendly interest explains why he was able to see so much. After Gettysburg, he went through the lines to New York, saw the draft riots in July, and went home convinced that the South was "destined, sooner or later, to become a great and independent nation."

To Col. Fremantle's fascinating story, Mr. Lord has added useful and colorful notes. The total production is an extremely interesting addition to Civil War literature. It is unfortunate that the editorial standards are not as high. The text of the 1863 edition has been slightly altered in many places, without notice that this has been done. The notes contain much undocumented material, and the quotations are often inaccurately made. These and other instances of carelessness, as in referring to ambassadors at so early a date, lessen the value of the work, as does the lack of an index.

Herbert W. Hill.

Dartmouth College,
Hanover, N. H.

A History of the South. By Francis Butler Simkins. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953. Pp. xiii, 655. Illustrations, biblography, and index. $5.75.)

In 1947 Simkins published *The South Old and New: A History, 1820-1947*. Now he offers a revision of his earlier work in which he has not only revised much of the first edition but has written several new chapters. Five of these treat of the period before 1820, where the 1947 book began,

and the last two bring the narrative from World War II to 1952. The greatest changes are therefore at the beginning and the end, though there is substantial revision throughout and one new chapter on "Social Diversions" which the earlier edition did not have.

Of the five chapters on the period before 1820, four of them cover various aspects of the colonial period, and the fifth one is on the Revolution in the South and its effects on the mind, character, institutions, and attitudes of the Southern American. In none of these does Professor Simkins explore beyond accepted presentations nor does he offer original interpretations: the chapters represent largely syntheses of earlier works. He examines and explains the English pattern of life which dominated Southern ways and concludes that the Revolution did little—though it did a little—to change them. The military aspects of the Revolution in the South are largely neglected and, curiously, the period between 1800 and 1820 is completely ignored. Although these five chapters have been added at the beginning, the general division of the work remains as before. About half the book concerns the period since Reconstruction. Here Simkins seems to feel more at home and here, undoubtedly, he intended his emphasis to be.

In none of the work, first or last, does Simkins pretend to survey the South's contributions to American history. Rather he is interested in stressing the traits of mind and character, and the variety of influences, which made the South a distinct cultural province, conscious of its distinctiveness and of its identity. On themes such as these Simkins is at his best, and his best is very good. There are portions of fine writing, such as the excellent chapter on literature in the New South, and there are numerous provocative evaluations where Simkins speaks his mind in analyzing the movements, trends, and attitudes he is describing. He makes many judgments, and some of them will provoke quarrels among southerners, but his judgments are characterized by authority and understanding, for he knows how to be critical and sympathetic in the same process. He condones without sentimentality and condemns without offensiveness.

The result is a book which is more than anything else a group of related essays characterized by clarity of writing, richness of knowledge, originality of presentation, and maturity of judgment. Conclusions are buttressed by pages of statistics and catalogues of names, and both grow tiresome at times. The undergraduate student may enjoy this book, but he will not understand it unless he has more than a fair knowledge of general American history before he tackles this regional review. Because of these features it is not a very teachable book, though this is not necessarily a criticism.

There are inevitably a few errors but only one seems important enough to mention. There are excellent bibliographies, arranged by chapters, but this feature is spoiled by the fact that the readings for chapters xxv-xxii have no relation to the subject matter of the chapters they professedly represent. The wrong numbering is, of course, a technical error and is a small item over which to quibble in so excellent a book.

Frontis W. Johnston.

Davidson College,
Davidson.

Caracas Diary, 1835-1840. By John G. A. Williamson. Edited by Jane Lucas de Grummond. (Baton Rouge: Camillia Publishing Company, Inc. Pp. 444. $10.00.)

In 1954 the diplomatic and commercial relations between the United States and Venezuela are close and important. One-sixth of all our capital investments in Latin America are in Venezuela and the two nations are increasingly interdependent. The relations were neither close nor important in 1835 when our neighbor was in swaddling clothes as a nation and more dependent on England than on her youthful neighbor republic in North America.

That year a native of Roxboro, North Carolina, John G. A. Williamson, was assigned to be our first diplomatic representative to the new South American republic. The appointment as charge d'affaires capped nine years of service by Williamson as our consul in the same general area. Williamson kept a diary during his more than four years in

Caracas, which has been resurrected, documented and published by a thorough and conscientious editor.

Dr. Jane Lucas de Grummond, native Pennsylvanian, now associate professor of history at Louisiana State University, first encountered the Williamson diary in the William T. Morrey Collection at Louisiana State while she was a graduate student in 1942. At that time she published extracts from it under the title of *Envoy to Caracas*. The complete work emerges bearing the clear impression of a great deal of scholarly labor. The result is that a very personal editorship throws interestingly colored slides over the historical events of the birth of a nation.

The rambling, subjective observations and reflections of Williamson, characterized by poor spelling and increasing morbidity, have been converted into a document of considerable historical worth. This has been done without reducing the pungency of the candid eye-witness account of life in Caracas during the first few years of Venezuela's career as a free nation.

Something about the diarist: Williamson was aided by a well-to-do and doting father in getting his education. He had a brief business experience in New York where an admirer classified him as the "handsomest" man in the city. He married a Philadelphia woman and returned to North Carolina to seek a political career. He failed in a bid for a seat in Congress, but he was a loyal supporter of Old Hickory, and it was Jackson who appointed him to his posts in Venezuela.

His diary covers the years of his service in Caracas, but it refers frequently to incidents and people who had been active during the nine preceding years in Venezuelan life. Altogether, Williamson's two jobs spanned the hectic years of readjustment following independence from Spain. He had brief personal contact with Simon Bolivar, the George Washington of South America, and some of his principal satellites. Offended by the liberator's indifference to the lusty, but youthful republic which he represented, as well as by Bolivar's open adulation of Britain, the diarist nourished a definite dislike for both Bolivar and the British.

His distaste for his British colleague in Caracas, Sir Robert Ker Porter, is aired frequently in his diary, and he accused Bolivar of increasing infidelity to the democracy he professed. He hints that Bolivar's early death obscured this unfaithfulness and came in good time to prevent the exposure of the liberator's own royalist ambitions. Williamson's obvious sensitiveness to personal slights, real or facied, colors and discolors his report. His diary remains, nevertheless, a close-up eye-witness account of men and their methods in a most important period in the life of the country. History gives sufficient support to some of his appraisals of men to warn against a casual dismissal of all of them as badly distorted. This may be said in spite of his caustic comments about the revered leader of the forces of South American independence.

Williamson's comments on the manners and morals of Caracas society are savage. As he climbed the dusty trails where now the most costly roadway in the world leads from the sea to the great capital city, or rode horseback to the picnic ground, where now stands the most beautiful country club in the Americas, he speculated on the personalities of many who lived in the dirty little city of some 30,000 inhabitants and groaned in the weakness of his own flesh.

He went pridefully to his assignment, apparently was diligent in the relatively trivial duties of his post but both pleasure and pride dwindled and his diary entries became sour and unhappy. His longing to return to the United States, stayed only by the need to accumulate a little money, may have been caused less by the faults in his environment than by the restlessness of a strangely inconsistent helpmate and his own failing health. Though no word of criticism of his wife appears, there is tragedy in each line of his diary as the time approaches for consummation of her stubborn resolve to return to Philadelphia, regardless of his course. She sailed in May, 1840 and less than three months later on August 7, he died in Caracas, probably of cancer. Ultimately throughout the diary trickles a distillation of pain and bitterness and it ends abruptly when his wife departs.

An ironic twist at the finish is that Williamson had to call on his dispised British colleague to take over his office and

make his final report to the United States Department of State.

"I have the honor," wrote Sir Robert Ker Porter, "of addressing you in order to impart the melancholy intelligence of the death of Mr. J. G. A. Williamson, charge d'affaires from the U. States to this Republic. He died at 10 o'clock on the night of the 7th instant in this city and his remains were interred this morning in the British Cemetery with every honor, respect and attention due to his public and private character." One may speculate wryly as to whether Sir Robert came upon and perused the diary.

Capus M. Waynick.

High Point.

Charles A. Beard: An Appraisal. Howard K. Beale, editor. (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1954. pp. xiii, 312. $4.50.)

Any book about Charles A. Beard, one of the most influential, significant, and incidentally one of the most controversial, historians of the United States would arouse interest. The caliber of the co-authors of this *Appraisal* insures its value and importance in the field of history. Eric F. Goldman leads off with an impressionistic view of Beard. It is an excellent and stirring pen picture of a combination of rugged hardheadedness, kindliness, patriotism, and a restive quest for truth, justice, and freedom. Then follow Harold J. Laski with an English view; Max Lerner on political theory; Luther Gulic on muncipal reform; George Soule on planning; Richard Hofstadter on the constitution; Walton Hamilton on "the Politics"; Howard K. Beale on the historian; George R. Leighton on foreign policy; Merle Curti on the critic; Arthur W. MacMahon on the teacher; George S. Counts on the public man; and Howard K. Beale on Beard's historical writings. The book also contains a bibliography of Beard's published writings, and a who's who of the authors. The limits of this review do not permit each article to be dealt with individually. All are of value but it seems that the articles by Walton Hamilton, interesting though it is, has little place in the volume.

Naturally, with such an approach, there is some overlapping and repetition in the essays, but both have been kept to a minimum and do not mar the value of the *Appraisal.* In fact, they may be said to strengthen it. An interesting repetition that casts light on one of Beard's fundamental qualities is the story of Beard's connection with the Connecticut dairy farmers' strike. Running through all the essays is the central theme of Beard's broad grasp of history and human society, his sincere patriotism, and his deep desire to improve man's condition and free him from the bonds that restrain him from the fullest development of his opportunities. Beard made important contributions to government planning, public administration, and municipal government. Broadly trained himself, he believed that it was the obligation and function of every citizen to translate his knowledge and understanding of government into positive action.

But it was as a historian that Beard made his greatest contribution and the essays of Hofstadter, Curti, and Beale are of primary value in the appraisal of his work in this field. Beard published forty-seven volumes of history that had a total circulation of nearly thirteen and one half million by 1949. These books embrace both European and American history as well as the philosophy of history and history's place in the social studies. But the quality of Beard's work is more significant than the quantity. More than ony other American historian Beard stimulated an interest in the economic interpretation of history. In this he was influenced by Karl Marx but he did not accept the Marxian philosophy of dialectical materialism. In his *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution* Beard hit at the tradition of individualism in American thinking and raised up a veritable storm of protest. Today, however, Beard's views on economic influences on the Constitution and American history generally are widely accepted. Beard's insistence that "domestic affairs and foreign affairs are intimately associated with each other" was another of his contributions. In this area, too, Beard stirred up a storm of protest, particularly with his books dealing with Roosevelt's policies and the coming of the second World War. Professor Beale says that while

"many loved him; many hated him." Whether Beard's views in this field will come to be accepted is yet to be seen.

This is an interesting and worthwhile book. It is to be lamented that no index was prepared.

Fletcher M. Green.

University of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill.

HISTORICAL NEWS

The Executive Board of the Department of Archives and History met in Raleigh on August 20, when budgetary estimates for the 1955-1957 biennium were approved.

In Winston-Salem on August 26 a marker was unveiled for the first registered Guernsey cattle brought to the state. The ceremonies were conducted by the North Carolina Guernsey Breeders Association, and those participating in the program included Mayor Marshall C. Kurfees, Mr. Alfred M. Brown, Mrs. T. Holt Haywood, Dr. Douglas L. Rights, and Dr. Christopher Crittenden.

On August 29 a historical marker for the historic landmark, the Flat Rock, was unveiled at the Town of Flat Rock, Henderson County. The Department of Archives and History was represented by Mrs. Sadie Smathers Patton, Board member, who was master of ceremonies; Board member Clarence W. Griffin, who made a brief address; Dr. Christopher Crittenden, director, who spoke briefly; and Mr. W. S. Tarlton, researcher. The principal address was delivered by Major General Edward P. King, United States Army, retired.

The Historic Sites Commission met in Greensboro, August 31, considered several requests for approval of sites for state aid, and heard an explanation by Mr. George H. Esser of the Institute of Government, regarding the proposed reorganization of state government insofar as the historic sites are concerned.

The Tryon Palace Commission met with the Advisory Budget Commission in New Bern on September 3-4, and met again in Greensboro on November 29. At the latter meeting the chief item of business was the consideration of the plans and specifications that had been prepared by Mr. William G. Perry, the architect. It is expected that the contract for the main building will be let within a few weeks.

Dr. Christopher Crittenden attended the annual meeting of the American Association for State and Local History in Madison, Wisconsin, September 9-11. At that meeting the Association announced forty-seven annual awards, of which three came to North Carolina: to Hugh Talmage Lefler and the late Albert Ray Newsome for their work, *North Carolina: The History of a Southern State* (University of North Carolina Press); to the Raleigh Model Railroad Club for installing a railroad exhibit in the Hall of History; and to the State Department of Archives and History for its first half century of achievement and service.

On September 23 Mr. Elbert Cox of Richmond, Va., regional director of the National Park Service, was the principal speaker at the annual celebration at Moore's Creek National Military Park. Mr. Ashley Murphy, Dr. Christopher Crittenden, and others spoke. Mr. J. V. Whitfield, chairman of the battleground committee, presided.

On September 25 in Raleigh memorial services were conducted for the late Dr. George Marion Cooper, who for many years served with the State Board of Health, and a tablet in honor of Dr. Cooper was unveiled in the Cooper Memorial Health Building. Participating in the program were the late Governor William B. Umstead, Dr. G. Grady Dixon, Dr. Amos B. Johnson, Dr. J. W. R. Norton, and Dr. J. H. Hamilton

In the Hall of History, October 1, a party was held for the purpose of securing public aid in identifying a number of pictures left to the Department by the late Albert Barden of Raleigh. These pictures were numbered, and placed on the walls, and prizes were offered to the persons who identified the largest number of photographs. Seventy-five or more persons attended. Many of the pictures were identified.

On October 13 in Vance County a marker was unveiled for Judge Richard Henderson. Dr. Archibald Henderson of the University of North Carolina delivered an address, and Dr. Christopher Crittenden spoke briefly. At Mars Hill on October

15 Dr. Christopher Crittenden addressed the North Carolina Baptist college social studies teachers on "The Writing and Preservation of Local History."

In Gaston County, October 16, a marker for Revolutionary General Joseph Dickson was unveiled. Mr. Frank B. Rankin of Mount Holly delivered an address and Mr. Clarence W. Griffin and Dr. Christopher Crittenden made short talks. The ceremonies were conducted by the William Gaston Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, with Mrs. Kay Dixon of Gastonia, the regent, presiding.

The annual church services and picnic luncheon were held on October 17 at restored St. John's Church in Vance County. The services were conducted by Bishop E. A. Penick and Reverend I. Harding Hughes, both of the Protestant Episcopal Church. At a business meeting Dr. Lawrence F. London, chairman of the restoration committee, presided and reports were made regarding the restoration project. Dr. Crittenden represented the Department of Archives and History.

On October 26 Dr. Crittenden spoke at the unveiling of a portrait of Governor James Turner in the Warrenton Public Library. The ceremonies were conducted by the Warren County Historical Society.

In Chicago, October 28-30, Dr. Crittenden attended the annual meeting of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, of which he is a trustee. On November 3 he was present at the first meeting of the advisory board of the new *American Heritage* (magazine of history).

North Carolinians participating in the programs of the Southern Historical Association at the annual meeting in Columbia, S. C. November 11-13 were as follows: Dr. Christopher Crittenden of the Department of Archives and History; Dr. Loren C. MacKinney and Dr. J. Carlyle Sitterson of the University of North Carolina; Dr. David L. Smiley of Wake Forest College; Dr. Rosser H. Taylor of Western Caro-

lina College; Dr. Robert F. Durden, Dr. Paul H. Clyde, Dr. E. Malcolm Carroll, Dr. William H. Cartwright, and Dr. William B. Hamilton of Duke University.

On November 20 in Hollywood Cemetery, Richmond, Va., Dr. Crittenden spoke at the unveiling of a memorial at the grave of Henry Lawson Wyatt of Edgecombe County, N. C., first soldier in the Confederate Service to be killed in battle (at Big-Bethel, June 10, 1861). The ceremonies were conducted by the Lee Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy, Richmond.

On November 30 in Hobgood, Halifax County, a marker was unveiled for General James Hogan. Mr. W. S. Tarlton, representing the Department of Archives and History, made the principal address.

Sir Walter Raleigh Day was celebrated in the public schools of the state on December 3. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction had been empowered "to permit voluntary donations to be made by the school children of the State for the erection of a memorial in the City of Raleigh in honor of Sir Walter Raleigh." The celebration was planned by the Sir Walter Raleigh Commission, of which Governor Luther H. Hodges is chairman; Dr. Clarence Poe, vice chairman; Dr. Charles F. Carroll, secretary; and Mr. Robert Lee Humber, chairman of the executive committee.

The annual meetings of the various cultural societies were held in Raleigh, December 1-4. The first meeting was the business session of the North Carolina State Art Society. Mrs. Katherine Pendleton Arrington of Warrenton was re-elected president of the Society at a meeting of the board of directors. Also re-elected by the board were Robert Lee Humber of Greenville, vice president and chairman of the executive committee; Mrs. James H. Cordon of Raleigh, treasurer; Miss Lucy Cherry Crisp of Raleigh, executive secretary and gallery director. Mrs. J. H. B. Moore of Greensville, John Allcott of Chapel Hill, and Mrs. Jacques Busbee

of Steeds were re-elected vice presidents at large. Elected to two-year terms on the board of directors were State Treasurer Edwin Gill, Mrs. Isabelle Bowen Henderson and Dr. Clarence Poe of Raleigh, and Dr. Clemmons Sommer of Chapel Hill. State Auditor Henry L. Bridgers and Jonathan Daniels of Raleigh, Gregory Ivey of Greensboro, and Mrs. Kenneth Mountcastle, Jr., of Winston-Salem, were elected to one-year terms on the board. Mr. Humber reported that it would probably be 1956 before the state receives the $1,000,000 art gift from the Samuel H. Kress Foundation.

Dr. Charles F. Carroll of Raleigh presided at the luncheon meeting of the Art Society and Dr. James Sprunt was the speaker. A report on the museum building and progress in the art collection was made by Mr. Robert Lee Humber who reported that objects of art, consisting of valuable paintings, porcelains, tapestries, and furniture, valued at approximately $703,900 had been donated to the state during 1954.

Mr. John H. Kerr, Jr., of Warrenton received the Society's Certificate of Merit and Achievement for distinguished service to the North Carolina State Art Society. Mr. Kerr was largely responsible for the passage in the General Assembly of 1947, of the bill appropriating $1,000,000 for the purchase of objects of art.

Mr. Robert Lee Humber presided at the evening meeting of the Society and Dr. Marshall Fishwick, associate professor of American Studies of Washington and Lee University, spoke on "Art in Our Daily Life and the Art Museum's Role in the Community." Winners of the 1954 Purchase Awards in the North Carolina Artists Competition were announced. The awards were presented by Miss Lucy Cherry Crisp to Mr. Claude Howell of Wilmington for his semi-abtract oil painting, "Beach Umbrella," Mr. Philip Moose of Newton for his impressionistic oil, "The Plaza," and Mr. Harry Ellensweig, State College student, for his ink and watercolor, "City Maze." After Dr. Fishwick's address a reception and preview of the North Carolina Artists' Exhibition were held in the State Art Gallery.

The Roanoke Island Historical Association held a luncheon meeting, December 1, at the Hotel Sir Walter.

On December 2 the North Carolina Society for the Preservation of Antiquities held its fourteenth annual meeting. The morning program of the session was composed of reports on restoration and preservation projects. Mr. James A. Stenhouse, chairman of the Historic Sites Commission, reported on St. Thomas Church at Bath and the Alston House in the Horseshoe. Mrs. John A. Kellenberger, chairman of the Tyron Palace Commission, stated that it had been decided to enlarge the grounds at the Palace and, if possible, restore the original park. Mrs. Dorothy R. Phillips, Hall of History, Raleigh, gave a slide program on "Historic Buildings in North Carolina." The officers of the Society were re-elected for another year.

At the luncheon meeting of the Antiquities Society Mr.. John A. Kellenberger of Greensboro presided. Mrs. Sterling M. Gary of Halifax presented Chancellor Robert B. House of the University of North Carolina, who spoke on the Halifax Resolves of April 12, 1776. Mr. James A. Stenhouse discussed the restoration and preservation of historic buildings in Halifax.

Miss Gertrude S. Carraway of New Bern presided over the evening meeting. Fourteen new life members were presented. The Cannon Awards were presented to the following: Attorney General Harry McMullan, Raleigh, for his aid to the Society in the preservation of historic sites; Mrs. Walter M. Stearns, Raleigh, for the preservation of her home, "Haywood Hall," which was built in 1792; Miss Cora A. Harris, Charlotte, writer and landscape gardener, for her designing and execution of period plantings for restoration projects, and for her writings in history and horticulture; Colonel Jeffrey F. Stanback, Mount Gilead, for his work in historical research and writing, his setting up of the Montgomery County Archives, and his endeavors in having old places in the state restored; Mr. and Mrs. George D. Allen, Scarsdale, New York, for their work with Duke University and the Duke

Endowment, as well as their restoration work in Warrenton; Mr. Cecil B. DeMille, formerly of Washington, North Carolina, for his many fine films. The program was presented by the Charles B. Aycock Memorial Commission of which Dr. D. J. Rose, Goldsboro, is chairman. "The Vision of Charles Brantley Aycock," by John Ehle and directed by Clifton Britton, was presented. A reception was held after the meeting.

On December 3 the State Literary and Historical Association held its annual meeting. Mrs. Inglis Fletcher presided at the morning session when the reports of the secretary-treasurer and of the committees were given and resolutions were passed. In the election of officers Dr. Fletcher M. Green, head of the history department at the University of North Carolina, succeeded Mrs. Inglis Fletcher of Edenton as president of the association; Mr. John Harden of Greensboro, Mr. Hugh Morton of Wilmington, and Dr. R. H. Taylor of Cullowhee were elected vice presidents. Dr. Christopher Crittenden, director of the Department of Archives and History, was re-elected secretary-treasurer. Dr. Lillian Parker Wallace of Meredith College and Dr. William H. Cartwright of Duke University were elected members of the executive committee.

The program of the Literary and Historical Association began with Dr. Paul Murray of Greenville speaking on "*The North Carolina Historical Review*—The First Thirty Years." Mr. Harry Golden of Charlotte talked on "The Jewish People of North Carolina" and Mr. Robert Mason of Sanford gave a review of North Carolina fiction of the year. The R. D. W. Connor Award for the best article on North Carolina history or biography in *The North Carolina Historical Review* was presented by Dr. Lillian Parker Wallace to Mr. Hugh F. Rankin, graduate student at the University of North Carolina, for his article, "Cowpens: Prelude to Yorktown." Mr. Roy Parker, Sr., of Ahoskie presented the Roanoke-Chowan Poetry Award to Mr. Thad Stem, Jr., of Oxford for his volume of verse entitled "The Jackknife Horse." Mrs. Mebane Holo-

man Burgwyn of Jackson was presented the American Association of University Women's Juvenile Literature Award by Mrs. Carl A. Plonk of Asheville for her book, *Penny Rose.*

Mr. D. L. Corbitt of the State Department of Archives and History presided at the luncheon meeting of the Association and Dr. Leonard B. Hurley of Greensboro gave a review of North Carolina non-fiction for the year.

The subscription dinner was presided over by Mr. Capus M. Waynick of High Point and Mrs. Inglis Fletcher gave the presidential address. Dr. D. J. Whitener of Boone presided at the evening meeting. The address, "The Elizabethan Politics and Colonial Enterprise," was given by Dr. Louis B. Wright of the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington, D. C. Mrs. Preston B. Wilkes, Jr., governor, Society of Mayflower Descendants in the State of North Carolina, presented the Mayflower Society Award to Dr. Hugh T. Lefler of Chapel Hill and the late Dr. A. R. Newsome of Chapel Hill, for their book, *North Carolina, The History of a Southern State;* and Miss Clara Booth Byrd, Greensboro, president of the Historical Book Club, presented the Sir Walter Raleigh Award to Mr. Ovid William Pierce of Weldon for his novel, *The Plantation.* A reception was held after the meeting.

The North Carolina Society of County and Local Historians met on the afternoon of December 3. The Society announced the plan for the presentation of an annual award for the best historical feature published in the newspapers of the state. The perpetuation of the Smithwick Award was announced and it will be given by Mr. and Mrs. S. T. Peace of Henderson. The award will be made for the best local historical work published in book form. It will be given on alternate years. Officers re-elected were: Mr. William S. Powell, Chapel Hill, president; Mr. Manly Wade Wellman, Chapel Hill, Colonel Jeffrey F. Stanback, Mt. Gilead, and Mrs. S. T. Peace, Henderson, vice presidents. Mrs. Musella W. Wagner of Chapel Hill was re-elected secretary-treasurer. "The Junior Historian Movement" was described by Dr.

Jonathan C. McLendon of Durham and Dr. Harry R. Stevens of Durham discussed "The Progress and Future of County History Writing."

at the meeting of the North Carolina Folklore Society, which was held on the afternoon of December 3, Mr. Manly W. Wellman spoke on "The Writer's Use of Folklore." After his talk Miss Margaret Underwood of Greensboro sang "Vandy, Vandy," and other North Carolina folksongs. Mr. James M. Carpenter discussed "Folklore Collecting in Britian and America."

The North Carolina Poetry Society also held its meeting on Friday afternoon, December 3. Mr. Paul Bartlett of Charlotte presided in the absence of Mrs. W. H. Vestal of Winston-Salem, president. Mr. Richard Walser of Raleigh issued greetings, and Mr. Stewart Atkins of Gastonia responded. The program of the meeting was "The History of the North Carolina Poetry Society," by Miss Zoe Kincaid Brockman of Gastonia. Recognition was given by Mr. Paul Bartlett to members who had published volumes of poetry. Mr. James Larkin Pearson, Poet Laureate of North Carolina, Guilford College, Mr. Frank Borden Hanes, Winston-Salem, 1953 Poetry Award winner, and Mr. Thad Stem, Jr., Oxford, winner of the present year; spoke briefly.

The members of the North Carolina Society of County and Local Historians were guests at the September 5 meeting of the Stanly County Historical Society. A tour included visits to several old homes and churches as well as to the aluminum plant at Badin and Morrow Mountain State Park. After lunch the group visited Pfeiffer College at Meisenheimer.

On October 10 the members of the North Carolina Society of County and Local Historians were the guests at a tour arranged by Mr. James G. W. MacClamroch and Mr. Raleigh C. Taylor, which covered northern Guilford County, Greensboro, and the Guilford Courthouse Battleground. A picnic lunch was enjoyed by the members who attended.

The Society of American Archivists eighteenth annual meeting at Williamsburg, Virginia, September 12-13, was attended by Dr. Christopher Crittenden, Mr. D. L. Corbitt, Mr. W. Frank Burton, Mrs. Doris H. Harris, and Mrs. Frances Whitley all of the Department staff. Dr. Crittenden talked on the subject, "The North Carolina Record Center," and Mr. Burton spoke on "Microfilming State Records."

Dr. Marvin L. Skaggs, professor and head of the department of history at Greensboro College, delivered the principal address at the September 17 ceremonies at Guilford Battleground, when the Daughters of the American Revolution presented a Revolutionary drum to Guilford Courthouse National Military Park. Dr. Christopher Crittenden was present and talked briefly about the drum.

The Restored Wachovia Museum was opened on September 18 by the late Governor William B. Umstead, in Old Salem, Winston-Salem. The restoration project was promoted and carried through by Old Salem, Inc., and is a part of their long-range program to recapture as nearly as possible the atmosphere and actuality of the Wachovia settlement. The museum was originally begun by the Young Men's Missionary Society of the Moravian Church.

The Wachovia Historical Society at its annual meeting on October 19, presented three North Carolina writers with Spangenberg Medals commemorating the first settlement in Wachovia. Those who were so honored were Mr. William T. Polk, author of *Southern Accent;* Mr. James S. Brawley, who wrote *The Rowan Story;* and Dr. Hugh T. Lefler, who co-authored *North Carolina, The History of a Southern State.* Mr. Polk, who was the principal speaker, is an associate editor of the *Greensboro Daily News.*

On September 26 Dr. Blackwell P. Robinson, professor of history at High Point College, and Mrs. Inglis Fletcher, novelist, were the featured speakers at the Homecoming Day program of the historic Old Bethesda Presbyterian Church

near Aberdeen. The program, which was attended by hundreds of the descendants of the Scottish settlers, lasted throughout the day and a picnic lunch was served. Mr. J. Talbot Johnson, chairman for 27 successive years, presided and students from Flora MacDonald College gave a program of religious music. Mrs. Fletcher's talk was on the topic, "History and the Writing of a Novel." Dr. Robinson read excerpts from his forthcoming history of Moore County.

An article which described the Robert H. Davis Collection of O. Henryana appeared in the October 17 edition of the *Greensboro Daily News*. It was written by Mr. Burke Davis, feature writer of the *Daily News* and author of the recent book, *They Called Him Stonewall.*

Mrs. Joye E. Jordan, head of the Division of Museums of the Department of Archives and History, accompanied by Mrs. Dorothy R. Phillips and Miss Barbara McKeithan, attended the annual meeting of the Southeastern Museums Conference in Miami, Fla., October 20-23. Mrs. Jordan is secretary-treasurer of this group.

On November 9 Mrs. Jordan spoke to the Dunn Junior Woman's Club on "North Carolina Pottery."

The thirtieth anniversary celebration of the Greensboro Historical Museum was held on October 28 with a luncheon address by Governor Luther H. Hodges, then lieutenant governor, and a visit to the museum which featured the Robert H. Davis Collection of O. Henryana. Mr. Karl E. Prickett is president of the Museum and Mr. McDaniel Lewis was chairman of the thirtieth anniversary celebration. Mr. W. Frank Burton, Mr. W. S. Tarlton, Mrs. Joye E. Jordan, and Mrs. Dorothy R. Phillips of the Department of Archives and History attended the meeting.

The following papers were read at the fall meeting of the North Carolina Historical Society on October 29: Dr. Sarah

Lemmon, "Eugene Talmadge and Dean Cocking"; Mr. Richard Walser, "The Mysterious Case of George Higby Throop, 1818-1896"; and Dr. J. G. de R. Hamilton, "General Robert F. Hoke and His Military Career." Dr. Robert H. Woody of Duke University was elected president and Mrs. Julia Spruill, vice president. Dr. Frontis W. Johnston was re-elected secretary-treasurer and the following members were elected to the council: Dr. Alice B. Kieth, Dr. Sam H. Hobbs, Jr., and Dr. Rosser H. Taylor.

Mr. Clarence W. Griffin of Forest City, a member of the Executive Board, represented the Department of Archives and History at the unveiling of a historical marker on October 31 at the home place of Captain William Moore in Buncombe County. The marker was erected in cooperation with the Unaka Chapter of the Daughters of American Colonists.

The Western North Carolina Historical Association met on November 6 at Brevard College. The business session was presided over by Mr. Sam E. Beck, president, of Asheville. Mr. Clarence W. Griffin, vice president, of Forest City introduced those on the program. Following a welcome by Rev. Robert Stamey, president of Brevard College, Mr. L. P. Hamlin talked on "The History of Transylvania County."

The Executive Committee of the North Carolina Register of Deeds Association met in Raleigh on November 10-11 to outline a legislative program. Mr. W. Frank Burton, head of the Division of Archives, worked with the group in an advisory capacity.

The popular historical magazine, *American Heritage,* which first began publication five years ago, was issued on December 6 in its new book format. This publication has been greatly expanded into book form and contains 124 pages of which 27 are 4-color process pictures. It is jointly sponsored by the American Association for State and Local History and the Society of American Historians. The book will be sold through book stores and not on magazine or news stands.

The Catawba County Historical Association recently elected Mr. Sam G. Rowe, Newton civil engineer, to succeed Dr. J. E. Hodges of Maiden as president. Other officers include Mrs. J. C. Plonk of Hickory, vice president; Mrs. Pearl Miller Tomlinson of Hickory, secretary; and Mrs. J. M. Ballard of Newton, treasurer. The society has decided to start a county museum as its principal project for the coming year.

The county commissioners of Montgomery County recently authorized a depository for the preservation of important manuscripts, documents, and county records. Colonel Jeffrey F. Stanback of Mount Gilead was appointed county historian. A number of important collections have been promised as well as several old maps when the depository is set up. January, 1955, has been set as a possible date when the archives will be available to the public.

Miss Lynette Adcock, originally of Oxford, North Carolina, who is at present connected with Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., Williamsburg, Virginia, compiled the statistics for the new book, *Guide to the Manuscript Collections of Colonial Williamsburg.*

Mr. D. L. Corbitt, editor of the Division of Publications of the Department of Archives and History, attended a number of meetings of county historical societies and addressed others during the last quarter. On September 25 he assisted in the organizational meeting of the Carteret County County Historical Society in Beaufort and spoke on the various phases of achieving a permanent society. Two weeks later following a membership drive 40 charter members elected the following officers: Mrs. Nat Smith of Gloucester, president, and Miss Amy Muse of Beaufort, secretary and curator. On the same date Mr. Corbitt assisted an interested group in Jacksonville in organizing the Onslow County Historical Society with 41 charter members. Mrs. Lillian R. Ray of Hubert was elected president and Mrs. John Starling of Hubert was elected secretary and treasurer. On October 4 Mr. Corbitt spoke at the annual meeting of the Currituck County His-

torical Society at Shawboro. His subject was "The Publication Program of the State Department of Archives and History." Approximately 75 persons attended this meeting. The Bloomsbury Chapter of the Daughters of the Revolution held their October 8 meeting at the Carolina Country Club with Mr. Corbitt speaking on "The Publication Program of the Department of Archives and History." The Mecklenburg Historical Association was organized in Charlotte on October 18 with Mr. Corbitt as speaker at the meeting. Following the program the association was formed with Mr. James A. Stenhouse as president and Mrs. Georgia Spratt Gray as secretary. The association has 160 members. On November 5 the Phi Alpha Theta, national honorary history fraternity of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, had a program which featured Mr. Corbitt, who spoke on "The Publishing of Historical Research Today," and Mr. Lambert Davis, of the University Press, who spoke on "University Presses and the Publishing of Doctor's Dissertations."

Mr. W. S. Tarlton, researcher for the Department of Archives and History, represented the Department at the meeting of the Bertie County Historical Society at the Bertie end of the Chowan River Bridge, September 19. Mr. John E. Tyler, historian of the group, presided. A picnic lunch was enjoyed by the guests and members. A series of markers located at this historic spot include the following: Governor Edward Hyde, Eden House, Pollock's Home, and the Nathaniel Batts House, which symbolically marks the home site of the first known settler in North Carolina. Mr. Tarlton spoke at the unveiling of a marker for Governor John Branch at Enfield, September 9. The ceremonies were sponsored by the local chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. On September 17 he talked on "The Restoration of Somerset Place" to the LaFayette Chapter, Daughters of the Revolution, in Raleigh. As a part of the Junior Historian program which is being sponsored by the Department of Archives and History he gave a talk to an eighth grade class at Needham Broughton High School, Raleigh, September 30, on "The Early History of Raleigh." On November 10 he was

the speaker at the meeting of the Scotch Gardeners Club in Laurinburg on the topic, "Restoration Projects in North Carolina," with emphasis on the Somerset Place project.

Dr. George V. Taylor, assistant professor of European History of the University of North Carolina, has returned from a year in France as a Fulbright Research Scholar where he acquired for the University Library valuable source material and documents on the French Revolution and Napoleonic period.

Dr. James W. Patton, director of the Southern Historical Collection, and Dr. Charles G. Sellers, Jr., assistant professor of history at Princeton University, taught in the 1954 summer session at the University.

Dr. Elisha P. Douglass, assistant professor of American History, spent the summer of 1954 at Princeton University doing research.

Dr. Carl H. Pegg, professor of modern European History, served as civilian consultant specialist in European affairs, at the Air Force conference held in Chapel Hill during the 1954 summer session.

Mr. Wesley H. Wallace has been appointed assistant professor in radio at the University.

Dr. Harold A. Bierck has been appointed to the faculty of the University of California at Los Angeles for the summer session of 1955.

The department of history and political science at North Carolina State College reports the following item: Dr. Philip Morrison Rice has been promoted to associate professor.

On November 21 Dr. L. Walter Seegers, associate professor, gave an address on the Mayflower Compact over Station WPTF, Raleigh.

Dr. Preston W. Edsall, head of the department, is general chairman of the third annual faculty conference on the state of the consolidated University of North Carolina, which will be held at State College, March 10-11, with approximately 180 members of the faculties of the three units of the University participating. The theme will be "Planning a Foreseeable Future." Dr. Edsall spent several weeks of the past summer in England and Holland.

Dr. Kenneth D. Rabb, assistant professor, conducted a circle tour by bus to the Pacific Coast during the summer of 1954. This tour is taken annually by a large number of public school teachers.

On October 16 Dr. W. Buck Yearns of Wake Forest College, read a paper, "The Peace Movement in the Confederate Congress," at a conference of the social studies faculties of the Baptist colleges of North Carolina at Mars Hill. The meeting was attended by Dr. Percival Perry, Dr. David L. Smiley, and Dr. Henry S. Stroupe. Dr. Smiley read a paper, "Cassius M. Clay and John G. Fee: A Study in Southern Anti-Slavery Thought." He is also the author of "Cassius M. Clay and Southern Industrialism", which was published in the *Filson Club History Quarterly,* October, 1954.

Dr. Henry T. Shanks, dean and professor of history at Birmingham-Southern College, was awarded an LL.D. degree by Wake Forest College in June, 1954.

Dr. C. Gregg Singer, head of the department of history at Salem College, recently resigned and Dr. Philip Africa of Warren, Pa., has replaced him. Dr. Africa received his doctorate from the University of Rochester in 1953. Mr. Donald M. McCorkle, who has joined the faculty of Salem College as assistant professor of musicology, is spending a great deal of time in the Moravian Archives cleaning and cataloging the music of the early Moravians, both secular and sacred. This research program is the largest in the history of American

music and will include the collection of old musical instruments as well as music.

The history department at Duke University reports the following: Dr. Robert F. Durden published an article, "*The Prostate State* Revisited: James S. Pike and South Carolina Reconstruction," in the *Journal of Negro History,* April, 1954.

Dr. W. T. Laprade authored the "Report of Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure," for the spring issue of the *Bulletin* of the American Association of University Professors.

Dr. Alan K. Manchester spent the summer in South America on special service for the United States Department of State; in October he addressed the Trinity College Historical Society on "Brazil in Transition." The Society had for its speaker in November Dr. Boyd C. Shafer, executive secretary of the American Historical Association.

Dr. Robert H. Woody has been recently appointed director of graduate studies in the history department.

Those of the Duke delegation to the Columbia meeting of the Southern Historical Association were Dr. E. Malcolm Carroll, Dr. Paul H. Clyde, and Dr. Robert F. Durden, and Dr. William H. Cartwright, and Dr. William B. Hamilton, who also participated in the program.

Mr. Raymond Esthus and Mr. Robert L. Ganyard, doctoral candidates, have this year joined the faculties of Brevard College and the University of Houston respectively.

The social studies department of Appalachian State Teachers College sends the following items: Mr. John H. Workman is one of the 26 teachers from this district who have been invited to attend a seminar on money and banking as guests of the Federal Reserve Board, Richmond, December 8-11.

Mr. J. C. Yoder attended the Southeast Division of the Association of American Geographers, Chapel Hill, November 19-20.

Dr. D. J. Whitener was recently re-elected executive vice president of the Southern Appalachian Historical Association, sponsor of "Horn in the West."

Dr. Ina Woestemeyer Van Noppen and Mr. John Mitchell Justice attended the Southern Historical Association meeting in Columbia on November 11-13.

Among the publications of the faculty of the University of North Carolina are the following articles and books (not including those articles or book reviews that appeared in *The Review* or were published by the Department of Archives and History): Dr. Harold A. Bierck's "Spoils, Soils, and Skinner," *Maryland Historical Magazine* (March, June, 1954); Dr. James L. Godfrey's "The Aftermath of World War II," chapter 16 in Setton and Winkler's *Great Problems in European Civilization* (New York: Prentice Hall, 1954); Dr. Fletcher M. Green's *The Chapel Hill Methodist Church: A Centennial History, 1853-1953* (Chapel Hill: Orange Printshop, 1954); Dr. Frank W. Klingberg's "The Reverend John T. Clark: Episcopal Unionist in Virginia," *Historical Magazine of the Episcopal Church* (September, 1954).

Mr. William S. Powell of the Library of the University of North Carolina, published "First Flight," in *American Heritage* (winter, 1953-1954).

Dr. Horace H. Cunningham of Elon College had an article, "Organization and Administration of the Confederate Medical Department," in the *Journal of Southern History* (July, 1954).

Dr. Sarah M. Lemmon of Meredith College was the author of "The Agricultural Policies of Eugene Talmadge," which appeared in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly*, January 1954.

The University of Kentucky Press announces the establishment of a fellowship which awards $5,000 to the writer of a book-length manuscript which will be based upon some signi-

ficant part of the cultural and historical life of Kentucky. The book selected will be published by the University of Kentucky Press. The award is being offered to attract scholars who are interested in this region and was made possible through a gift of Mrs. Margaret Voorhies Haggin of New York City. Further data may be obtained from the Press at Lexington, Kentucky.

Books received recently include the following:

Richard Lyle Power, *Planting Corn Belt Culture: The Impress of the Upland Southerner and Yankee in the Old Northwest* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1953); Frank E. Vandiver, *Southern Historical Papers* (Richmond: Virginia Historical Society, 1953); *South Dakota Historical Collections and Report, Volume* XXVI (Pierre: South Dakota Historical Society, 1953); Bell Irwin Wiley, *Fourteen Hundred and 91 Days in the Confederate Army* (Jackson, Tennessee: McCowat-Mercer Press Inc., 1954); Stuart Noblin, *The Grange in North Carolina, 1929-1954,A Story of Agricultural Progress* (Greensboro: North Carolina State Grange, 1954); Richard Cecil Todd, *Confederate Finance* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1954); Wilbur R. Jacobs, *Indians of the Southern Frontier* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1954); Aubrey Lee Brooks, *Selected Addresses of a Southern Lawyer* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954); Clarence Edwin Carter, *The Territorial Papers of the United States, Volume* XX, *The Territory of Arkansas, 1825-1829* (Washington: National Archives and Records Service, 1954); Alexander Mathis, *The Lost Citadel* (New York: Pageant Press, Inc., 1954); William B. Hesseltine, *Dr. J. G. M. Ramsey* (Nashville: Tennessee Historical Commission, 1954); Ed Kilman and Theon Wright, *Hugh Roy Cullen, A Story of American Opportunity* (New York: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1954); Marion Buckley Cox, *Glimpse of Glory, George Mason of Gunston Hall* (Richmond, Virginia: Garrett and Massie, Inc., 1954); Claude G. Bowers, *Making Democracy a Reality: Jefferson, Jackson and Polk* (Memphis, Tennessee: Memphis State College Press, 1954); Richard M.

Cameron, *The Rise of Methodism: A Source Book* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1954); Charles C. Cole, Jr., *The Social Ideas of the Northern Evangelist, 1826-1860* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954); Jay B. Hubbell, *The South in American Literature, 1607-1900* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1954); Burke Davis, *They Called Him Stonewall, A Life of Lientenant General T. J. Jackson, C.S.A.* (New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1954); William H. Masterson, *William Blount* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1954); J. H. Easterby, *Colonial Records of South Carolina, Volume* IV (Columbia: South Carolina Archives Department, 1954); Richard B. Harwell, *Stonewall Jackson and the Old Stonewall Brigade* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 1954); Max Freund, *Gustav Dresel's Houston Journal: Adventures in North America and Texas, 1837-1841* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1954); Edwin Adams Davis and William Ransom Hogan, *The Barber of Natchez* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1954); Allen R. Richards, *War Labor Boards in the Field* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1953); Joseph H. Parks, *General Kirby Smith C.S.A.* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1954); John Harden, *Tar Heel Ghosts* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954); and Marshall Fishwick, *General Lee's Photographer: The Life and Work of Michael Miley* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1954).

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

Mr. Paul Conkin is at present serving with the armed forces in Germany. He received his M.A. from Vanderbilt and was working on his doctorate when called into service.

Dr. William S. Hoffman is chairman of the division of social studies at Wiley College, Marshall, Texas.

Dr. Max L. Heyman, Jr., is on the faculty of the Washington Junior High School, Los Angeles, California.

Dr. Margaret Burr DesChamps is assistant professor of history at Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Georgia.

Mr. Francis B. Dedmond is professor of English and head of the Department of English at Gardner-Webb College, Boiling Springs, North Carolina.

Dr. Hugh T. Lefler is a professor of history at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.