

NORTH CAROLINA
STATE LIBRARY

THE NORTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL REVIEW

ISSUED QUARTERLY

VOLUME XXIX

NUMBER 2



APRIL, 1952

PUBLISHED BY
STATE DEPARTMENT OF ARCHIVES AND HISTORY
Corner of Edenton and Salisbury streets
RALEIGH, N. C.

THE NORTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL REVIEW

*Published by the State Department of Archives and History
Raleigh, N. C.*

CHRISTOPHER CRITTENDEN, *Editor*
DAVID LEROY CORBITT, *Managing Editor*

ADVISORY EDITORIAL BOARD

WALTER CLINTON JACKSON
FRONTIS WITHERS JOHNSTON
HUGH TALMAGE LEFLER
DOUGLAS LETELL RIGHTS
GEORGE MYERS STEPHENS

STATE DEPARTMENT OF ARCHIVES AND HISTORY

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN BROWN, *Chairman*
GERTRUDE SPRAGUE CARRAWAY
CLARENCE W. GRIFFIN
WILLIAM THOMAS LAPRADE
MCDANIEL LEWIS
MRS. SADIE SMATHERS PATTON
MRS. CALLIE PRIDGEN WILLIAMS
CHRISTOPHER CRITTENDEN, *Director*

This review was established in January, 1924, as a medium of publication and discussion of history in North Carolina. It is issued to other institutions by exchange, but to the general public by subscription only. The regular price is \$2.00 per year. To members of the State Literary and Historical Association there is a special price of \$1.00 per year. Back numbers may be procured at the regular price of \$2.00 per volume, or \$.50 per number.

THE NORTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XXIX

APRIL, 1952

NUMBER 2

CONTENTS

- THE BAR EXAMINATION AND BEGINNING YEARS
OF LEGAL PRACTICE IN NORTH
CAROLINA, 1820-1860 159
FANNIE MEMORY FARMER
- ELECTIONEERING IN NORTH CAROLINA, 1800-1835 171
JOHN CHALMERS VINSON
- JIM POLK GOES TO CHAPEL HILL..... 189
CHARLES GRIER SELLERS, JR.
- THE HATTERAS EXPEDITION, AUGUST, 1861 204
JAMES M. MERRILL
- PAPER MANUFACTURING IN SOUTH CAROLINA
BEFORE THE CIVIL WAR..... 220
ERNEST M. LANDER, JR.
- PAPERS FROM THE FIFTY-FIRST ANNUAL SESSION
OF THE STATE LITERARY AND HISTORICAL
ASSOCIATION, Raleigh, December 7, 1951
INTRODUCTION 228
CHRISTOPHER CRITTENDEN
- OLD BRUNSWICK, THE STORY OF A COLONIAL
TOWN 230
E. LAWRENCE LEE, JR.
- NORTH CAROLINA NON-FICTION WORKS
FOR 1951 246
FRONTIS W. JOHNSTON
- LETTERS FROM NORTH CAROLINA TO ANDREW
JOHNSON 259
ELIZABETH GREGORY MCPHERSON
- NORTH CAROLINA BIBLIOGRAPHY, 1950-1951 269
MARY LINDSAY THORNTON

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

BOOK REVIEWS 278

EDMONDS'S *The Negro and Fusion Politics in North Carolina, 1894-1901*—BY PRESTON W. EDSALL; RECORD'S *The Negro and the Communist Party*—BY PRESTON W. EDSALL; DULA'S AND SIMPSON'S *Durham and Her People*—BY D. J. WHITENER; TAYLOR'S *Survey of Marine Fisheries of North Carolina*—BY DAVID H. WALLACE; BAILEY'S AND LEAVITT'S *The Southern Humanities Conference and Its Constituent Societies*—BY M. L. SKAGGS; GOING'S *Bourbon Democracy in Alabama*—BY FRONTIS W. JOHNSTON; CARTER'S *The Territorial Papers of the United States*—BY WALTER H. RYLE; LOTH'S *The People's General: The Personal Story of Lafayette*—BY MAY DAVIS HILL; FISHBEIN'S AND BENNETT'S *Records of the Accounting Department of the Office of Price Administration*, SHONKWILER'S *Records of the Bureau of Ordnance*, and MARTIN'S *Records of the Solid Fuels Administration for War, Preliminary Inventories of the National Archives*, numbers 32, 33, and 34—BY DOROTHY DODD.

HISTORICAL NEWS 295

THE NORTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XXIX

APRIL, 1952

NUMBER 2

THE BAR EXAMINATION AND BEGINNING YEARS OF LEGAL PRACTICE IN NORTH CAROLINA, 1820-1860

BY FANNIE MEMORY FARMER

Before a young man could launch out on a legal career a century ago he was faced with the same problem which aspirants have today. He had to go through what is known as a bar examination. The feelings of those young men were not different from those of candidates in the twentieth century. The boys, no matter how thorough their preparation had been, felt a twinge of nervousness as they approached the august judges. A son of Justice Thomas Ruffin, William K. Ruffin, wrote to his father in 1833 that he was really afraid to appear as a candidate for a license. He had begun to realize the fact that he was inadequately prepared and had not studied enough. He confided to his father that he was determined to be a more careful student after he obtained his license than he had been in the months just past. He felt worried about some of the fine distinctions of certain points of law and admitted that "The chapter on *Assumpsit* I think the most difficult, because perhaps I cannot understand his leading distinction, for though I read it twice I cannot tell when a *special assumpsit* should be brought and when a *General Indebitatis Assumpsit*."¹ It is easy to feel sympathetic with young Ruffin.

While preparing for the bar examination, some of the students attempted to find out from the judges which subjects they should stress in their studies. In 1840 Tod R. Caldwell wrote to Thomas Ruffin:

I wish to get some advice from you relative to a course of reading. My intention at present is, to make application, at the next session of the Supreme Court, for license to practice in the

¹ Joseph Gregoire de Roulhac Hamilton, editor, *The Papers of Thomas Ruffin* (Raleigh, 1918-1920), II, 79-80.

County Courts and I have already read and reviewed second and third Blackstone, Walker's Introduction to American Law and Stephen on Pleading. Gov: Swain had advised me to take up Chitty on Contracts but on application to Messrs. Turner and Hughes I find that that book is not to be had. It is not thro' want of confidence in any recommendations that the Gov: may make that I now solicit your advice; but because I am confident that it necessarily follows from the situation which you occupy, that you must be more intimately acquainted with what is expected of young men by your court, when they make application for license. I am sorry that I neglected the opportunity of conversing with you on this subject, when I last saw you.²

From 1760, when the court began to examine applicants, to 1880, it does not appear that any definite amount of time for study was required before an applicant could take the bar examination. From 1760 to 1904 there was no supervision of legal studies.³ The lack of strict requirements is well illustrated by the case of Robert Rufus Bridgers, a graduate of the University of North Carolina class of 1841. He studied law in his spare time during his senior year and was admitted to the bar a week after graduation. This haphazard method of preparation was criticised by Chief Justice Ruffin, who said it would either interfere with college studies or impair the health of the student. The court hoped to reject Bridgers; but, though the justices examined him at great length, he gained admission to the bar.⁴ Despite the oral criticism of the system by the court, nothing was done to remedy the situation for years. Students continued to appear before the judges when they felt well enough prepared to pass the examination.

The North Carolina legislature conferred the power of admitting attorneys to the bar on the judges of the Superior Courts in 1754. In 1818 the power was given to two or more judges of the Supreme Court; this law was in effect until 1869.⁵ If the judges found a candidate to be qualified, so far as his knowledge of the law was concerned, and of good moral character, he was given a certificate to practice in any court for

² Hamilton, *Papers of Thomas Ruffin*, II, 180-181.

³ Albert Coates, "Standards of the Bar," *North Carolina Law Review*, VI (December, 1927), 39, 41.

⁴ Samuel A'Court Ashe, Stephen B. Weeks, and Charles L. Van Noppen, editors, *Biographical History of North Carolina* (Greensboro, 1905-1917), I, 173.

⁵ *In re Applicants for License*, 143 N. C. 11 (1906).

which the judges deemed him qualified.⁶ At this time the examination was oral.⁷

The date for the examination for admission to the bar was not established at a fixed time as it is today. William A. Graham wrote in 1827 that he had appeared for questioning on a particular morning but that Judges Hall and Taylor did not attend court that day. Consequently, his examination had been deferred till that night or the next morning.⁸ Imagine the consternation the boy must have felt at having this important event nonchalantly postponed a day! In 1838 the Supreme Court provided that "All applicants for admission to the Bar must present themselves for examination during the first seven days of the term."⁹ This put some limit on the time in which the law student could try for his license, but the time was still none too definite.

At this period of legal history, the law required two examinations—one for a County Court license and one for a Superior Court license; and the Court required the lapse of a year between the granting of the two.¹⁰ As was true of many of its ukases, the Court did not strictly enforce this regulation. For example, William H. Battle was so thoroughly prepared when he presented himself that the Supreme Court granted him County and Superior Court licenses at a single term.¹¹

In many cases the bar examiners had taught several of the applicants. The leaders of the bar during this period served on the bench; the leaders also engaged in teaching and conducting the most successful law schools. Because the judges had often taught the examinees, they frequently knew the capacities of individuals taking the examination; in fact, most of the applicants were known to at least one of the members of the examining

⁶ Henry Potter, John Louis Taylor, Bartlett Yancey, editors, *Laws of the State of North Carolina, including the Titles of such Statutes and Parts of Statutes of Great Britain as Are in Force in Said State; Together with the Second Charter Granted by Charles II. to the Proprietors of Carolina; The Great Deed of Grant from the Lords Proprietors; The Grant from George II. to John Lord Granville; The Bill of Rights and Constitution of the State, including the Names of the Members of the Convention that formed the same; The Constitution of the United States, with the Amendments; and The Treaty of Peace of 1783; with Marginal Notes and References* (Raleigh, 1821), I, Ch. 115, Sec. 7, 284. Hereinafter cited *Revised Code of 1821*. See also Bartholomew F. Moore and Asa Biggs, editors, *The Revised Code of North Carolina* (n. p., [1852]), Ch. VIII, Sec. 1, 18. Hereinafter cited *Revised Code of 1852*.

⁷ Charles F. Warren, "The President's Address," *Report of the Second Annual Meeting of the North Carolina Bar Association, Held at Battery Park Hotel, Asheville, N. C., June 27th, 28th, and 29th, 1900* (Durham, 1900), 117.

⁸ Hamilton, *Papers of Thomas Ruffin*, I, 370.

⁹ "Rules of Court," 20 N. C. 324 (1838).

¹⁰ Kemp Plummer Battle, *Memories of an Old-Time Tar Heel*, edited by William James Battle (Chapel Hill, 1945), 81.

¹¹ *Obituaries, Funeral and Proceedings of the Bar in Memory of the Late Hon. Wm. H. Battle* (Raleigh, 1879), 22.

board.¹² In many respects this was an advantage to the prospective lawyers, for the judges were more apt to take a personal interest in the young men whom they knew than in those absolutely unknown to them. They were also likely to take into consideration the fact that the applicants might not do quite so well under the strain of an examination as they could do under more favorable circumstances.

Good moral character was a prerequisite to admission to the legal profession in the nineteenth century, just as it is in the twentieth century. A certificate to the effect that a man was of upright character was regarded as *prima facie* evidence of his moral fitness.¹³

Some of the letters of recommendation to the Supreme Court are interesting. Wright C. Stanley wrote to Thomas Ruffin in 1830 saying he had known the applicant, Hamilton Graham, since infancy. He added that he would appreciate it if Ruffin would "extend civilities and attentions . . ." to the boy.¹⁴ John Giles wrote a recommendation for Burton Craige saying that Craige had been deprived of his parents before he finished school but "without the aid of these two kind and best friends . . .," he had made good in his studies.¹⁵ James T. Morehead wrote on January 12, 1831, that the bearer of the letter, Joseph C. Meggison, was visiting Raleigh with the idea of securing his law license. Morehead said that the recommendation was a second-hand one. George Tomas had spoken well of the applicant and had asked Morehead to write to Ruffin on Meggison's behalf. Thomas did not himself write because he and Ruffin were not acquainted. Morehead assured Ruffin that he had heard the aspirant spoken of "in highly respectable terms . . ." by other men.¹⁶

James C. Dobbin wrote to J. J. Daniel that Robert Strange, Jr., "possesses more *moral qualities* than are well calculated to adorn the profession he has assumed."¹⁷ William Gaston, writing about one hopeful applicant, "Mr. Sparrow," said that the boy's father's calamities had induced Sparrow to apply for

¹² "The North Carolina Bar," *North Carolina Journal of Law*, I (January, 1904), 2.

¹³ Reed Kitchen, "Applicant's Character for Admission to Bar," *North Carolina Law Review*, II (December, 1924), 234.

¹⁴ Hamilton, *Papers of Thomas Ruffin*, II, 16-17.

¹⁵ Hamilton, *Papers of Thomas Ruffin*, II, 54.

¹⁶ Hamilton, *Papers of Thomas Ruffin*, II, 20.

¹⁷ Hamilton, *Papers of Thomas Ruffin*, II, 232.

a license earlier than he had intended. However, the boy was diligent and would hasten to make up his deficiencies in case he seemed to be unprepared at the examination.¹⁸ William N. H. Smith observed that applicant A. P. Yancey might appear to a disadvantage because of the embarrassment of an examination, but Smith felt certain that Yancey's attainments were sufficient to entitle him to practice in the higher courts of the state.¹⁹

It is obvious that a personal element entered strongly into the matter of the bar examination during the years of the nineteenth century. Individual problems and difficulties were often mentioned; undoubtedly, the examining judges were influenced by the statements of their fellow lawyers as to the fitness of those aspiring to the law. The legal profession was not overcrowded; the judges did not prepare extremely difficult examinations for the boys who came before them. Ambition and a willingness to work were assets to be taken into account in determining the quality of the law student seeking recognition as a full-fledged attorney.

Though it appears that failure to pass the bar examination was an almost unheard-of thing, nearly every applicant felt uneasy about taking the oral examination from the justices of the Supreme Court. Kemp P. Battle hoped to have a perfect examination, as he thought he knew everything in the textbooks. Though Pearson asked him a question he did not know, he was granted a license.²⁰ Surprise was sometimes expressed at the unusually good results accomplished by certain students. For example, Frederick Nash, writing to his son about a newly licensed lawyer, said that he had learned from Judge Ruffin that the boy obtained his license with much ease and that his examination had been very good, "much to my surprise."²¹

There was a general rule that licenses should not be issued before the twenty-first birthday. The Supreme Court, however, did not hold to this regulation with uniform strictness. Duncan K. McRae wrote to the Court requesting that his license be issued nine days "earlier than the Law suggests . . ." so that he might begin practicing at the opening of the Onslow County Court.²²

¹⁸ Hamilton, *Papers of Thomas Ruffin*, II, 215.

¹⁹ Hamilton, *Papers of Thomas Ruffin*, II, 289.

²⁰ Battle, *Memories of an Old-Time Tar Heel*, 108.

²¹ Frederick Nash to his son, Fred Nash, [month?] 29, 1839, Nash Papers, North Carolina Department of Archives and History, Raleigh.

²² Hamilton, *Papers of Thomas Ruffin*, II, 195.

The Court decided to overlook the nonage of George E. Badger, licensed in 1815, because of "the narrowness of his fortunes and the dependance of his mother and sisters upon his exertions for their support."²³

Successful applicants received licenses worded much like the law licenses of today.

The State of North Carolina: To the justices (or judges) of the county (or superior) courts within the state:

Whereas _____ hath applied to me _____, and _____ and _____ judges of the supreme court of North Carolina, for admission to practice as an attorney and counsellor, in the several county (or superior) courts within the state aforesaid we do hereby certify that he hath produced to us sufficient testimonials of his upright character, and upon an examination had before us, is found to possess a competent knowledge of the law, to entitle him to admission according to his said examination.

Given under our hands at _____, this day of _____, 18____.²⁴

The license having been issued, the new attorney had to be sworn in in open court,²⁵ a requirement still obtaining. There were three required oaths. The first was the attorney's oath.

I, _____, do swear or affirm that I will truly and honestly demean myself in the practice of an attorney according to my best knowledge and ability; so help me God.

The second oath was one of allegiance to the state of North Carolina and its constitution; the third required a pledge of allegiance to the United States Constitution.²⁶

Even the passing of the examination and the taking of the three oaths did not enable the attorney to enter upon the practice of his profession. Before he could practice, a new lawyer had to pay a tax on his license and to produce the receipt of the clerk showing that the license tax had been paid. The tax was paid to the clerk of the court in which the attorney first exhibited his license.²⁷ Several years later a statute provided that the tax be paid to the clerk of the Supreme Court when the

²³ W. J. Peele, editor, *Lives of Distinguished North Carolinians* (Raleigh, 1898), 185.

²⁴ Edward Cantwell, *The Practice at Law in North Carolina* (Raleigh, 1860), I, 121.

²⁵ *Revised Code of 1852*, Ch. VIII, Sec. 3, 18.

²⁶ Cantwell, *The Practice at Law in North Carolina*, I, 122.

²⁷ *Revised Code of 1821*, Ch. 698, Secs. 1 and 2, 1064.

license was granted. The judge handed over the license to one of the clerks; the clerk then passed the license back to the new attorney after payment of the tax.²⁸ In 1852 this tax was set at \$10.00;²⁹ it was later raised to \$15.00.³⁰ In discussing the license tax in 1827, Chief Justice Taylor said:

On the subject of your enquiry I am able to state, that the practise has been invariable when two licenses have been granted, to require a tax of £5 for a county court license, and an additional tax of £10 for a general license. I know too that it was a principal motive with Judge Haywood in giving a general license at first to save to poor young men the additional tax.

I cannot call to mind a single exception to the practise first stated; and you remember the Judges until a few years ago, were accustomed to collect the tax, and account for it to the comptroller. We always received £5 for a county court license and £10 for a superior court one. I remember too having paid both taxes.³¹

After going through all of the procedure outlined above, the admission of the new attorney to the bar caused little fanfare or comment in the newspapers of the day. Simple notices such as the following, which appeared in the *Raleigh Register* on June 17, 1848, were common. "The following gentlemen underwent an examination before this Court on Tuesday last, and were fully admitted to Superior Court License. . . ."³² A list of the names of those who had passed was printed after the preliminary statement. After each term of the Supreme Court the newspapers printed similar notices of County and Superior

²⁸ The money collected from this source was used in defraying the costs of state prosecution and contingent county expenses. *Revised Code of 1821*, Ch. 769, Sec. 1, 1155. The Supreme Court Clerk was required to deposit license tax moneys in the public treasury within two months after their payment; if he failed to perform this duty, he was liable on his official bond. *Public Laws of North Carolina, Passed by the General Assembly, at Its Session of 1846-47: Together with the Comptroller's Statement of Public Revenue and Expenditure*, Ch. LXXII, Sec. 7, 140. Hereinafter cited *Public Laws of North Carolina*.

²⁹ Of this \$10.00 the clerk took six per cent as his commission. *Revised Code of 1852*, Ch. 99, Sec. 36, 209.

³⁰ *Public Laws of North Carolina*, (1856-1857), Ch. 34, Sec. 40, 40. The 1858-1859 laws gave the clerk a five per cent commission. *Public Laws of North Carolina* (1858-1859), Ch. 25, Sec. 93 (4), 57. The state acquired more than might be expected from this source. The treasurer's report from October 31, 1850, to November 1, 1852, shows that \$210.00 was collected in January, 1851; \$180.00 in June; \$400.00 in January, 1852; and \$180.00 in July. See "Public Treasurer's Report to the Legislature of North Carolina, for the Two Fiscal Years Ending Nov. 1, 1852," in *Public Laws of North Carolina* (1852), 4-7. In 1853 the comptroller's statement showed that this tax yielded \$590.00. In 1854 \$550.00 came from this source. See "Statements of the Comptroller of Public Accounts, for the Two Fiscal Years Ending October 31st, 1853 and 1854," *Public Laws of North Carolina* (1854-1855), 148-149, 183, 185. The amount rose steadily, until, in 1859, \$1,647.30 was received. See "Statements of the Comptroller of Public Accounts, for the Two Fiscal Years Ending September 30th, 1859 and 1860," *Public Laws of North Carolina* (1860-1861), 132. At this period, the Supreme Court held sessions in Morganton as well as in Raleigh. The Morganton clerk was instructed to apply the money paid to him toward the purchase of law books for a Supreme Court library in Morganton. *Public Laws of North Carolina* (1850-1851), Ch. XCIII, Sec. 1, 164.

³¹ Hamilton, *Papers of Thomas Ruffin*, 1, 421.

³² *Raleigh Register*, June 17, 1848.

Court licenses that had been issued. The names of new lawyers first appeared in the reports of the Supreme Court decisions in 1854. This brief notice gave the names of the new members of the bar and the counties from which they came.³³

In 1824 the Raleigh Register stated that "Another young gentleman applied for a license, but being born an alien and not naturalized, he was not examined."³⁴ The problem of admission of aliens to the North Carolina bar and of comity licenses was not definitely settled until 1824. In that year the North Carolina Supreme Court decided that aliens would not be allowed admission to the bar because the licentiate was supposed to be politically, as well as legally and morally, qualified to transact business of a legal nature in the state of North Carolina. The court stated that the legal profession was "in its nature the noblest and most beneficial to mankind; in its abuse and debasement the most sordid and pernicious.' . . ."³⁵ No person coming into North Carolina from a foreign country or from another state would be admitted to practice unless he had previously resided one year in the state or unless he could produce a testimonial of good character from the chief magistrate or from some other competent authority.³⁶ The statute failed to define what was meant by competent authority, but the admissibility of aliens and persons from other states does not seem to have caused much difficulty in North Carolina.

Most North Carolina lawyers were native born and so there was little need to have definitely settled rules of comity. Several inquiries to Ruffin expressed ignorance of the practice of granting comity licenses in North Carolina. Warren Winslow wrote in November, 1840, that he had an Alabama license and wanted an examination in North Carolina at the close of the December term. He was wholly uninformed as to the procedure he should take in arranging for such an examination.³⁷

After being admitted to the legal fraternity, the newly licensed attorney had to find some way to establish himself in his profession, but the step from law school to the practice of law was not difficult to take. His training had been practical, and the

³³ See volume 46 of the *North Carolina Supreme Court Reports*, 5, 6.

³⁴ *Raleigh Register*, July 25, 1824.

³⁵ *Ex parte Thompson*, 10 N. C. 364 (1824).

³⁶ *Revised Code of 1821*, I, Ch. 115, Sec. 8, 284.

³⁷ Hamilton, *Papers of Thomas Ruffin*, II, 189.

young lawyer had some idea of how to proceed when he was favored with the patronage of a client. In the later years of the period, the training became more theoretical than practical and the jump into practice was more difficult than it had been. However, older lawyers were always eager to offer advice to the younger members of the profession.

Frederick Nash wrote to his recently licensed son, shortly before he launched his legal career.

Let the community see that you are determined to devote yourself to your profession—they will have confidence in you and you will in time reap your reward—As to books I do not know exactly what to say or do—You must take with you, your brothers Blackstone—& Iredells digest, tell him I will let him have my Iredell, when I return, he must not be without a copy—Take also my Chitty on Civil Pleading—& first and 2nd Phillips on Evidence—the latter you will find very useful, in telling you what pleas to enter, in the various kinds of actions & what is the evidence appropriate to each. It is a very useful book to a young beginner [*sic*]. Take also Selwyns Nisi Prius. . . .

Nash said further that his son should have the *North Carolina Supreme Court Reports*, but he did not feel that he could afford to buy them for him. He suggested that his son use the set of reports in the clerk's office or borrow that of a fellow lawyer. He urged his son to be very careful about money and to regard what he advanced to him as a sound deposit, to be used for necessary expenses only. He wisely advised the young lawyer to take time to think and to study every case he had. In closing, Nash reminded his son that he could call on older lawyers when he needed help. He advised him that if he was "called on to file a Bill in Equity—old Harrisons Chancer[y] will give you a form or you can get one, by applying to M. Worth from his office." Nash also touched on the personal side of his son's new life by saying "Remember too Shepard you will not have your mother to darn & mend for you—be careful of your clothes. . . ." ³⁸

Judge Gaston wrote to a young lawyer, John L. T. Sneed, in 1842, giving him a little fatherly advice on beginning his legal career. He said:

³⁸ Frederick Nash to Shepard K. Nash, undated, Nash Papers, North Carolina Department of Archives and History, Raleigh.

You have entered on a career in which diligence can scarcely fail to secure you success. Every motive that can be addressed to a good heart and a sound head concurs to impress upon a lawyer, the conviction that he owes to his clients the utmost fidelity. He is charged with the interests of one unable to act for himself, and he is faithless to the trust if he leaves any honorable means unexerted to secure and advance those interests. There is no mode so sure of rising to eminence in the profession as the exact, punctual, prompt and steady discharge of this duty. In the greater, far greater number of cases, in which a lawyer is engaged, extraordinary talents are not required; but in all negligence may prove fatally destructive. An established reputation for diligence must therefore command employment. No man of common sense can be willing to confide important concerns to the management of a careless Attorney.

Next to diligence in the discharge of the immediate duties which you owe to your client, is the obligation of endeavoring to perfect yourself in the knowledge of your profession. Suffer no day to pass without study, Read slowly—make what you read your own by eviscerating the principles on which the doctrine rests. It is impossible to charge the memory with a vast number of merely arbitrary distinctions; but the principles on which they rest are few, and these may be faithfully treasured.³⁹

Nash's and Gaston's advice to young lawyers of their acquaintance is still applicable, and any modern attorney would profit by following the advice laid down by two of the great lawyers of a century ago.

Newly licensed lawyers, full of advice from fathers and friends, generally found the first few years of practice unprofitable from a financial point of view. They sometimes felt insecure in the handling of the first bits of business which came into their offices, but experienced members of the bar were usually kind and willing to give them advice and aid. Though they did not have much business, many young attorneys made a point of adhering to regular hours and of riding the circuits in several counties so as to attract clients. For example, James C. Dobbin, who hung out his shingle in Fayetteville in 1835, made it a practice to be in his office during business hours whether anyone called or not. He believed that this regularity contributed greatly to his later success. Rather than seek a large circuit at the beginning, he gave his time and energies to a faithful discharge

³⁹ *North Carolina University Magazine*, VII (August, 1857), 37-38.

of "chamber practice" and in attending the County and Superior Courts of Cumberland, Sampson, and Robeson counties.⁴⁰ Attendance at the County and Superior Courts of three counties would seem a large order for a young attorney today, but evidently such a circuit was considered a moderate one one hundred years ago.

Thomas Ruffin, Jr., wrote to his mother that the circuit he had just completed had been pleasant and the judge had been "very kind and indulgent to . . ." him.⁴¹ Thomas S. Kenan related the experience he had at his first case. He was licensed to practice in the County Courts in 1858 and in the Superior Courts in December, 1859. He opened his office in 1860, and his first suit was the collection of a note for a large amount of money. When Kenan saw the docket and all that had been written there, he felt inclined "to enter a *nol pros.*, leave the court house, abandon the practice and engage in other business." Older lawyers reassured him; he completed the suit and won. His fee was \$4.00, taxed against the defendant as a part of the costs.⁴² It is evident that the older members of the bar and the judicial officers were helpful to the fledglings on more than one occasion.

The value of opening an office in a small town or city and staying in it whether clients came or not proved profitable in the long run. William Horn Battle opened an office, but he decided to farm on the side while waiting for clients. He lived in the country for five years and his practice was negligible; he moved at the end of that time and devoted all of his attention to the law. Quickly he built up a large practice.⁴³

The remoteness of Battle's office from his home probably contributed to his early failure as a lawyer, but the first few years of practice were not usually crowded with work for new lawyers. The *Raleigh Register* related an anecdote about a young lawyer whose time was not fully occupied. The writer of the article observed that since young attorneys had little to do, "during the years of their long apprenticeship, they usually make most of their leisure, in maturing schemes of frolic and fun, which

⁴⁰ James Banks, "A Biographical Sketch of the Late James C. Dobbin," *North Carolina University Magazine*, IX (February, 1860), 322.

⁴¹ Hamilton, *The Papers of Thomas Ruffin*, II, 494.

⁴² Thomas S. Kenan, "Remarks by Thos. S. Kenan, President of Bar Association," *North Carolina Journal of Law*, II (August, 1905), 345-346.

⁴³ Battle, *Memories of an Old-Time Tar Heel*, 12-14.

not only vastly delight themselves, but sometimes provoke even the grave and reverend seniors of the profession into a momentary oblivion of briefs and fee, green bag and greener clients."⁴⁴ If the above statement can be taken literally, the lawyers, during the early years of practice, had an amusing time but did little work and received almost no financial reward. Such was undoubtedly the case. Several lawyers of the period left statements as to their financial returns during the first years in which they engaged in practice. Bartholomew Figures Moore, who was admitted to practice in 1823, revealed that his total income from the profession of law for *seven* years was only \$700.00.⁴⁵ Daniel Gould Fowle was admitted to the bar in 1853; his receipts from the first year of his practice amounted to the small sum of \$64.00.⁴⁶ It is a wonder more young barristers were not discouraged in the early years of the practice of law than were! The *Raleigh Register* commented:

There are . . . young Lawyers in this city, who, we venture to say, do not, each, earn three hundred dollars per annum. A mason or a carpenter, boldly asks twenty shillings a day and gets it, all the year round—and yet parents scorn to make their sons mechanics—but rather allow them to starve in professions. How injudicious!! If it was more fashionable to be a Carpenter than a Lawyer or Physician the difficulty would soon be overcome. We know one contract given to a carpenter and Mason for \$100,000! This is really business.⁴⁷

It seems strange that despite the disadvantages which were connected with the legal profession—the long period of training, the bar examination, the starvation years faced by every young attorney, and the difficulty of building up a practice—it was the favored profession. The legal profession carried with it a certain prestige not found in other lines of work. It was the avenue to politics. A person from one of the lower classes of society could rise and be recognized as a gentleman by becoming a lawyer. The advantages outweighed the rather numerous disadvantages in the eyes of a large number of young men, and the legal profession grew in size at a rapid rate during the years from 1820 to 1860.

⁴⁴ *Raleigh Register*, May 12, 1849.

⁴⁵ Ernest Haywood, *Some Notes in Regard to the Eminent Lawyers Whose Portraits Adorn the Walls of the Superior Court Room at Raleigh, North Carolina*. Address before Wake County Junior Bar Association, June 1, 1936 (n.p., n.d.), 15-16.

⁴⁶ Haywood, *Some Notes in Regard to the Eminent Lawyers*. . . , 10.

⁴⁷ *Raleigh Register*, May 31, 1836.

ELECTIONEERING IN NORTH CAROLINA, 1800-1835

BY JOHN CHALMERS VINSON

American history is so characterized by change that this transmutation is frequently assumed to be all-inclusive. For example, it is sometimes asserted that candidates today conduct their campaigns in a manner far different from that employed in the early days of this country. According to this school of thought, candidates in the early days of the Republic eschewed personal solicitation of votes, and left electioneering in the hands of their supporters. However, with the passage of time, the candidates allowed their eagerness to win public offices to corrode this high moral standard which once governed their conduct in campaigns. While this picture of pristine democracy may be representative of some, it is not applicable to all candidates. The practices of candidates in North Carolina for seats in the General Assembly and in Congress during the first three decades of the nineteenth century indicate that these candidates not infrequently solicited votes. Furthermore, a technique of winning votes was developed which was as subtle, persuasive, and infamous as any developed since that time.

The prevalence of electioneering by the candidate can be gauged, roughly at least, by the interest in elections. A closely contested election was almost certain to call forth every effort that a candidate could command to assure his success. By this criterion electioneering must have been frequently employed, for the contest for office was often bitter, as is shown clearly in the following account:

I have been to the place of voting, and had to carry a dirk for fear of getting into a scrape there; I had some violent angry disputes; cursed my wife's brother; insulted my uncle; told my father he was a tory; dared my nearest neighbor to fight; have not for months been on speaking terms with my oldest friends . . . and what is it for? To elect a man to an office . . . I have been running after his heels, freeman as I am, and barking at his enemies like a dog, ready to tear out my neighbor's eyes, bite off his nose, split his thumb, slit his lip, or scollop his ear.¹

The editor of the newspaper in which this account appeared declared it a true description of elections from the smallest to

¹ *The Star and North Carolina Gazette* (Raleigh), November 19, 1835.

the largest; from constable to President. By 1835, when a convention was called to revise the constitution of the state, local elections were denounced because they were frequently productive of "heart-burnings and bitterness,"² and nurtured "feuds, quarrels, and bloodshed."³ Occasionally, a Grand Jury would find it necessary to denounce the prevalence of "high party spirit," and adopt resolutions recommending "cool reflecting judgment, unbiased by party rage or intriguing design."⁴

Such interest might, at first glance, appear to be inexplicable in view of the property qualifications for officeholding and for voting.⁵ However, the percentage of the population casting votes for the candidates for Representative was so high as to indicate that few people were disfranchised by the necessity of paying taxes. The requirement of a fifty-acre freehold appears to have reduced the number voting for state Senator to about half of those voting for Representative, but even so, a substantial part of the populace could cast this ballot.

Successful candidates had to command a large public following, and the early laws on the conduct of elections indicate that a variety of means were employed to achieve this end. The first law in this code, passed in 1777, prohibited bribery, stuffing the ballot box, and multiple voting by one person.⁶ Another law, added to the code in 1793, made the use of "force and violence to break up an election by assaulting the officers in charge or depriving them of the ballot boxes" a misdemeanor punishable by fine and imprisonment.⁷ Further protection for the voter was provided by a law passed in 1795. By the terms of this act a fine of five hundred pounds, later changed to four hundred dollars, was assessed anyone convicted of assembling at a polling place a regimental battalion, company muster, or any group of armed men.⁸ Legal protection from a more subtle form of coercion, "treating," was afforded the voter by the adoption

² *Proceedings and Debates of the Constitution Convention of North Carolina Called to Amend the Constitution of the State* (Raleigh, 1835), 47, 48.

³ William K. Boyd, *History of North Carolina* (Chicago, 1919), II, 144.

⁴ *Western Carolinian* (Salisbury), February 12, 1828.

⁵ The constitution of North Carolina, adopted in 1776, was not amended in regard to provisions for elections until 1835. Candidates for the House of Commons were required to own one hundred acres of land and candidates for the state Senate had to own three hundred acres. To vote for a Senator a citizen had to show title to a fifty-acre freehold. However, any freeman, black or white, who paid taxes could vote for the representatives to the lower house. John Haywood, *A Manual of the Laws of North Carolina* (Raleigh, 1819), 138-139. (Hereafter referred to as Haywood, *Laws*.)

⁶ Haywood, *Laws*, 366.

⁷ Haywood, *Laws*, 181.

⁸ *Revised Statutes of North Carolina* (Raleigh, 1836), 197-198.

of a law in 1801. It provided a fine of two hundred dollars "if any person shall treat, either with meat or drink, on any day of election or any previous day with the intention of influencing the election. . . ." The sheriff, on penalty of a fine of forty dollars, was directed to publish this law before each election.⁹ The final addition to the legal framework for elections was an oath, adopted in 1812, which required the appointed inspectors to discharge their duties with fairness and honesty.¹⁰

In addition to the restraint imposed by these laws, the candidates faced another limitation—a popular theory of republican government—that the electorate be independent and self-sufficient in the choice of public officials. The candidates should be men of outstanding ability who did not seek office, but who accepted election as a call to public service. From this ideal grew the belief that candidates for office should not influence the voters unduly by actively seeking election. A candidate who solicited votes might find the public warned against "the vernility of insinuating, electioneering characters," who would seize the opportunity to "destroy the pivot on which . . . minds should turn."¹¹ Under this theory any active campaign for office might be condemned. In North Carolina, during the early years of the nineteenth century, these principles were universally professed by the candidates, but were subject, as the legal provisions just discussed may indicate, to widely differing interpretations in the heat of contested elections.

With reference to this ideal, the actual practices of the candidates thereby classify them into one of three general categories. The first category was made up of candidates who adhered to the ideal in its strictest interpretation and made no campaign to gain office. They averred that any electioneering was a violation of the voter's freedom of choice. The second class of candidates campaigned, but only because they professed to feel an obligation to educate the public as to issues and office seekers. A third group electioneered, so they maintained, in self-defense. Their purpose was to protect themselves and the voters from the lies and slanders spread abroad by the opposition.

⁹ *Revised Statutes of North Carolina*, 298.

¹⁰ Haywood, *Laws*, 372.

¹¹ Broad­sides, S. C., 1802. The broad­sides cited herein are found in the Manuscript Collection at the Duke University Library.

Candidates in the first category, who refused to make a campaign, were well represented by William Lenoir who explained his position as follows: "I never asked a man for his Vote yet, and I think it such an imposition on a freeman to do it, that I hope I shall never be Guilty of so great an insult on the understanding and liberty of my Countrymen." He pictured the ideal election as one in which the people "would be actuated by good Sound Principles of Honor and Justice . . . and Vote impartially for those they think most faithful and capable to serve them."¹² Some years later this position was upheld by John Stanley, who stated that he would take pride in the election only if it were the result of a free expression of the will of the people. "Electioneering," he added, "I shall therefore abstain from."¹³ An editor, in 1833, indicated the universal profession of this ideal when he spoke of "that deep and abiding abhorrence with which sober and sensible people look upon the shameful practice of begging for office. . . ."¹⁴

An excellent expression of the ideal of the second group of candidates, who approved the campaign for educational purposes, was printed in the *Greensborough Patriot* in 1833. According to this article, "Electioneering is justifiable, and even commendable where the candidates travel among the people for the purpose of enlightening their minds instead of exciting their prejudices."¹⁵ This care to appeal to reason rather than to emotion was typical of men who subscribed to the ideal of political education of the people. Their aim was exemplified by a candidate, in 1810, who stated that in his campaign he had "abstained from every remark and expression which might rouse the furious passions of a party."¹⁶

Candidates who fell into the third class campaigned to refute misrepresentations both actual and anticipated. They usually took the field by reason of circumstances rather than as a matter of choice. Judge William B. Gaston, a very prominent man in public life in early North Carolina history, told the people that his active campaign was forced upon him by the necessity of answering the "electioneering misrepresentations which I learnt

¹² Fletcher Melvin Green, editor, "Electioneering 1802 Style," in *The North Carolina Historical Review*, XX (July, 1943), 244n.

¹³ Broad-sides, July 24, 1822.

¹⁴ *Greensborough Patriot*, July 19, 1833.

¹⁵ *Greensborough Patriot*, July 19, 1833.

¹⁶ Broad-sides, July 24, 1810.

have been circulated to injure me. . . ."17 Charles Fisher of Salisbury, in 1833, regretting that it was necessary to intrude on the voter's time, told him that "the untiring pains that have been taken for years past to run me down in your good opinion; and that will continue to be taken between this and the election, seem to require that I should notice these arts of malice and put you on your guard against their authors."¹⁸

As might be expected, with such varying interpretations of the ideal of a free and enlightened electorate, there was much electioneering in North Carolina in the period 1800-1835. In nearly all instances studied, the ideal of the voter's freedom of choice was affirmed by the office seeker. It was maintained, as will be seen in the further study of the methods of candidates, that the real purpose of the campaign was to broaden rather than to abridge the rights of the voter.

The electioneering candidate usually made use of all of the available means for reaching the public. In this day these included newspapers, broadsides, personal canvasses, and speeches.

The first of these channels, the newspaper, was seldom a major factor in local campaigns. Newspapers were few in number,¹⁹ most of them were weekly, and frequently they ignored the local elections completely.²⁰ The chief reasons for this reticence by the press were, on one hand, a journalistic policy which emphasized literary works and national news; and, on the other hand, an instinct for self-preservation. This latter attitude had been instilled by the observation of the untimely deaths of those too critical of hotheaded, straight-shooting aspirants to office.²¹

Campaign by newspaper was hindered in still another respect. Reading was an ability which only a few Americans had acquired by the 1830's. One candidate, recognizing this problem,

¹⁷ Broadsides, July 24, 1810.

¹⁸ Broadsides, June 25, 1835.

¹⁹ It is estimated that there were only seven newspapers in North Carolina in 1820, and that the number increased to twenty-three by the early thirties. Willie P. Mangum Papers, Duke University Manuscript Collection. William K. Boyd, *Life of Willie P. Mangum*, unfinished manuscript, ch. VI, 6. Also Clarence Clifford Norton, *The Democratic Party in Ante-Bellum North Carolina, 1835-1861* (Chapel Hill), 12.

²⁰ The *Carolina Watchman* of Salisbury made no mention of the local election of 1833 which, according to information in the broadsides distributed by the candidates, was a hotly contested affair. See Broadsides, Charles Fisher, June 25, 1833.

²¹ The editor of a Raleigh newspaper was involved in a law suit in 1816, because he refused to reveal the name of a libelous and anonymous critic who employed the paper as a sounding board for his condemnation of a local politician. *Raleigh Register and North Carolina Gazette*, September 6, 1816. Willie P. Mangum and William Seawell almost engaged in a duel because of a circular printed in the latter's paper, which cast aspersions on Mangum. He demanded satisfaction for the insult. The matter was settled by an exchange of nothing more dangerous than heated words. Mangum Papers, Mangum to Seawell, 1823.

asked the aid of his supporters in overcoming it. "I beg such of my friends as can read the newspaper to name [his candidacy for office] to their neighbors who can't read, particularly the mechanics and laboring men. . . ." ²² However, the chief factor in eliminating the newspaper from the local political campaigns appears to have been the editorial and personal policy of the owners.

Printed matter was, nevertheless, an important element in the strategy of the electioneer. Instead of newspapers, the candidate employed broadsides and circulars couched in words of "learned length and thundering sound." ²³ These broadsides were similar in form to handbills of today. They usually consisted of a single sheet about eight by fifteen inches in size printed on one side. There was much variation in size, with some as small as a filing card and others nearer the dimensions of a present-day news sheet. Broadsides were distributed in several ways. Occasionally, they were printed in the newspapers and constituted the principal method by which the candidate employed the press in his campaign. More frequently, however, the broadsides were distributed by hand and by mail. Congressmen often used the franking privilege for the latter method. ²⁴

The degree to which candidates made use of broadsides was indicated by a report, in 1804, that there had been a "great influx of that species of pestilence," the broadside. A candidate in an election of that year had issued a thousand circulars written in longhand. One observer caustically described this effort as a "specimen of his zeal in the cause of the people." ²⁵ Nor did this form of zealousness decline during the next few decades. The *Greensborough Patriot* reported, in 1833, that it had printed a thousand broadsides for a candidate in a local election. ²⁶

The content of the broadside was subject to much variation, depending on the ideals of the candidate. If he believed campaigning should be employed to educate the public, the circular might be a formal account of his accomplishments in office, or his qualifications for the post. If he were refuting slanders,

²² *Carolina Observer and Fayetteville Gazette*, August, 1825.

²³ *Greensborough Patriot*, August 10, 1836.

²⁴ Norton, *The Democratic Party*, 28.

²⁵ *Minerva; or Anti-Jacobin* (Raleigh), August 6, 1804.

²⁶ *Greensborough Patriot*, May 15, 1833.

or spreading them, his epistle was limited in form only by his imagination and ability as a writer. Another factor which determined the style of the broadside was the proximity of election day. The more formal circulars announcing candidacy were issued early in the year, while the personal attacks and refutations came later in the campaign. As a general rule, an effort was made to release the most damaging information on the day of election.²⁷

Nearly all candidates, whether they electioneered or not, issued circulars announcing that they were seeking office. They usually felt it necessary to give in this notice the reasons which had influenced them in reaching their decision to enter the race. Frequently, the office seeker gave a simple explanation, feeling that no other justification was needed beyond the fact that any citizen who could qualify had the right to seek office in a democracy.²⁸ Others felt that their candidacy would be enhanced by a more detailed cataloguing of their abilities. In this purpose, few could surpass the candidate who asserted that he sought re-election, because he had never "heard a murmur of disapprobation or a whisper of censor uttered against my [his] public conduct."²⁹

Many candidates did not presume to judge their own fitness, but entered the hustings because they felt that a citizen owed his country the best service he could give. John Scott, a candidate in 1827, asserted that he was seeking office because he believed it "to be the duty of every citizen to contribute something to the benefit of his country."³⁰ More eloquent in his expression of this ideal was John Stanley, who averred, "There are few among you upon whom interest, duty and feeling call more loudly than upon myself, to abandon public service and to remain at home; yet . . . every man belongs to his country. If it is your pleasure to elect me, I will serve you in the Senate."³¹

Other individuals did not consider themselves worthy of office, but became candidates, so they asserted, in response to an overwhelming demand on the part of the people. Such was

²⁷ Announcements of candidates for Congress were usually released early in the year. The 33 circulars in the Duke University collection show the following distribution: January—2; February—6; March—2; April—1; May—2; June—6; July—9; and August—5. Broad­sides, Duke University. These are totals for all years.

²⁸ Broad­sides, August 4, 1823.

²⁹ *Carolina Federal Republican* (New Bern), August 1, 1812.

³⁰ Broad­sides, June 25, 1827.

³¹ Broad­sides, July 24, 1822.

the situation which brought about the candidacy for Congress of W. B. Grove. He declared that he had not sought office, but was entering the contest because of the "solicitations of a respectable number of my fellow citizens."³² Apparently, the effectiveness of this approach to the voter was enhanced if the candidate was in no way involved in eliciting the popular clamor. In any event, the candidate-to-be was surprised, with startling regularity, by a popular demand that he serve his country in office. A candidate, in 1831, stated, "A very flattering nomination having been made of my name without my privity or consent, I have no option but to comply with what seems to be the desire of a large portion of my fellow citizens."³³

A variation of this technique was an expression of the popular demand for candidacy by an open letter printed in the local newspaper. With remarkable presence of mind the candidate usually mastered his surprise in time to accept the nomination, sometimes, with a letter in the same issue of the paper.³⁴

Those candidates who did not believe in electioneering would, after the announcement of entry, quietly await the expression of the unprejudiced opinion of the public. However, for those candidates who felt a duty to educate the public this announcement was merely the beginning. They then set about presenting their qualifications to the public in the most convincing fashion that they could command.

To these candidates the approach which aimed to appeal to the common man was well known. The voter was assured that the candidate was a poor and unpretentious person who knew and shared the problems of the common man. James Wellborn, in an appeal to the voters in 1802, pointed out that "he never kicked the people, he was a Republican, he was Elected by the Poor men and not by the rich." His opponent, he charged, was by contrast "in Combination with the rich" and would be dangerous to elect since his "interest was different from theirs."³⁵

A more eloquent effort to establish the same democratic relationship of interest was offered by a candidate, in 1817, who said, "The bread of labor is sweet. I have eaten thereof—I am

³² *The North Carolina Chronicle; or, Fayetteville Gazette*, January 24 and January 31, 1791. Other examples of this technique are found in Broad­sides, July 4, 1817, and June 30, 1824.

³³ Broad­sides, July 4, 1831.

³⁴ *Hillsborough Recorder*, July 25, 1834.

³⁵ Green, "Electioneering 1802 Style," 245.

acquainted with your toils, and can justly appreciate your worth."³⁶ This candidate enlarged the scope of his appeal by modestly calling attention to the fact that he had worked at mercantile, agricultural, mechanical, and professional callings.³⁷ Perhaps, such nearly universal assertions of plainness did not arouse the suspicion of the people. They did, however, cause candidates who were trying to excel in the affections of the masses, to become skeptical of these professions. Such was the case with an office seeker, in 1823, who declared, "I am, as many of you know, a plain farmer (I mean a farmer on land, not on paper) . . . my interests in no respect differ from yours."³⁸

The candidate, having identified his interests with those of the voters, usually continued his appeal to the people by defining the issues in the election, and stating the policy which he advocated. Most candidates felt it necessary to adopt a specific platform. If they failed to do so, the opposition would supply the deficiency by imputing to them a program false to the candidate's real ideals.³⁹ Even though the candidate did not believe in electioneering, he might distribute a broadside in which he commented on the issues in a learned and dispassionate manner. Generally, such a circular would be devoted completely to the survey of public policy, and only a sentence or two would be devoted to soliciting votes.⁴⁰

The more active campaigners did not regard a platform merely as a process of education or protection; they recognized that it could be a valuable device for winning votes. To serve this practical purpose the candidate found it expedient to fashion a platform which overlooked the vital issues difficult to treat, while vigorously belaboring fictitious menaces, which could be expelled easily. Although this technique was widely used, it was not universally condoned. One irate citizen denounced these candidates who got a theme and rode it "as a hobby" into the seats of power as "besotted demagogues," who walked over the people's "prostrate liberties into the halls of legislation." In "riding a hobby" one candidate would promise the building of a

³⁶ Broad­sides, July 4, 1817.

³⁷ Broad­sides, July 4, 1817.

³⁸ Broad­sides, July 8, 1823.

³⁹ Broad­sides, July 4, 1817.

⁴⁰ Broad­sides, April 15, 1822; June 25, 1827; January, 1829; February, 1829; June 24, 1829; February 16, 1831.

railroad as an internal improvement, while another would oppose the project in order to save taxes. The fact that he was not a lawyer by profession supplied a suitable "hobby" for one office seeker; at the same time another commended himself to the public because he was one. These and many other "hobbies" the observer branded as devices designed to distract and confuse rather than to educate and enlighten the public. The epitome of this issue-evading approach was the campaign technique of G. T. Moore. This would-be solon conveniently overlooked the local issues in his campaign speech, the burden of which was, "Huzza for Jackson, and damn the Tariff."⁴¹

A variation of the technique of circumventing the local issues, blameless in itself, was the flag-waving praise of democracy, frequently emphasized to the exclusion of all other issues. John Giles, a candidate for Congress in 1823, devoted so much of his circular to enthusiastic praise of democracy that no space was left for any other matter. "Where," began this oration, "was caught the holy flame which warms and animates the oppressed Greek? From America, were wafted on the wings of heaven, those sacred truths contained in the Declaration of Independence."⁴² Praise of the free elections of the Republic furnished another candidate a similar theme. "The time, Fellow Citizens, is now at hand, when as men breathing the air and treading the soil of liberty, with none to molest or make you afraid you must again go forth to the polls. . . ."⁴³ The editor of the *Greensborough Patriot* condemned this interminable "shouting of liberty," which he scorned as being nothing more than a fig leaf to hide the candidate's naked failure to provide a positive program for the public good.⁴⁴ This same paper condemned in a verse, more distinguished in feeling than in technical perfection, the whole "hobby" technique of electioneering.

Our candidates, some hobby ride,
Like the boy his cow astride,
Some dogma use to gain affection,
If they can find the favorite toast,
They use anything almost,
To gain their election.⁴⁵

⁴¹ *Greensborough Patriot*, August 29, 1832.

⁴² *Broadsides*, no date, 1823.

⁴³ *Greensborough Patriot*, August 29, 1832.

⁴⁴ *Greensborough Patriot*, July 25, 1832.

⁴⁵ *Greensborough Patriot*, August 11, 1830.

Some candidates made no promise to the voter beyond the assurance that they would use their own judgment in promoting the general welfare. They felt that it was the representative's duty to be independent and to remain free of his constituents' influence on specific issues. William Lenoir let the voters know that he would "make no promis [sic] to serve them if Elected but would do what I [he] thought was right."⁴⁶ Jesse Slocumb, in 1819, was no less independent when his only promise to the public was to do "what shall appear to me the best interest of our country."⁴⁷

These statements were diametrically opposed to another theory common at the time—the instruction of candidates. According to this idea, the voter should decide all matters of policy, and the office seeker should make known his will.⁴⁸

In any event, the character of the candidate and the confidence that he could inspire were doubtless of more importance than any specific platform he might adopt. Personal popularity and integrity were vital factors in the campaign. The editor of the *Hillsborough Recorder*, speaking of an election in 1823, observed that "the comparative merit of the two gentlemen . . . was the pivot on which the contest turned."⁴⁹

With the emphasis thus focused on the character of the candidate, it was natural that the politician of the day often sought to raise himself in the voter's estimation by degrading his opponent. This tendency was deplored by a candidate who reported, "Scarcely had my name been announced when the ever ready tongue of slander began its worthy work."⁵⁰ This experience was evidently typical, for an editor of the time stated, "A seat in the legislature can not be obtained without wading belly-deep in falsehood, slander and vituperation."⁵¹

Specific cases show that a wide variety of improprieties were alleged in these attacks. A candidate, in 1812, was accused of disloyalty to the federal government.⁵² A congressman, seeking re-election in 1816, had to deny the charge that he advocated

⁴⁶ Green, "Electioneering 1802 Style," 244.

⁴⁷ Broad sides, June 10, 1819.

⁴⁸ Broad sides, July 4, 1831. An interesting contemporary discussion of this question of the relation between the representatives and the people is found in John Augustine Smith, *Syllabus of the Lectures Delivered to the Senior Students in the College of William and Mary, on Government* (Philadelphia, 1817), 32-47.

⁴⁹ *Hillsborough Recorder*, September 10, 1823.

⁵⁰ *Greensborough Patriot*, July 25, 1832.

⁵¹ *Greensborough Patriot*, August 29, 1832.

⁵² *Carolina Federal Republican*, August 29, 1812.

a raise in pay for representatives.⁵³ A statesman who had succeeded in gaining re-election on several occasions was branded a professional politician, whose only motive was self-advancement, while candidates just entering politics were scorned because of their lack of experience.⁵⁴ In another instance, the voters were warned of the general incompetence of a candidate who was "too stupid to write and too cowardly to fight."⁵⁵

An exchange, typical of the charge and countercharge which this method evoked, took place in 1834 between David Worth and an unnamed opponent who operated a grog shop. Worth stated that his opponent's place of business had "aptly been compared to hell itself." The dispenser of drinks replied by saying that Worth was the shop's most faithful customer and sought there the "fluid with which he kept his body constantly electrified." Worth contradicted this charge and asserted that no respectable white man would patronize an establishment which catered to the lowest class of Negroes.⁵⁶

In some instances, even an apparently flawless character did not afford the candidate immunity from criticism by his opposition. For example, a candidate, in 1830, stated, "It is perfectly out of all character for a man who has no other claims upon your confidence than those of honesty, promptness and fidelity, to remain in office forever."⁵⁷

Perhaps, the most damaging misinformation that a candidate could spread was the rumor that his opponent had withdrawn from the race. The newspapers frequently ran circulars in which candidates frantically protested that they did choose to run and were still in the race.⁵⁸ For maximum effectiveness, this, and other especially damaging accusations, were generally reserved until shortly before the election. The voter might doubt the truth of the indictment, but would not have time to verify his opinion before casting his ballot. The candidates, well aware of this situation, made every effort to turn it to their own advantage.⁵⁹ The air of election day was often filled with incrimination and recrimination. Falsehood, base calumnies, sneaking

⁵³ *Raleigh Register and North Carolina Gazette*, July 25, 1816.

⁵⁴ *Broadsides*, August 3, 1833.

⁵⁵ *Carolina Federal Republican*, July 17, 1813.

⁵⁶ *Broadsides*, August 13, 1834.

⁵⁷ *Greensborough Patriot*, July 28, 1830.

⁵⁸ *Carolina Observer and Fayetteville Gazette*, August 5, 1824.

⁵⁹ Norton, *The Democratic Party*, 29.

insinuations, and vulgar abuse "either privately circulated in whispers or thrown out with dashing effrontery at the moment of election" were a part of the usual election scene.⁶⁰ Apparently, this situation continued to exist throughout the entire period, for an observer, in 1812, declared that this deplorable state of affairs, as just described, had so long been in use as to be commonplace. As late as 1830 a candidate complained of the same sort of last-minute attack. "I do not say that he intended by this late manœuvre, to take any advantage; but I must confess I cannot see any other object he can have."⁶¹ Anticipation was the only defense against such eleventh-hour attacks, and often both sides came to the election well supplied with countercharges and refutations designed to meet any eventuality.

The practice of dealing in personalities was thoroughly reprehensible to many public-spirited citizens who subjected it to vigorous attack. One critic ran a satirical advertisement which stated, "Our machinery can be turned to the manufacture of falsehoods, suited to the peculiar situation, prospects and necessities of each candidate. Any who wish a supply wholesale or retail apply to No. 6950-Tattle Row Greensborough."⁶²

Objections to dealing in personalities did not eradicate the evil, and candidates met the situation by devising special techniques in addition to the usual denials. One of those was the distribution of circulars containing short, signed statements by witnesses who vouched for the integrity of the candidate, and upheld his innocence of specific charges made against him. Henry Tillman, a candidate in 1812, was defended by four witnesses who denied the accuracy of derogatory reports about his political ideals.⁶³ D. G. Rae, accused of beating a boathand with an oar, had five witnesses to testify, "We have never known him to strike with a stick, switch, or other weapon, any white man in his employ at any time."⁶⁴ Evidently, integrity rather than literacy was the prime requisite of the compurgators for, in some instances, they signed with an X.⁶⁵

⁶⁰ *Carolina Federal Republican*, August 29, 1812.

⁶¹ *Greensborough Patriot*, August 11, 1830.

⁶² *Greensborough Patriot*, July 25, 1832.

⁶³ *Carolina Federal Republican*, August 22, 1812.

⁶⁴ Broad sides, July 23, 1836.

⁶⁵ Broad sides, August 3, 1840. No candidate was able to gather for his testimonial the distinguished array of witnesses claimed by Beckwith's Anti-Dyspeptic Pills for the "cure of almost every variety of functional disorder. . . ." This panacea was recommended by three preachers, a bishop, a governor, a state treasurer, and even a professor. *Raleigh Star and North Carolina Gazette*, November 19, 1835.

Important as printed matter was in the conduct of a campaign, it is probable that the office seeker's chief reliance was in direct meetings with the people. The candidate in this personal contact with the voter fostered his cause chiefly by the use of "flowery speeches and free liquor."⁶⁶ Such accounts of speeches as are available show that the candidates usually made the same type of appeal to the voter which is revealed in the broadsides. There was widespread agreement as to the effectiveness of political oratory or speaking "on the fence," as it was then called.⁶⁷ Thomas Clingman urged Willie P. Mangum to leave the United States Senate long enough to aid in a local campaign, declaring, "Half a dozen speeches at dinners would get a majority."⁶⁸ Mangum, himself, attributed his narrow victory in the Congressional race of 1825 to a rainstorm which prevented his eloquent opponent from delivering the last speech of the campaign.⁶⁹ The zeal with which some candidates employed this method was illustrated by Josiah Crudup, a minister who, according to his opponent, electioneered from the stump six days a week and from the pulpit on the seventh day, winning more votes in his Sunday sermon than in the rest of the week combined.⁷⁰ Occasionally, the lay candidates took advantage of the opportunity for electioneering which the gathering of a Sunday congregation afforded, and mixed the things of Caesar with those of God. D. L. Barringer, on one occasion, made such unrestrained statements, at the Spring at Hepzibah meeting house, that his opponent challenged him to a duel.⁷¹ As a general thing, the speaking campaign was carried on not only at church, but also at musters, court days, and on any other occasions where a crowd might be gathered.⁷²

Speechmaking became a campaign issue in some cases. Some candidates made it a point to refrain from oratory, asserting that as plain honest farmers they were unaccustomed to public speaking. Others, however, built their whole campaigns around speaking tours on which they delivered memorized orations which they "let off like hail on sheepskin."⁷³

⁶⁶ *Greensborough Patriot*, August 11, 1830.

⁶⁷ "On the fence" was the equivalent of the present-day term "stump speaking." Green "Electioneering 1802 Style," 243n.

⁶⁸ Mangum Papers, Boyd, *Life of Mangum*, unfinished manuscript, Ch. V, 17.

⁶⁹ Boyd, *Life of Mangum*, Ch. IV, 8.

⁷⁰ Boyd, *Life of Mangum*, Ch. IV, 8.

⁷¹ Boyd, *Life of Mangum*, Ch. IV, 4.

⁷² *Broadsides*, June 25, 1833.

⁷³ *Greensborough Patriot*, August 29, 1832.

The importance of stump speaking as a campaigning method was attested by the various techniques which were developed to prevent its effective use by the opposition. One candidate, for example, complained that his opponents would ride as far as twenty miles to break up meetings at which he spoke. Various methods were developed, he reported, to accomplish this end. In one instance, as the speaker rose to his feet to begin his address, riders galloped up to the crowd and offered to bet five hundred dollars against his chances for election. Apparently, this tactic sorely tried the faith of some of the candidate's followers, and, consequently, had a disastrous effect on the morale of the meeting.⁷⁴ In another instance, a more subtle, and probably more effective, method was employed. Here, the rival partizans offered free whiskey to all who would come over to a barrel, set up just outside the range of the persuasive voice of the speaker. The orator took up the challenge and told his listeners to choose liquor or eloquence as their inclinations dictated.⁷⁵ Unfortunately, no record exists as to the number selecting each alternative.

Another technique used by the candidate to contact the public directly was a canvass of individual voters. The thoroughness with which this method was employed by one office seeker was indicated by the editorial observation: "We understand that he will not 'Electioneer' as he wishes to raise another crop before he dies and does not wish to ride his horse to death."⁷⁶ Another critic complained that the office seekers would not let the voters rest, and intruded "upon their *time* and *patience* with such a disgusting slang, as should make a dog howl in derision!"⁷⁷ Few escaped these visitations, for it was not uncommon for a candidate to "scour every section of the country in search of votes."⁷⁸

While the voters themselves might decry the importance of the canvass, the candidates professed to feel that it was a public service. G. Munford, seeking office in 1816, stated that he sought only to educate the public. He intended to "go through the district as much as I can, and . . . make candid disclosures

⁷⁴ Broad­sides, July 30, 1833.

⁷⁵ Broad­sides, July 30, 1833.

⁷⁶ *Greensborough Patriot*, July 24, 1833.

⁷⁷ *Greensborough Patriot*, July 19, 1834.

⁷⁸ *Raleigh Register and North Carolina Gazette*, August 30, 1816.

of my sentiments on all civil questions, civilly addressed.”⁷⁹ This canvass of voters was probably a more rewarding method of campaigning than the broadside, for, from time to time, circulars were published in the newspapers, explaining that the candidate was advertising his candidacy in print only because he would be unable to see all of the voters personally.⁸⁰ He sometimes included in his broadside the explanation that he was doing his best to see each voter and to visit each muster ground; any failure to contact a voter would be the result of a lack of time rather than a lack of interest.⁸¹

The use of free liquor was a mainstay of electioneering throughout the period, despite the existence of a law forbidding the exchange of “treats” for votes.⁸² One candidate in the campaign of 1816 distributed liquor with such a free hand that it was reported he had “drenched every muster ground with inspiring whiskey.”⁸³ However, not every office seeker could afford the liquor necessary to float a whole campaign. Consequently, a more frequent and reliable use of this facility was to reserve it until the election day. John Stanley, a candidate in 1822, condemned and described this practice in the following words: “Who in his calm moments, can look without grief and shame, upon the picture of an election scene, in which the Candidate with his jug, and the voter with his glass, perhaps reeling together, belch forth their patriotism and fidelity?”⁸⁴ Another candidate, who also viewed this situation with despair, declared that people would sell their votes, but he hoped that in time they would progress to a point where they would demand a higher price for their franchise than a drink of grog.⁸⁵

Treating to gain votes became such a prevalent abuse that additional steps were taken to curb it. Despairing of succeeding in prohibiting the disposal of whiskey in exchange for votes, the law-makers of 1823 adopted what seemed a more practical approach. The period of election, formerly three days, was reduced to one. The longer period had been instituted in order to give all citizens an opportunity to get to the polls. However,

⁷⁹ Broad­sides, 1816.

⁸⁰ *Raleigh Standard*, May 5, 1836.

⁸¹ Broad­sides, February 17, 1821; January 8, 1831; July 4, 1817.

⁸² Haywood, *Laws*, 366, Law passed in 1801.

⁸³ *Raleigh Register and North Carolina Gazette*, August 30, 1816.

⁸⁴ Broad­sides, July 24, 1822.

⁸⁵ Broad­sides, July 24, 1822.

experience showed that the extended period did not serve its purpose, and was merely an incitement to dissipation, intemperance, and violence, with the result that "time and health were both squandered."⁸⁶

Even this step did little to solve the problem, for seven years later a poet measured the effectiveness of electioneering in the following terms:

For who can stoop, and treat the most
Is very sure to rule the rest,
And worst of all, the last dram,
Turns the vote of a man,
Whose vote was sold before we guess.⁸⁷

Election day in a closely contested race was likely to be the scene of a desperate effort to win the deciding votes. Whisper campaigns, slanderous circulars, and free liquor, were only a few of the factors which frequently made an election "a wild affair." Voters might be bribed, dragged up to vote, threatened with law suits, and menaced with bodily violence. Prominent local citizens, not infrequently, spent the whole day on horseback electioneering among the free Negroes, and buying votes.⁸⁸

Such elections must have been fairly common. One reason given for the abolition of the borough representation in 1835 was the general disruption brought on by the annual election. One of the delegates to the convention declared that, in addition to feuds and bloodshed, "mechanics and others are excited by the parties interested in such elections, business is neglected, and the morals of the people corrupted."⁸⁹

In conclusion, it appears that the candidates for state office in early nineteenth-century North Carolina adopted an ethical ideal of electioneering in which they recognized the desirability of freedom of choice on the part of the voter. However, it has been shown that in practice the candidates at times violated this standard.

When the complaint is made today that our politicians are corrupt, callous of public good, and self-seeking, some comfort may be taken in the realization that this species of American

⁸⁶ *Raleigh Register and North Carolina Gazette*, August 15, 1823.

⁸⁷ *Greensborough Patriot*, August 11, 1830.

⁸⁸ *Carolina Watchman*, September 1, 1832.

⁸⁹ *Proceedings and Debates of the Convention of North Carolina*, 35, 36.

is not of recent origin. Candidates for public office were described as far back as 1804 as being "bold, impudent, and unprincipled demagogues."⁹⁰ Perhaps, there is some hope in the fact that it has been one hundred and forty years since Judge William Gaston opined that the candidates of his day were motivated by the selfish interest of "what will most contribute to the strength of our party," rather than by the true ideal of republican government of "what will best advance the interest of the country."⁹¹

⁹⁰*Minerva*, September 10, 1804.

⁹¹ *Broadsides*, July 24, 1810.

JIM POLK GOES TO CHAPEL HILL

BY CHARLES GRIER SELLERS, JR.

It is a singular fact that the two Presidents born in North Carolina and a third, whom the Old North State has always vigorously, if a bit dubiously, claimed, all arrived at the White House through careers in Tennessee. But at least one of the three, James K. Polk, had enough of North Carolina in his background to qualify as both "Tar Heel born" and "Tar Heel bred."

Sam Polk's oldest son was just eleven in the fall of 1806, when the family pulled up its roots in Mecklenburg County and made the trek across the mountains to settle on a farm in Maury County, Tennessee. A sickly lad, Jimmy did not take happily to the chores of the farm or to the arduous trips through the Tennessee wilderness with his surveyor father, when the boy was expected to take care of the pack horses and camp equipage and to prepare the meals.¹ He was continually bothered by grinding abdominal pains, which were eventually diagnosed as evidence of gallstone. When Jim was seventeen, Sam Polk took him 230 miles on horseback to Danville, Kentucky, for an operation by Doctor Ephraim McDowell, the pioneer surgeon in the West. Anesthesia and antisepsis were still unknown, but the operation was successful and brought about a miraculous transformation in the boy. Polk later acknowledged that but for McDowell he would never have amounted to much.²

As his vitality returned, however, Jim Polk showed no enthusiasm for farm work or the rough outdoor life of a surveyor, and his father, finally despairing of his son's following in his own footsteps, placed him with a merchant to learn the business. But Jim's eyes were fixed on the grand and alluring career of a professional man, and after a few weeks in the store, his father yielded to his entreaties that he be allowed to go to school.³

¹ John S. Jenkins, *The Life of James K. Polk, Late President of the United States* (Auburn, N. Y., 1850), 37-38.

² Samuel D. Gross, *Lives of Eminent American Physicians and Surgeons of the Nineteenth Century* (Philadelphia, 1861), 210-211, 221, 223, 229; Mary Young Ridenbaugh, *The Biography of Ephraim McDowell, M. D., "The Father of Ovariectomy"* (New York, 1890), 76-78; Archibald H. Barkley, *Kentucky's Pioneer Lithotomists* (Cincinnati, 1913), 38.

³ [J. L. Martin,] "James K. Polk," *United States Magazine and Democratic Review*, II (1838), 199-200.

Polk had a good mind, but the training he had received was so meagre that at the age of eighteen he spelled badly and wrote in the worst style.⁴ In July, 1813, he enrolled in the school at Zion Church, about three miles south of Columbia, the seat of Maury County. The school was taught by the Reverend Robert Henderson, one of the first Presbyterian preachers in that part of the country and a forthright and effective orator. Henderson had once won the respect of Andrew Jackson by preaching a sermon against cock-fighting to the general and a number of other prominent men who had gathered for a weekend of the sport. This was young Polk's first introduction to fashionable classical education; he commenced Latin grammar and for about a year "read the usual course of Latin Authors, part of the greek [sic] testament and a few of the dialogues of Lucian."⁵ The whole experience was tonic in its effect. He was older than most of the scholars and worked indefatigably, making up for lost time. The teacher was not allowed to whip students, but once a week "Uncle Sam" Frierson, the patriarch of the community, came to the school, took wrongdoers down to the spring,

talked over their sins with them, and when necessary vigorously applied a birch from a nearby thicket. If such actions did not prove corrective "Uncle Sam" would proceed to pray over the misdoer long and loudly—something much more to be dreaded than three hard whippings.⁶

It is unlikely that Jim Polk ever required such treatment.

Sam Polk was so impressed with his son's accomplishments that he agreed at the beginning of 1815 to send him to a more distinguished academy, conducted by another Presbyterian, Samuel P. Black, at the newly established town of Murfreesborough, some fifty miles to the northeast. When Polk presented himself at the log building which housed the school, he was still small for his age. "His hair was much fairer and of lighter growth than it afterwards became. He had fine eyes, [and]

⁴ Gross, *Eminent American Physicians*, 221.

⁵ Certificate of Henderson, quoted in Eugene Irving McCormac, *James K. Polk: A Political Biography* (Berkeley, 1922), 3. See also Mary Wagner Highsaw, "A History of Zion Community in Maury County, 1806-1860," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly*, V (1946), 113; A. V. Goodpasture, "The Boyhood of President Polk," *Tennessee Historical Magazine*, VII (1921), 47; S. G. Heiskell, *Andrew Jackson and Early Tennessee History* (Nashville, 1920-1921), III, 681-683.

⁶ Quoted in Highsaw, "Zion Community," 113.

was neat in appearance.”⁷ He boarded with a family in town and worked hard at

English Grammar the Latin and Greek languages, Arithmetic, the most useful branches of the Mathematics, Geography, Natural and Moral Philosophy, Astronomy, Belles-letters [sic], Logic, and such other useful and ornamental branches of Literature.⁸

The school term was closed in October with an “exhibition,” at which the students delivered orations and acted in portions of plays. Polk showed “the finest capacity for public speaking,”—he had probably learned more than Latin grammar from Parson Henderson—and a spectator remarked that he was “much the most promising young man in the school.”⁹

Such was young Polk’s progress at Murfreesboro that in less than a year he felt ready to enter college. It was only natural that he should choose the University of North Carolina, where his cousin, Colonel William Polk, was one of the most active trustees. Arriving at Chapel Hill in the fall of 1815, he was examined by the faculty on Latin and Greek grammar, Caesar’s Commentaries, Sallust, Virgil, Mair’s Introduction, ten chapters of Saint John’s Gospel in Greek, and Murray’s English Grammar. On the basis of this examination, he was given credit for all the freshman and half the sophomore work and was admitted to the sophomore class when the second term opened in January, 1816.¹⁰ This is striking evidence of his intelligence and of the assiduity with which he had pursued his studies in the two and a half years since he had commenced them under Parson Henderson.

The University of North Carolina was the same age as Polk himself. Its early years had been neither prosperous nor distinguished, and in 1815 it had a faculty of only five. The Reverend Robert Chapman was president, but the real leader of the institution was the Professor of Mathematics, Doctor Joseph Cald-

⁷ Samuel H. Laughlin, “Sketches of Notable Men,” *Tennessee Historical Magazine*, IV (1918), 77-78. See also Thomas B. Wilson, “Reminiscences of the Civil War,” *Tennessee Historical Quarterly*, V (1946), 93-94; C. C. Henderson, *The Story of Murfreesboro* (Murfreesboro, Tenn., 1929), 27-29; *Nashville Whig*, Oct. 25, 1814.

⁸ Certificate of Samuel P. Black, Stanley F. Horn, ed., “Holdings of the Tennessee Historical Society: Young James K. Polk’s Credentials,” *Tennessee Historical Quarterly*, IV (1945), 339.

⁹ Laughlin, “Sketches of Notable Men,” 77-78.

¹⁰ *The Laws of the University of North-Carolina. As Revised in 1813* (Hillsborough, N. C., 1822), 5. (Hereafter referred to as *U. N. C. Laws.*)

well, who was, like Chapman, a Presbyterian clergyman. In addition there was a senior tutor, William Hooper, later to be Professor of Languages, and two other tutors, recently graduated students, who lived in the dormitories, tried to keep order, and taught the lower classes. There were eighty students at the beginning of 1816, the number rising to ninety-one by the end of the year.¹¹

However poor in some respects, the University had a magnificent situation, lying on a great ridge rising out of piedmont North Carolina, some thirty miles west-northwest of the capital at Raleigh. The whole countryside was heavily forested, cool, clear springs ran from the slopes around the sides of the eminence, and from Point Prospect, a promontory at its eastern end, one could look off for miles toward the coastal plain. The University buildings were set upon the highest point of the broad and gently rolling plain which was the top of the ridge. Old East, a two-story dormitory with sixteen rooms, had been constructed in 1795. At right angles to it was the recently completed Main Building (now South Building), a more pretentious structure with three floors and a cupola and containing classrooms, library, society rooms, and dormitory rooms. Stretching northward from the Main Building was the "Grand Avenue," a wide park of oaks and hickories with natural undergrowth. At the far end, some three hundred yards away, ran the main street of the straggling village of Chapel Hill, and hidden in the woods beyond was the small frame building which housed the University's preparatory school. Directly across the Grand Avenue from Old East stood the small, plain chapel, and in the opposite direction was the large, frame Steward's Hall, where many of the students ate their meals. Beyond the Steward's Hall and toward the east, another broad, cleared avenue ran along the Raleigh road to Point Prospect, affording a vista over the plain beyond. The tiny village itself had only thirteen houses, two stores, and a tavern.¹²

¹¹ Treasurer's Accounts, November 20, 1816, University of North Carolina Papers (Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina), hereafter referred to as U. N. C. Papers; University of North Carolina, Minutes of the Trustess, 1811-1822, MS. vol. (North Carolina Collection, Library of the University of North Carolina), 153, 159.

¹² Archibald Henderson, *The Campus of the First State University* (Chapel Hill, 1949), 15, 25n, 42-43, 45, 60, 65; William D. Moseley to Professor Elisha Mitchell, August 15, 1853, University of North Carolina, Letters, 1796-1835, MS. vol. (North Carolina Collection, Library of the University of North Carolina).

From its earliest years the infant university had been under strong Presbyterian influences and had tried to model itself upon Princeton. It was ordained that a student who denied the being of God or the divine authority of the Christian religion should be dismissed, and the entire student body was examined periodically on the Bible.¹³ The bell on top of the Main Building was rung at six in the morning, and fifteen minutes later another bell summoned to morning prayers in the Chapel; prayers were held again at five in the afternoon, and on Sunday students were required to attend public worship clad in "neat black gowns." The bell was rung again at eight at night in the winter and nine in the summer, after which students were supposed to repair to their rooms for study. The year was divided into two terms, with vacations between, one of a month during December, and the other of six weeks in the summer. Each term was concluded by a public examination, the one in November by the faculty and the one at commencement in June by a committee of the trustees. In addition to their regular studies, the students were required to give orations following evening prayers, two or more each evening as their names came up alphabetically, and seniors were required to deliver two original orations during the year, one of them at commencement.¹⁴ Tuition was \$10 and later \$15 a term, and room rent was \$1.¹⁵

Polk's health was still feeble, but he threw himself with his usual energy into the sophomore studies¹⁶—Cicero's Select Oration, Xenophon's Cyropoedia, Homer, geography, arithmetic, and Murray's Grammar. The classics were less important after July, when he entered upon the junior course—elements of geometry, algebra, trigonometry, logarithms, mensuration, select parts of the classics, and the inevitable Murray's Grammar.¹⁷ The extensive training in mathematics was given by Doctor Caldwell, while William Hooper, "tall and erect, polished in manners, gentle in disposition, and a ripe scholar," a rigid disciplinarian,¹⁸ was responsible for the classical work. Caldwell

¹³ *U. N. C. Laws*, 10; University of North Carolina, Reports from the Faculty to the Trustees, MS. vol. (North Carolina Collection, Library of the University of North Carolina), December 6, 1816.

¹⁴ *U. N. C. Laws*, 4, 7-8, 10, 17-18; U. N. C. Trustee Minutes, 131-132.

¹⁵ *U. N. C. Laws*, 16; U. N. C. Trustee Minutes, 154.

¹⁶ John Y. Mason, *Address before the Alumni Association of the University of North Carolina, Delivered in Gerard Hall, June 2, 1847. The Evening Preceding Commencement Day* (Washington, 1847), 7.

¹⁷ *U. N. C. Laws*, 5.

¹⁸ Edward J. Mallett, *Address to the Graduating Class at the University of North Carolina, at Commencement, June 2d, 1881* (Raleigh, 1881), 3.

had composed his own geometry text, which was then copied in manuscript by the students. The copies were, of course, filled with errors.

But this was a decided advantage to the junior, who stuck to his text, without minding his diagram. For, if he happened to say the angle at A was equal to the angle at B, when, in fact the diagram showed no angle at B at all, but one at C, if Dr. Caldwell corrected him, he had it always in his power to say: "Well, that was what I thought myself, but it ain't so in the book, and I thought you knew better than I." We may well suppose that the Dr. was completely silenced by this unexpected *argumentum ad hominem*. You see how good a training our youthful junior was under, by a faithful adherence to his text, to become a "strict constructionist" of the constitution, when he should ripen into a politician.¹⁹

At the semiannual examination in November it was found that "James K. Polk and William Moseley are the best scholars" in the class, and the entire class was highly approved.²⁰

The course of study in the final year was natural and moral philosophy, chronology, select parts of the Latin and Greek classics, and, again, Murray's Grammar.²¹ At the midyear examination this time, the faculty was able to pronounce

only a general sentence of approbation. Distinctions might be made in scholarship, but it would be difficult [to know] at what point to stop. They are all approved. And this class is especially approved on account of the regular moral, and exemplary deportment of its members as students of the university.²²

The faculty was strengthened in the second half of Polk's senior year by the addition of Elisha Mitchell, fresh from Yale, as professor of mathematics. Polk was "passionately fond" of this subject, and under Professor Mitchell his was the first class at the University to study such advanced geometry as conic sections. The class was unfortunate in just missing the teaching of Denison Olmstead, another Yale man, who had been hired along with Mitchell to teach chemistry but who stayed at New Haven for an additional year of advanced study under Benjamin Silliman before coming to Chapel Hill.²³

¹⁹ William Hooper, *Fifty Years Since: An Address, Delivered before the Alumni of the University of North-Carolina, on the 7th of June, 1859. (Being the Day before the Annual Commencement)* (Raleigh, 1859), 23.

²⁰ U. N. C. Faculty Reports, December 5, 1816.

²¹ U. N. C. *Laws*, 5-6.

²² U. N. C. Faculty Reports, January 4, 1818.

²³ U. N. C. Trustee Minutes, 145; W. D. Moseley to Professor Elisha Mitchell, August 15,

As in most colleges at that time, much of the important training was received outside the classroom, through the "literary societies." At Chapel Hill most of the students were members of either the Dialectic or the Philanthropic Society, between which there was the keenest rivalry. Polk became a member of the former during his first term.²⁴ The societies met weekly in their own halls in the Main Building, with a topic arranged for debate at each meeting. Each member was required to participate in the debates every other week and to present compositions at the alternate meetings. The best compositions were filed in the society archives, eight of Polk's being so honored, two of which are still extant.

The first of these, written in 1817, an argument against "The Admission of Foreigners into Office in the United States," was filled with the spread-eagle patriotism characteristic of the expanding America which emerged from the War of 1812. Polk feared that foreigners would be imbued with aristocratic or monarchical ideas, or that they would try to establish a state church. Nor did he show much faith in the ability of the people to make correct decisions. So soon as foreign influence insinuates itself into the favor of a credulous populace, he said, "party is established and faction is founded, yes, faction, that destroyer [of] social happiness and good order in society, that monster that has sunk nations in the vortex of destruction."²⁵ Twenty years later Polk would have thought such a sentiment clear evidence that its author was either an aristocrat or a Bank hireling, but in 1817 government was entrusted by almost common consent to Republican elder statesmen, and parties were often considered not only unnecessary but highly dangerous.

The second composition, an effusion of schoolboy enthusiasm "On the Powers of Invention," reflects all the winds of thought which blew upon students at Chapel Hill in the early nineteenth century. Based on John Locke's analysis of human psychology, it showed that Doctor Caldwell's lectures on "moral philosophy"

1853, U. N. C. Letters.

²⁴ University of North Carolina, Dialectic Society, Minute Book, 1812-1818, MS. vol. (North Carolina Collection, Library of the University of North Carolina), January 25, 1816.

²⁵ Composition of James K. Polk, University of North Carolina, Dialectic Society, Addresses of the Dialectic Society, First Series, MS. Vol. IV, P to Y (North Carolina Collection, Library of the University of North Carolina). There is a "List of Compositions and Addresses now in the Archives of the Dialectic Society" in University of North Carolina, Dialectic Society, Temporary Laws, Etc., 1818, MS. vol. (North Carolina Collection, Library of the University of North Carolina), which lists eight Polk compositions, only two of which seem to have survived.

had left a strong impress of the Age of Reason on his hearers. Polk's theme was a profound faith in the powers of human reason and an ecstatic view of man's progress, through reason, from ignorance and superstition to where "he sits enthroned on the pinnacles of fame's proud temple." But by 1817 reason had its limits, and the youthful writer regrets that the noble works of invention have been "basely used by a Paine a Hume and a Bolinbroke [*sic*] as the harbinger of infidelity." The influence of romantic thought was also beginning to be felt, and the romantic hero appears: "St. Helena blooms with nature's richest production wafted to her shore by the winds of adversity and though fallen yet noble, debased yet acting with philosophical composure." Romanticism is even more evident in the full-blown style and bombastic exaggeration, characteristics which are in striking contrast with everything else Polk is known to have said or written. The composition closes with an apostrophe to America, which is forging ahead of Europe "under the happy auspices of an equilibrium in government."²⁶

The Dialectic Society was strict in enforcing its rules, attendance was required, and Polk was a half dozen times among those fined for absence. He was also penalized a number of times for "irregularity" and once for "gross irregularity." Whether these fines were levied for keeping library books out too long, spitting tobacco juice on the floor, or for some other impropriety has not been determined, but they do dissipate the myth of Polk, the superhumanly correct student, who never failed in the punctual performance of every duty. The debates at Society meetings were often hotly contested, and one evening a member was fined ten cents for using threatening language to James K. Polk, and Polk was fined a like sum for replying.

Many of the debates were on questions with which Polk had to deal in his later public career. The record for the evening of his admission to the Society unfortunately does not show whether Polk voted or argued on the side of the negative majority on the question, "Would an extension of territory be an advantage to the U. S.?" The decision was again negative on, "Would it be justifiable in the eyes of the world for the United States to assist Spanish America in deffence [*sic*] of their

²⁶ Ten-page MS. in Polk's hand, Dialectic Addresses.

liberty?" On still another occasion, after "warm and animated debate," it was decided that the practice of law *is* congenial to the pure precepts of Christianity. Polk's later views triumphed in the debate over, "Ought a representative to exercise his own judgment or act according to the directions of his constituents?" when the decision was in favor of the latter. These aspiring politicians also decided that the life of a statesman was preferable to that of a warrior. But not all the questions were so serious, as witness, "Is an occasional resort to female company beneficial to students?" the outcome of which may well be imagined.²⁷

Each of the two societies had a library superior to the University's meagre stock of books. To the Dialectic collection of 1,623 volumes, Polk contributed a set of "Gibbon's Rome," "Williams' France," "Darwin's Memoirs," "Addison's Evidences," and John H. Eaton's recent biography of Jackson. The interest in history indicated here is shown also by the fragmentary record of books taken from the University library, which indicates that Polk borrowed Gibbon's *Rome* and one of David Ramsay's works on the American Revolution.²⁸ Among its innumerable activities, the Di also included philanthropy; the members taxed themselves two dollars per term for a loan for the education of one of their fellows who seems to have had no other means of support.²⁹

Polk was an active leader in the society. He served two monthly terms as treasurer and held other offices, principally secretary and chairman of the executive committee.³⁰ At the end of his junior year he was elected president of the society, and the following spring was chosen for a second term, a mark of respect without precedent.³¹ This mark of confidence

²⁷ Dialectic Minutes, January 25, 1816-May 20, 1818, *passim*; University of North Carolina, Dialectic Society, Committee Minutes, 1816-1824, MS. vol. (North Carolina Collection, Library of the University of North Carolina), February 24, 1817.

²⁸ *Catalogue of Books Belonging to the Dialectic Society, Chapel-Hill, February, 1821* (Hillsborough, N. C., 1821), 4; Dialectic Minutes, October 16, 1816; University of North Carolina, "Library Books Borrowed, August 26, 1817-March 25, 1819," MS. bound with University Demerit Roll, October 26, 1838-September 18, 1840, MS. vol. (North Carolina Collection, Library of the University of North Carolina).

²⁹ University of North Carolina, Dialectic Society, Treasurer's Individual Accounts, 1811-1818, MS. vol. (North Carolina Collection, Library of the University of North Carolina), 207-208.

³⁰ University of North Carolina, Dialectic Society, Treasurer's Book, 1807-1818, MS. vol. (North Carolina Collection, Library of the University of North Carolina), August, 1816, and March, 1817, for Polk's accounts as treasurer; his individual accounts with the Society are in Dialectic Individual Accounts, 1811-1818, 221, 260, 307, and University of North Carolina, Dialectic Society, Treasurer's Individual Accounts, 1818-1821, MS. vol. (North Carolina Collection, Library of the University of North Carolina), 29; Dialectic Committee Minutes, August, 1816-March, 1818, *passim*.

³¹ Dialectic Minutes, May 8, 1817, and April 29, 1818.

may have been the result of Polk's efforts to preserve the honor of the society by pushing the impeachment of a member accused of stealing some tongs and a shovel from another member, letting himself "be publickly kicked in one of the passages of the main building . . . without making any honorable resistance," charging \$25 worth of books to the Society and then presenting them to the Society as his own gift, leaving Chapel Hill without paying his debts, claiming to have a large estate with the intention "of imposing himself upon some too credulous one of the female sex," and permitting himself to be called a liar without doing anything "to vindicate his character." Polk industriously collected evidence against the villain, who was expelled by a unanimous vote of the Society.³²

Polk's second inaugural address, on "Eloquence," shows that he already had an eye to politics. You may, he told his listeners,

be called upon to succeed those who now stand up the representatives of the people, to wield by the thunder of your eloquence the council of a great nation and to retain by your prudent measures that liberty for which our fathers bled. It may be a delusive phantom that plays before my imagination, but my reason tells me it is not. For why may we not expect talents in this seminary in proportion to the number of youths which it fosters, and with the advantages which have been named may we not expect something more than ordinary. But even if it were visionary I would delight to dwell for a moment upon the pleasing hope. . . . Although our body resembles what Rhetoricians would term a miscellaneous assembly your proficiency in extemporaneous debating will furnish you with that fluency of language, that connexion of ideas and boldness of delivery that will be equally serviceable in the *council*, in the *pulpit* and at the *bar*.

That his own technique was already well developed is indicated by his further remarks:

I cannot but remark two very fatal and opposite faults that prevail in the exercises in debating that are exhibited in this body. The one is looseness of preperation [sic] before assembling in this Hall. The other is writing and memorizing your exhibitions in which there is often too much attention paid to the elegance of language and too little to the ideas conveyed by it. The former so far from making you fluent and bold, will only

³² Hardy L. Holmes to James K. Polk, November 12, 1817, "James H. Simeson's Impeachment & Expulsion, January 21st 1818." Dialectic Society Papers (Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina).

tend to corrupt language and embarrass your address. The latter will make you timorous and unprepared to engage in an unforeseen discussion. A due degree of attention should be given to the subject under consideration. The several heads upon [which] you mean to touch should be distinctly arranged in the memory, but the language in which your ideas are expressed should not be elaborate, but that which is suggested at the moment of delivery when the mind is entirely engrossed by the subject which it is considering. The attention of your hearers will not then be diverted from the merits of the question by the studied metaphors and flowers of language.³³

Such a concept of forensic technique was not very common in the nineteenth century and indicates a bold and original mind. Polk's assiduity in applying and developing it in the debates of the Society and later were to make him a formidable foe on the stump in Tennessee and in the give and take of the House of Representatives. It would have been hard to improve on the Dialectic Society as a school for statesmanship.

Many of Polk's fellow students did indeed rise to eminence. William D. Moseley, with whom he roomed on the third floor of Main Building, later became governor of Florida. In after years he recalled to Polk the "many tedious and laborious hours" they had spent together, "attempting to discover the beauties of Cicero and Homer and the less interesting amusements of quadratic equations and conic sections."³⁴ John Y. Mason, who later became a United States Senator from Virginia and a member of Polk's cabinet, graduated during Polk's first year at Chapel Hill, while John M. Morehead, subsequently governor of North Carolina, was in the class ahead of Polk. In his own class of fourteen there were, besides himself and Moseley, a future Bishop of Mississippi, William Mercer Green, the first president of Davidson College, Robert Hall Morrison, and a president of the North Carolina senate, Hugh Waddell. William H. Haywood, to be a United States Senator from North Carolina, was among the younger boys at Chapel Hill in Polk's time.³⁵

Life at "the Hill" was not all serious, however. Much of the time was spent in sports, excursions through the surrounding

³³ MS. in Dialectic Addresses.

³⁴ William D. Moseley to James K. Polk, November 29, 1832, James K. Polk Papers (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress); William D. Moseley to Professor Elisha Mitchell, August 15, 1853, U. N. C. Letters.

³⁵ "Catalogue of Students (copied by Wm. D. Moseley)," U. N. C. Letters; *Catalogus Universitatis Carolinae Septentrionalis* (Raleigh, 1817), 14-16; Kemp Plummer Battle, *History of the University of North Carolina* (Raleigh, 1907, 1912), I, 258-259.

forests, or deviltry. Playing ball against the walls of the buildings got to be such a nuisance that it had to be prohibited by the trustees.³⁶ Swimming in nearby ponds was a favorite in the summer. Bandy, or shinny, the most popular game, was rough and dangerous. Hygiene and sport were combined at the "Twin Sisters," two small brooks on the north slope of the campus, whose waters had been channelled so as to provide a natural shower bath. More exciting were midnight marauding and such standard college pranks as tying a cow to the bell or building rude fences across the village streets. President Caldwell was in the habit of making midnight excursions of his own and was so fleet of foot and adept in the apprehension of wrong-doers that he was dubbed "Diabolus," usually shortened to "Bolus." Youthful energy occasionally got completely out of hand, as in 1817 when the trustees were so infuriated by "the late outrages on the buildings of the University & grove," that they ordered the faculty to prosecute the offenders in the courts.³⁷

It is doubtful whether Polk's health permitted him to engage in the more strenuous diversions, but he got abundant exercise in the walk of a mile or more down a long, steep hill to the farmhouse in the valley north of the village where he took his meals during a part of his stay.³⁸ There were also vacation excursions with Moseley and others to Raleigh, where the boys stayed at the home of Colonel William Polk, and probably, also, visits to the homes of classmates during the longer summer recesses.³⁹

The most stirring event which occurred during Polk's residence at Chapel Hill was the rebellion of 1816. College life in those days exhibited a perpetual warfare between the students and their preceptors. Even the punctilious Polk had advised his fellows to "stoop not from the true principles of honor to gain the favour of the Faculty and thus succeed in your views of promotion."⁴⁰ President Chapman had been an opponent of the War of 1812, and the University had long been suspected in the state of being

³⁶ Resolution of the Trustees, December 6, 1817, U. N. C. Papers.

³⁷ Resolution of the Trustees [December, 1817,] U. N. C. Papers. See also Henderson, *Campus*, 57, 110; Hooper, *Fifty Years Since*, 25-31; W. D. Moseley to Prof. E. Mitchell, August 15, 1853, U. N. C. Letters. Caldwell had again become president of the University in 1816.

³⁸ William Hillyard to John Haywood and others, December 6, 1816, U. N. C. Papers; John D. Hawkins to John Y. Mason, April 17, 1847, photostatic copy (North Carolina Collection, Library of the University of North Carolina).

³⁹ William Hillyard to John Haywood and others, December 6, 1816, U. N. C. Papers; John D. Hawkins to John Y. Mason, April 17, 1847, photostatic copy (North Carolina Collection, Library of the University of North Carolina).

⁴⁰ James K. Polk, "Eloquence," MS. in Dialectic Addresses.

under Federalist domination. One evening in September, 1816, after prayers, the customary oration was given by William B. Shepard. He had submitted his address, as was the rule, to Chapman, who had made certain changes. But in delivering it, he defied the president and gave it as originally written. When ordered to sit down, he persisted, to the enthusiastic applause of the assembled student body. Afterwards there was "great noise and riot" in the dormitories for most of the night, and the next morning twenty-seven students, mostly members of the Philanthropic Society, answered a call for a meeting in the Chapel to support Shepard.

The harassed faculty retaliated at once. Shepard and two of his principal encouragers were suspended forthwith. Those present at the student meeting who would sign a recantation, among them William Moseley, were forgiven, but the rest were likewise suspended. Meanwhile the incident was becoming a state-wide political issue. The Republican papers denounced the tyranny of the faculty, while the Federalist organ printed Doctor Chapman's claim that he had ordered Shepard to delete only passages smacking of infidelity—though the bitter criticisms of Great Britain in the offensive passages were doubtless primarily responsible for arousing the president's choler. The Phi Society, reduced to thirteen members by the suspensions, bitterly accused the Di men of promising to attend the student meeting then failing to appear, a charge which was hotly denied.

The students were outwardly cowed by the disciplinary measures, but the explosion of a bomb, made of a brass doorknob, in front of the room of one of the tutors showed the depth of their resentment. And they eventually triumphed. The trustees, sensitive to public opinion, forced President Chapman to resign a few months later and replaced him with Doctor Caldwell. In the interest of discipline, though, they were finally forced to expel Shepard and the chief promoter of the student meeting. Six months later, with enrollment down to sixty, the University was still suffering from the effects of the incident.⁴¹

⁴¹ Battle, *U. N. C.*, I, 231, 235-239; John Patterson to Thomas T. Armstrong, September 24, 1816, typed copy, and William M. Green to Martin W. B. Armstrong, October 17, 1816, typed copy, bound with *U. N. C. Faculty Reports*; *Minerva* (Raleigh), October 18, 1816; *Raleigh Register and North-Carolina Gazette*, October 4, 1816; Thomas B. Slade to Alfred M. Slade, October 9, 1816, *U. N. C. Papers*; William Hooper to Walter Alves, March 6, 1817, copy, *J. C. Norwood Papers* (Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina); *U. N. C. Trustee Minutes*, 122, 133, 136.

On the last Wednesday in May, 1818, a committee of the trustees arrived in Chapel Hill to spend a week examining the students preparatory to commencement.⁴² This annual event was one of the state's outstanding social occasions, and its high point for the students was the ball held in the dining room of the Steward's Hall. A member of the Class of 1818 later recalled:

At commencement ball (when I graduated) my coat was broad-cloth of sea green color, high velvet collar to match, swallow tail, pockets outside, with lapels and large silver plated buttons; white damask vest, showing the edge of a blue undervest; a wide opening for bosom ruffles, and no shirt collar. The neck was dressed with a layer of four or five cornered cravats, artistically laid and surmounted with a cambric stock, pleated and buckled behind. My pantaloons were white Canton crape, lined with pink muslin, and showed a peach blossom tint. They were rather short, in order to display flesh colored silk stockings; and this exposure was increased by very low cut pumps, with shiny buckles. My hair was very black, very long and *queued*. I would be taken for a lunatic or a harlequin in such costume now.⁴³

On the last day of the festivities, each senior delivered an oration in the chapel, and Polk, graduating with the "First Honor," gave the Latin Salutatory before a large company of the first men of the state.⁴⁴ Commencement was a proud occasion for Polk, but also part of it was the sadness of taking leave of good friends and pleasant associations; mementos were exchanged, Polk presenting his friend Moseley with a breast-pin which the latter cherished for years.⁴⁵

Polk's precarious health had again been impaired by the pressure of studies and activities as his senior year drew to a close, so he did not return immediately to Tennessee, but spent a few months resting and visiting friends in North Carolina. He was doubtless in Chapel Hill for the wedding of one of his classmates two weeks after commencement and was back again in August, when he drew some books from the University library. Finally, in the fall, he turned homeward.⁴⁶

It was only five years since Jim Polk had entered Parson Hen-

⁴² *Raleigh Register and North-Carolina Gazette*, May 1, 1818.

⁴³ *Memoirs of Edward J. Mallett, a Birthday Gift for Each of His Children. May 1st, 1880* (n. p., n. d.), 38-39.

⁴⁴ *Battle, U. N. C.*, I, 258.

⁴⁵ William D. Moseley to James K. Polk, December 1, 1830, Polk Papers.

⁴⁶ *Raleigh Register and North-Carolina Gazette*, June 19, 1818; "U. N. C. Library Books Borrowed," entries for August 15, 22, 1818; Goodpasture, "Boyhood of Polk," 48-49.

derson's little academy at Zion Church, and the young man had good reason to take pride in the industry and intelligence which in so short a time had brought the uncouth country boy to the head of the University's graduating class. These were the five years that had made the man, and of the five the latter ones, spent at Chapel Hill, had been by far the most important.

THE HATTERAS EXPEDITION, AUGUST, 1861

BY JAMES M. MERRILL

It was late at night. Bursting with excitement, Postmaster General Montgomery Blair, Assistant Secretary of the Navy Gustavus Fox, and Major-General Benjamin F. Butler roused the White House watchman. Fifteen minutes later, President Lincoln "flew around the [Cabinet] room, . . . [his] night shirt . . . considerably agitated," and danced a jig with Fox, who had just informed him of the fall of Fort Hatteras.¹ About 4:00 a. m. the following morning, August 31, 1861, the telegraph key at the headquarters of the Department of Virginia drummed out the official report:

a glorious victory at Hatteras Inlet, [North Carolina] by the joint [army-navy] expedition under the command of Major General Butler and Commodore [Silas] Stringham. . . . Many captured. . . .²

The Union North was shaken from its doldrums by the Bull Run defeat. Bands blared; whistles shrieked; crowds gathered. The *Boston Journal* termed the victory an entering wedge into the Confederacy; the *New York Herald* described the exploit as a "splendid and decisive blow . . . which surpasses in importance anything yet accomplished against the enemy"; the *Philadelphia Public Ledger* heralded the success as one of "the most important advantages yet gained by the Government."³ In Washington, General Butler was led to the National Hotel where he bellowed to the crowd: "Oh, it was glorious to see . . . [the] arm of the Union stretched out against its rebellious children."⁴

In the Confederate South the scene was different. "The gleam of sunshine from Hatteras," observed a *London Times* correspondent, "has thrown a dark shadow across the South."⁵ Public reaction varied. An irate Confederate Congress demanded intelligence on the Hatteras collapse.⁶ The *Richmond Daily Dis-*

¹ Benjamin F. Butler, *Autobiography and Personal Reminiscences* . . . (Boston, 1892), 288.

² Wool to Cameron, Fort Monroe, August 31, 1861, Jessie A. Marshall [editor], *Private and Official Correspondence of Gen. Benjamin F. Butler* . . . (Norwood, 1917), I, 236.

³ *Boston Journal*, n. d., Frank Moore, ed., *The Rebellion Record* . . . (New York, 1862), III, 24; *New York Herald*, n. d., quoted in *Salem Register*, September 5, 1861; and *Public Ledger*, (Philadelphia), September 2, 1861.

⁴ *Public Ledger* (Philadelphia), September 3, 1861.

⁵ *The Times* (London), September 23, 1861.

⁶ Resolution of Burton Craige (North Carolina), August 31, 1861, "Journal of the Congress of the Confederate States of America, 1861-1865," *Senate Document, No. 234*, 58 Cong., 2

patch admonished southerners for being spoiled by previous successes, while the *Petersburg Express* jested that no fresh water existed at Hatteras and "Old Butler will have to take his brandy and whiskey undiluted, and such as we have been informed he generally uses, will speedily consume his vitals."⁷ But the North Carolinians did not consider the defeat a jest. The House of Representatives was aghast; state officials scrambled desperately to deflect blame; investigations began; tension heightened.⁸ "The Yankee capture," fretted a Raleigh resident,

amounts to this: The whole of the eastern part of the State is now exposed to the ravages of the merciless vandals. . . . [It] is now plunged into a great deal of trouble. . . .⁹

One Kentuckian jotted to Navy Secretary Gideon Welles that the attack

has alarmed the Confeds more than anything yet that has been done. We have people continually coming from that direction, the South, who tell us that the alarm of such an expedition is raising the devil in all their sea ports and distracts them very much.¹⁰

The elation in the North over this first naval victory relieved the Navy Department from pressure, which had been continually mounting. At the outbreak of the Civil War the Union was caught unprepared: commissioned vessels were scattered from the Mediterranean to the South Pacific. Other ships were undergoing extensive repairs. A Navy Department survey counted only twelve vessels in home waters, of which four were in northern ports ready for duty.¹¹ Without waiting for Congress to

sess. (Washington, 1904), I, 456. Also see Davis to Cobb, Richmond, August 31, 1861, *Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion* (Washington, 1897), ser. 1, VI, 137. (Hereafter cited as *NOR*. All subsequent citations are series 1.)

⁷ *Daily Dispatch* (Richmond), August 31, 1861; and *Express* (Petersburg, Virginia), n. d., quoted in *Sacramento Daily Union*, October 1, 1861.

⁸ Clark to Dortch, Raleigh, September 5, 1861, North Carolina, Governor, *Capture of Hatteras* . . . [Raleigh, 1861], 3-4; Winslow to Clark, Raleigh, September 6, 1861, North Carolina, Governor, *Capture of Hatteras*, 7; Morris to Winslow, Raleigh, September 5, 1861, North Carolina, Governor, *Capture of Hatteras*, 12. Also see *Standard* (Raleigh), August 31, 1861, quoted in *Sacramento Daily Union*, October 1, 1861; *Goldsborough Tribune*, n. d., quoted in *Daily Richmond Enquirer*, September 3, 1861; and Howard Swiggett, editor, *A Rebel War Clerk's Diary* . . . (New York, 1935), I, 77.

⁹ *Express* (Petersburg, Virginia), n. d., Moore, *The Republican Record*, III, 26. For additional information on panic caused by the Hatteras expedition, see *Charleston Mercury*, n. d., quoted in *Daily Richmond Enquirer*, September 7, 1861; *Wilmington Journal*, n. d., quoted in *Daily Richmond Enquirer*, September 2, 1861; *Newbern Progress*, n. d., quoted in *Sacramento Daily Union*, October 1, 1861; and Rowan to Stringham, Fort Hatteras, September 5, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 172.

¹⁰ Nelson to Fox, Maysville, Kentucky, September 25, 1861, Robert M. Thompson & Richard Wainwright, editors, *Confidential Correspondence of Gustavus Vasa Fox* . . . (New York, 1918), I, 380.

¹¹ "Report of the Secretary of the Navy, July 4, 1861," *Senate Executive Document*, No. 1, 37 Cong., 1 sess. (Washington, 1861), 86.

assemble, a large building plan was undertaken, and great quantities of ships of all sizes were purchased.

The Navy Department's sketch of its operational plans in early 1861 included: 1) the blockade of southern ports; 2) the organization of combined army-navy expeditions against strongholds on the Confederate seaboard; and 3) the pursuit of enemy privateers. President Lincoln in April, 1861, issued proclamations for the blockade of the southern seaboard with its 3,500 miles of coastline. Although the blockade proved to be the Navy's greatest contribution to the Union victory, it existed only on paper for several months after the proclamations. The lack of ships and personnel hindered construction of the commercially important harbors.¹² By the late spring of 1861, the Navy was in disrepute for its inactivity. Municipal, state, and federal officials descended upon the department demanding ships to defend harbors and to patrol the coast. One public official stormed:

The growing discontent created in the public mind by the extraordinary and disheartening delays of the Navy Department will undoubtedly soon result in meetings of the People, who will declare their want of confidence. . . . A month has elapsed since the Blockade proclamation. . . . [yet] every Port, south of the Chesapeake . . . is still open.¹³

An obstacle to the effectiveness of the Union blockade was the protection afforded southerners by their coastline, much of which was supplied with a double shore, punctured with numerous inlets. Small ships from Carolina ports would sneak along the inside passage until they reached an outlet, and then dash for the open seas. Hatteras Inlet was such an obstacle. "The Swash," as the inlet was referred to by the Federals, was a long, sandy barrier off the coast of North Carolina, six miles south of Cape Hatteras and about ninety miles by water from New Bern and Washington, North Carolina. "Norfolk and Richmond," diagnosed a Union naval officer in June, 1861, "are not yet blockaded or completely cut off from the sea. They have a back outlet. . . ." Confederate ships could be passed from these cities through

¹² Charles O. Paullin, "President Lincoln and the Navy," *American Historical Review*, XIV (1909), 284-285, 294; Carroll S. Alden & Allan Westcott, *The United States Navy* (Chicago, 1943), 132-137, 140, 142-146; and Dudley W. Knox, *A History of the United States Navy* (New York, 1936), 191-195.

¹³ Crea to Fox, New York, May 29, 1861, Thompson & Wainwright, *Confidential Correspondence of Gustavus Vasa Fox*, I, 359.

internal waterways to Hatteras or neighboring inlets. This should convince officers, continued the lieutenant, of "the great advantages and facilities the enemy will have in possessing this vast internal water navigation unmolested."¹⁴ Secessionists also recognized these advantages. Fortifications of these outlets were begun and by the middle of June, 1861, despite sandstorms, the major work had been accomplished on Fort Hatteras.¹⁵

About five feet high with slanting sides and situated an eighth of a mile from the channel entrance, the fort was constructed from sand, mud, and turf. Its 62- and 32-pounders commanded the approaches by land and sea. "I hardly think," speculated Colonel W. Bevershaw Thompson, chief engineer for North Carolina's coastal defenses, that "a flotilla can get into the harbor."¹⁶ A second bastion, Fort Clark, "an irregular figure," smaller, but constructed similarly to Fort Hatteras, was ready for service in late July of the same year. The two redoubts, located about three-fourths of a mile from one another on the same island, "secures to us," boasted Thompson, "a cross fire upon . . . the entrance to this inlet. I now consider this . . . secure against any attempt of the enemy to enter."¹⁷ Quickly, other fortifications were marked off and built at Ocracoke and Oregon inlets, two neighboring outlets to the sea.

Gales and high seas off the North Carolina coast frequently wrecked Union merchantmen on Hatteras Island, where their crew and cargo were seized by Confederate troops.¹⁸

These losses were unimportant compared to the toll taken by Confederate privateers, operating from Hatteras Inlet. A look-out station at Cape Hatteras and a system of signals enabled raiders anchored in the inlet to pounce on lone merchantmen, when the blockading vessels patrolled other areas. The marauders would "dash out," bewailed a Union naval officer, and be "back again in a day with a prize."¹⁹ After Fort Hatteras was constructed, two side-wheelers, a schooner, a tugboat, and a pilot

¹⁴ Lowry to Welles, on board the *Pawnee*, Potomac River, June 1, 1861, *NOR*, V, 688.

¹⁵ Thompson to Winslow, Fort Hatteras, June 17, 1861, quoted in *The Times* (London), September 21, 1861.

¹⁶ Thompson to Bradford, Newbern, June 13, 1861, quoted in *The Times* (London), September 21, 1861.

¹⁷ Thompson to Winslow, Fort Hatteras, July 25, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 713.

¹⁸ Statements of Penny and Campbell, New York, August 12, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 78; news clippings, n. d., enclosed in letter Welles to Stringham, Washington, August 8, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 67-68; Andrews to Clark, Fort Hatteras, July 22, 1861, quoted in *The Times* (London), September 21, 1861; and Washington columnist quoted in *Sacramento Daily Union*, September 30, 1861.

¹⁹ Selfridge to Welles, on board the *Cumberland*, at sea, August 10, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 72.

boat operated as privateers, the most notorious of which was the side-wheeler *Winslow*.²⁰ The schooner *Priscilla* with 600 bushels of salt, a large brig cargoes with sugar and molasses, and three schooners were a week's catch during July, 1861.²¹

The Confederate ravages caused repercussions in Washington. Letters deluged the Navy Department. A committee of the New York Board of Underwriters clamored for action to prevent further captures "by the pirates who sally out from those inlets"; the State Department reminded Welles that the rebels were "doing a very active business through the various inlets of . . . North Carolina"; the Treasury Department mentioned the depredations on United States commerce.²² As irritating were the letters from junior naval officers, hinting that something should be done at Hatteras. The "coast of Carolina is infested with a nest of privateers that have thus far escaped capture, advised a naval lieutenant, and "in the ingenious method of their cruising, are probably likely to avoid the clutches of our cruisers."²³

In turn, Secretary Welles goaded Commodore Silas H. Stringham, commanding the Atlantic Blockading Squadron, with a flood of derogatory news clippings and letters. Welles scolded that Confederate coastal activities had alarmed the commercial community and had caused embarrassment to the department. "There is no portion of the coast which you are guarding that requires greater vigilance," continued the secretary, "or where well-directed efforts and demonstrations would be more highly appreciated by the Government and country than North Carolina."²⁴ Badgered, Stringham retorted that his naval force was insufficient to cope with the menace, and that permanent benefit

²⁰ Statements of Penny and Campbell, New York, August 12, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 78; Thompson to Winslow, Fort Hatteras, July 25, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 713; Barron to Sinclair, Newbern, August 27, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 718; and William H. Parker, *Recollections of a Naval Officer, 1841-1865* (New York, 1883), 212.

²¹ Andrews to Clark, Fort Hatteras, August 2, 1861, quoted in *The Times* (London), September 21, 1861. Also see letters Andrews to Clark, Fort Hatteras, July 27, August 8, 1861, quoted in *The Times* (London), September 21, 1861. For an account of privateering activities at Hatteras, see William M. Robinson, Jr., *The Confederate Privateers* (New Haven, 1928), 101-115.

²² Smith, Bierwirth, and Thompson to Welles, New York, August 12, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 77-78; Godfrey to [State Department], Washington, August 17, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 110-111; Chase to Welles and enclosures, Washington, July 16, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 27-29. Also see *The New York Times*, n. d., quoted in *Daily Richmond Examiner*, September 3, 1861; and *The Times* (London), September 24, 1861.

²³ Selfridge to Welles, on board the *Cumberland*, at sea, August 10, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 72; and Lowry to Welles, on board the *Pawnee*, Potomac River, June 1, 1861, *NOR*, V, 688-689.

²⁴ Welles to Stringham, Washington, August 23, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 110. Also see Welles to Stringham, Washington, August 10, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 71.

could only result with the aid of a coöperating army detachment to occupy the forts at the mouths of the harbors.²⁵

The necessity of the Hatteras expedition is clear; its origin is vague. It is, perhaps, to be credited to the numerous suggestions that came to the attention of Secretary Welles. Intelligence reports of Confederate strength filtered back to Washington. Imprisoned for months at Newbern, North Carolina, ten survivors of captured Union merchantmen were released, travelled northward through the sounds in an open boat; and were subsequently picked up by the *Quaker City* and taken to Hampton Roads. Questioned, they reported that they had watched as many as fifty vessels pass through Hatteras Inlet, nine of which were prizes. According to their observations, three companies were stationed at the two forts, whose supply of ammunition was very short. In calm weather pickets extended nearly ten miles up the beach; on rough days, about a mile. To conclude, the survivors declared that Union forces could be landed anywhere along the beach without difficulty, if not opposed by land forces.²⁶

A memorandum from naval Lieutenant Robert B. Lowrey in June, 1861, advised Welles that there was no part of the country in armed rebellion against the government which could so easily be made to feel the power of the United States by its occupation than the inland coast of North Carolina.²⁷ A similar recommendation by another naval lieutenant pompously predicted that if his scheme were carried into operation nothing more would be heard of the Carolina marauders.²⁸ According to Welles, the seizure of important ports on the Confederate seaboard early commanded the attention of the Navy Department. A committee was convened by the secretary to make a thorough investigation of the "coast and harbors, their access and defences,"²⁹ and, presumably, to sift through the numerous suggestions. This work completed, Welles acted.

Confidential information was dispatched to Stringham on August 9, 1861, advising that the obstruction of the North Caro-

²⁵ Stringham to Welles, Hampton Roads, July 18, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 12. Also see Stringham to Welles, August 8, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 66-67.

²⁶ Statements of Penny and Campbell, New York, August 12, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 78-80. Also see Andrews to Clark, Fort Hatteras, August 8, 1861, quoted in *The Times*, (London), September 21, 1861.

²⁷ Lowry to Welles, on board the *Pawnee*, *Potomac River*, June 1, 1861, *NOR*, V, 688-689.

²⁸ Selfridge to Welles, on board the *Cumberland*, at sea, August 10, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 72-73.

²⁹ "Report of the Secretary of the Navy, December 2, 1861," *Senate Executive Document*, No. 1, 37 Cong., 2 sess. (Washington, 1862), 6.

lina coast should be "thoroughly attended to. . . ." ³⁰ The operational plan called for the capture of forts Hatteras and Clark and the clogging of the channel entrance by sinking schooners loaded with stone. The island was not to be held permanently. On August 13, orders were sent to Major-General John E. Wool, who had recently relieved Butler of his command at Fort Monroe, to organize a detachment to assist the naval operations against Hatteras; on the 22nd Wool was informed that the expedition "originated in the Navy Department, and is under its control"; on the 24th Wool pressed General Winfield Scott for 25,000 troops to carry out his assignment; on the 25th 860 men were assigned. ³¹ Commanded by Major-General Butler, the infantry was composed of the Ninth and Twentieth New York Volunteers, plus a company of the Second United States Artillery from Fort Monroe. To news reporters, Wool blurted that he was going to make such demonstrations upon the coasts of North Carolina, Florida, and Louisiana as were necessary for the rebels to keep their armies at home. ³² To army officials, Stringham hinted that the transports chartered for the expedition were unseaworthy, causing the Navy Department "extreme astonishment." ³³ Albeit, the unsafe steamers *Adelaide* and *George Peabody* were included in the conglomerate naval force, which consisted of Stringham's flagship, the steam frigate *Minnesota*, steam frigate *Wabash*, gunboats *Monticello* and *Harriet Lane*, steam sloop *Pawnee*, tugboat *Fanny*, and a retinue of smaller vessels—two dismasted schooners, two iron boats, and several flat fishing smacks. The sail sloop *Cumberland* was assigned to join the squadron at sea. In addition to the army detachment, the sailors, and the marines, a group of Union coastguardsmen accompanied the expedition. ³⁴

Secrecy surrounded the force's destination, but a few southerners were awake to the peril of a coastal attack. Our defenses, bragged the *Raleigh Standard*, will give "the Yankees a warm reception," and assured its readers that the southern seacoast had been rendered not only secure against attack, but prepared

³⁰ Welles to Stringham, Washington, August 9, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 70.

³¹ Townsend to Wool, Washington, August 13, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 82; Townsend to Wool, Washington, August 21, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 106; Wool to Scott, Fort Monroe, August 24, 1861, *The War of the Rebellion: . . . Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies* (Washington, 1882), ser. 1, IV, 603 (Hereafter cited as *AOR*. All subsequent citations are series 1); and Churchill to Butler, Fort Monroe, August 25, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 112.

³² *Albany Evening Journal*, n. d., quoted in *Public Ledger* (Philadelphia), August 19, 1861.

³³ Welles to Stringham, Washington, August 22, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 107; and Stringham to Welles, Hampton Roads, August 23, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 108.

³⁴ See Stringham to Welles, New York, September 2, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 120.

for offensive operations.³⁵ The harbors may be amply protected, but, questioned the *Savannah Republican*, are the creeks and inlets safe?³⁶

Early on the morning of August 27, a Confederate operator at Norfolk telegraphed a dispatch southward: "Enemy's fleet . . . left last evening; passed out of the capes and steered south," headed for the coast of North Carolina.³⁷

The Union squadron's passage from Hampton Roads to Fort Hatteras proved uneventful. At 9:30 a. m. on August 27, Cape Hatteras Light was sighted, and, after rounding the shoals, the squadron dropped anchor to the southward during the afternoon watch. Gathered in the wardroom of the *Minnesota*, officers discussed the next day's operation. Attack plans were outlined. "The works are pretty strong, and we may have a hard fight of it," noted Butler to his wife that evening, "but we mean to take them."³⁸

Across the water in a Confederate tent, a private was being court-martialled for catnapping on watch. The proceeding against the unfortunate was dropped. The Union force had been sighted. Colonel William A. Martin, commanding the forts, having but 350 men, urgently dispatched a pilot boat to Portsmouth, North Carolina, for more troops.³⁹ An army lieutenant expecting action penned to his father:

In all probability . . . tonight or tomorrow the rattle of musketry and roar of cannon will be heard here. Old Abe has waited long, but at last has come, and one would suppose with the determination to break up this 'hornet's nest' at Hatteras.⁴⁰

The Federal assault commenced at 6:40 a. m. on August 28. The *Monticello*, *Harriet Lane*, and *Pawnee* took their stations to cover the landing two miles from Fort Clark, while soldiers, marines, and coastguardsmen in small boats maneuvered toward shore. But, reported one eye-witness, "as fast as they neared the

³⁵ *Standard* (Raleigh), n. d., quoted in *Public Ledger* (Philadelphia), September 4, 1861.

³⁶ *Savannah Republican*, n. d., quoted in *The Southern Enterprise* (Thomasville, Georgia), September 4, 1861. Also see *Wilmington Journal* n. d., quoted in *Sacramento Daily Union*, October 1, 1861; and a Pensacola correspondent quoted in *Daily Richmond Examiner*, September 3, 1861.

³⁷ Huger to Cooper, Norfolk, August 27, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 137. Also see Clark to Walker, Raleigh, August 29, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 137; and Gatlin's report concerning North Carolina's affairs, Everettsville, October 1, 1862, *AOR*, IV, 574.

³⁸ Butler to his wife, on board the *Minnesota*, at sea, August 27, 1861, Marshall, *Private and Official Correspondence of Gen. Benjamin F. Butler*, I, 227-228.

³⁹ Martin to [Gatlin], on board the *Minnesota*, at sea, August 31, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 140.

⁴⁰ Briggs to his father, [Fort Hatteras], August 22-27, 1861, quoted in *The Times* (London), September 21, 1861.

beach the breakers carried them aground. . . ."⁴¹ Swamped, the small detachment scrambled up the beach to safety. There was confusion. Colonel Max Weber grimly pictured the condition of his 320 men: "All of us were wet up to the shoulders, cut off entirely from the fleet, with wet ammunition, and without any provisions."⁴² The surf boats bilged, whaleboats were then employed in a futile attempt to discharge more troops. By late afternoon further plans to land men were discarded.⁴³

Since 10:10 a. m., Fort Clark had been under heavy bombardment from the *Wabash*, *Cumberland*, and *Minnesota*. "Being a fire of shells only," said Martin in the bulwark, "it might well be spoken of as a flood of shells."⁴⁴ Continually, the three Union ships passed and repassed, belching round after round at the fort and its environs where troops might possibly be concealed. Promptly, the fort had returned the fire, but a shout of "derisive laughter" was heard from the *Minnesota's* gundeck, when the shells fell a half mile short.⁴⁵

The side-wheeler *Susquehanna*, returning to Hampton Roads after her tour of duty with the West Indian Squadron, chugged upon the scene and was immediately directed to join in the bombardment at 11:00 a. m. The cannonading was stepped up, and the air was "so filled with smoke" that it was only occasionally that the Federals could see the batteries on shore, noted a news reporter.⁴⁶

The condition of Fort Clark became precarious. Brutally pestered with Yankee troops only three miles away and ammunition nearly exhausted, the officers agreed to evacuate and to fall back to Fort Hatteras. Grasping everything they could carry and spiking their five guns, the fifty-five men retreated.⁴⁷ At 12:25 p. m., a shout rang out on board the *Minnesota*: "They're running!" Union guns were silenced; the Confederate forts were not flying their colors. Feeling ran high. Officers in the *Minnesota's* wardroom, who that morning had asked the surgeon ques-

⁴¹ *New York Herald*, n. d., Moore, *The Republican Record*, III, 24.

⁴² Weber to Butler, Fort Hatteras, September 5, 1861, *AOR*, IV, 589.

⁴³ Butler to Wool, on board the *Minnesota*, off Hatteras Inlet, August 30, 1861, *AOR*, IV, 582; and Hawkin's account, Robert U. Johnson & Clarence C. Buel, editors, *Battles and Leaders of the Civil War* . . . (New York, 1887), I, 632-633.

⁴⁴ Martin to [Gatlin], on board the *Minnesota*, at sea, August 31, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 141.

⁴⁵ *Boston Journal*, n. d., Moore, *The Republican Record*, III, 18.

⁴⁶ *Boston Journal*, n. d., Moore, *The Republican Record*, III, 18.

⁴⁷ Martin to [Gatlin], on board the *Minnesota*, at sea, August 31, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 141.

tions about wounds and treatments, met again to congratulate each other upon the victory.⁴⁸ Their joy was premature.

To reconnoiter and to aid the soldiers on shore, Butler, at 4:00 p. m., had the *Harriet Lane* and the *Monticello* ordered into the treacherous inlet. As the *Harriet Lane*, preceded by the *Monticello*, attempted to cross the bar, guns roared from Fort Hatteras. The *Monticello's* pivot gun and starboard battery quickly returned the fire. In peril of running aground and the target of the brisk fire from the fort, the gunboat, declared its commanding officer, was in a "tight place." Having little room in which to work the ship, the sailors had difficulty heading the *Monticello* toward open water. One shell tore away her boat davits, ramming fragments through the armory, pantry, and galley, another fragment ripped up the main deck, passed through the berthing compartment, the paint locker, across the fire room and lodged in the port coal bunker.⁴⁹

This short range blasting lasted fifty minutes until the *Minnesota*, *Wabash*, and *Susquehanna* started pummeling both forts with their batteries. Viciously drubbed, the *Monticello* escaped out of range. Dumbfounded, the Federal troops, who by this time had raised the Stars and Stripes, were shelled out of Fort Clark. A retreat was hastily executed.⁵⁰ During the second dog-watch, the squadron's guns ceased firing because of darkness and the threatening appearance of the weather. Stringham commanded his ships to withdraw out to sea, except the *Monticello*, *Harriet Lane*, and *Pawnee*, who were directed to lay off the beach to protect the soldiers.⁵¹

On board the flagship, officers and men were uneasy and despondent. One correspondent chafed:

The feeling throughout the ship . . . was that we were beaten. It seemed probable that the vessels stationed to protect our men on shore would be compelled to leave them to the mercy of the rebels, . . . During the night the secessionists might make our soldiers prisoners, reinforce their own forts, repair damages, and be ready to show that they were not to be easily vanquished.

⁴⁸ *Boston Journal*, n. d., Moore, *The Republican Record*, III, 19. Also see Stringham to Welles, New York, September 2, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 121.

⁴⁹ Gillis's preliminary report, on board the *Monticello*, off Hatteras Inlet August 30, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 123; and Gillis to Welles, on board the *Monticello*, off Hatteras Inlet, August 31, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 125-127; and abstract of the *Monticello's* log, August 28, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 135.

⁵⁰ Weber to Butler, Fort Hatteras, September 5, 1861, *AOR*, IV, 589; and *New York Herald*, n. d., Moore, *The Republican Record*, III, 25.

⁵¹ Stringham to Welles, New York, September 2, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 121.

Tired, hungry, and disgusted, officers sat down to their evening meal only to discover that it had been stolen from the galley.⁵²

Federal troops on the beach suffered greater discomfort. Rain fell. The men discussed the possibility of capture. An officer and twenty-eight men were sent that night to regain possession of Fort Clark; pickets were put out; a second detachment was deployed to occupy the beach near Fort Hatteras.⁵³

A mile away Confederate spirits were heightened, when, under cover of darkness Commodore Samuel Barron, chief of the Confederate coastal defenses, and about 230 officers and men disembarked from the *Winslow* and other light draft vessels and joined the garrison. The new arrivals found the fort's men exhausted from exposure and hard fighting. Urged by fellow officers, Barron consented to take command of Hatteras. Anticipating further reinforcements at or before midnight, he designed an attack upon Fort Clark which he was forced to discard since the additional troops did not arrive.⁵⁴

During the first watch the *Monticello*, *Harriet Lane*, and *Pawnee* were driven seaward by the weather, but before dawn the heavy seas subsided, and Union ships bustled with activity. At 5:30 a. m. the squadron weighed anchor and stood in toward shore. Warned not to fire on Fort Clark, the lead ship, the *Susquehanna*, followed closely by the *Wabash*, steamed in and opened fire on Hatteras. Later the *Cumberland* came in under sail, anchored, and turned her guns on the fort with excellent effect; the *Harriet Lane* joined in the hostilities. One Confederate officer described the barrage:

Firing of shells became . . . literally tremendous, as we had falling into and immediately around the work not less on an average of 10 each minute, and the sea being smooth, the firing was remarkably accurate.⁵⁵

The ineffective range of Confederate guns, the lack of ammunition, and the casualties finally convinced officers that further resistance would only result in a greater loss of life without damaging the adversary. As if to settle their hesitation, a shell

⁵² *Boston Journal*, n. d., Moore, *The Republican Record*, III, 19-20.

⁵³ Weber to Butler, Fort Hatteras, September 5, 1861, *AOR*, IV, 589; and *New York Herald*, n. d., Moore, *The Republican Record*, III, 25.

⁵⁴ Barron to Mallory, on board the *Minnesota*, at sea, August 31, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 138-139.

⁵⁵ Andrews to [Gatlin], on board the *Minnesota*, at sea, September 1, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 144.

fell down the ventilator shaft into a room next to the principal magazine locker. Although the ensuing fire was brought under control, Barron ordered the white flag run up at 11:07 a. m.⁵⁶

Spying the surrender colors, the sailors on board the *Minnesota* "flew to the rigging, and from ship to ship rang the cheers of victory."⁵⁷ Shortly before, Butler with a small detachment had disembarked into the *Fanny* to effect a landing. Hearing the cheers and whistles of victory, the General ordered the tugboat to head into the inlet. The *Fanny* anchored, Butler sent his aide in a rowboat ashore to demand the meaning of the white flag. He returned quickly bringing a memorandum from Barron, which stated that to avoid further bloodshed he was willing to surrender the bulwark, if the officers and men were set free. In reply, Butler irately dispatched the following:

The terms offered are these: Full capitulation; the officers and men to be treated as prisoners of war. No other terms admissible. . . .⁵⁸

Meanwhile, the transports *George Peabody* and *Adelaide* with the remaining troops headed into the inlet, followed by the *Harriet Lane*. The *George Peabody* safely navigated the channel, but the *Adelaide* and the *Harriet Lane* piled up on a sand bar. The quick action of Commander Henry Stellwagen freed the transport; the *Harriet Lane*, however, remained hard aground. "This to me," said Butler later,

was a moment of the greatest anxiety. By this accident a valuable ship of war and transport steamer [loaded with troops] . . . was [*sic*] in front of the enemy. I had demanded the most stringent terms which he was considering. He might refuse, and . . . renew the actions.⁵⁹

After waiting anxiously forty-five minutes but determined "not to abate a 'tittle,'" Butler's fears were eased when Barron and two high-ranking officers boarded the tugboat and informed the General that his terms had been accepted. Weighing anchor, the *Fanny* steered out of the inlet toward the *Minnesota*. On board

⁵⁶ Barron to Mallory, on board the *Minnesota*, at sea, August 31, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 139.

⁵⁷ *Boston Journal*, n. d.; Moore, *The Republican Record*, III, 20.

⁵⁸ Butler to Barron, [Hatteras Inlet, August 29, 1861], *AOR*, IV, 583.

⁵⁹ Butler to Wool, on board the *Minnesota*, off Hatteras Inlet, August 30, 1861, *AOR*, IV, 584.

the flagship, the Confederate officers signed the articles of capitulation, which called for unconditional surrender.⁶⁰

Butler and a small force, together with Colonel Weber and his troops, who by this time had surrounded Hatteras, formally took the surrender of the fort. Disembarked from the transports now anchored in the sound, the Federal troops marched into the bastion and raised the Union flag. To celebrate the victory, Butler and his men set about to fire a thirteen-gun salute. At the order "fire" the guns sputtered and then fizzled, and, due to the strong wind, the men standing a few yards away instantly became covered with kernels of unburned powder.⁶¹

About 600 Confederates were herded on board the *Adelaide* along with their wounded. Southern casualties were seven dead and thirty wounded.⁶² When the prisoners were on board the *Adelaide*, "the call for water was universal," reported one crew member,

and their thirst appeared unquenchable. . . . The prisoners said they had had no water fit to drink since they had been in the Fort. They were perfectly exhausted, and could lie down anywhere for a nap.⁶³

Upon examination of the redoubt, it was discovered that the enemy's armament was deficient, not because of its grade, but for "the utter worthlessness of the powder used."⁶⁴ Surrendered were 650 stands of small arms, twenty-five cannon in and around the fort, tents for 650 men, a supply of onions, bread, and coffee, a brig containing a quantity of cotton, two schooners, and whiskey, which, said a pious Boston reporter, "was the most dangerous enemy our troops were called upon to meet."⁶⁵

The only damage to the Union force was the *Harriet Lane*, still aground in the inlet. The crew endeavored to float her; ammunition, stores, provisions, spars, coal, and 32-pounders were jettisoned. Men, boats, and equipment were rushed from

⁶⁰ Articles of Capitulation, August 29, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 120.

⁶¹ Butler's testimony, January 15, 1862, "Report of the Point Committee on the Conduct of the War," *Senate Report*, No. 108, pt. iii, 37 Cong., 3 sess. (Washington, 1863), 284.

⁶² For Confederate casualties, see King to Stellwagen, Hampton Roads, August 31, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 128-129.

⁶³ *Public Ledger* (Philadelphia), September 3, 1861.

⁶⁴ *Boston Journal*, n. d., Moore, *The Republican Record*, III, 22; and Butler's testimony, January 15, 1862, "Report of the Joint Committee . . .," *Senate Report*, No. 108, pt. iii, 37 Cong., 3 sess., 284.

⁶⁵ *Boston Journal*, n. d., Moore, *The Republican Record*, III, 22.

the other ships in the squadron. On board the grounded vessel, all hands were kept busy throughout the night, but to no avail.⁶⁶

Late the same evening, Butler and Stringham met in the commodore's cabin. Their orders had been explicit. The Federal forces were to level the forts, block the channel, and return. However, the General recognized that Hatteras would be invaluable as a depot for the blockading squadron, as a safe refuge in all weathers for the coasting trade, and as a staging area for future operations against North Carolina and Virginia.⁶⁷ Orders, therefore, were disobeyed: the forts were not levelled, nor the channel blocked.

To hold the inlet, troops and a naval force consisting of the *Monticello*, *Pawnee*, *Susquehanna*, and the grounded *Harriet Lane* remained behind. The following day, August 30, 1861, the squadron headed northward and Butler arrived in Washington late the same night. On September 5, Secretary of War Simon Cameron dispatched the following message to Wool:

The position at Cape Hatteras must be held, and you will adopt such measures, in connection with the Navy Department, as may be necessary to effect the object.⁶⁸

The seizure of Hatteras was successful because of the squadron's accurate fire with its smothering effect on the forts. The most notable flaw in the execution of the maneuver was the lack of organization. Faulty intelligence may have been responsible for the singular lack of foresight displayed in landing troops through the breakers. If the planning had been thorough or Union leaders more aggressive, thrusts at neighboring Confederate cities might have created considerable havoc. Instead of "wasting time in speechifying," censured the *Philadelphia Public Ledger*, Stringham and Butler should have followed up their blows.⁶⁹ A Confederate naval officer confided that the enemy erred in not taking possession of the sounds immediately after capturing Hatteras—"there was nothing to prevent it..."⁷⁰ Had there been more troops, more light draft vessels which could easily navigate through the sounds, a carefully elaborated and

⁶⁶ Faunce to Stringham, Hampton Roads, September 6, 1861, *NOR*, VI, 129-131.

⁶⁷ Butler to Wool, on board the *Minnesota*, off Hatteras Inlet, August 30, 1861, *AOR*, IV, 584-585.

⁶⁸ Cameron to Wool, Washington, September 5, 1861, *AOR*, IV, 606.

⁶⁹ *Public Ledger* (Philadelphia), September 6, 1861.

⁷⁰ Parker, *Recollections of a Naval Officer*, 215.

aggressive plan of attack, the Hatteras expedition could have pushed into North Carolina, as Federal troops did a year later.

Credit for the initial success of the expedition must be given to the Federal Navy—unaided, the squadron gained the immediate objective. Confederate officers refused to surrender to the Army, but insisted, since it was a naval victory, the articles of capitulation be drawn up jointly between Union army and naval officers. Although the Army played a secondary part in the attack, it was essential to hold what had been won. The wisdom of the decision to garrison the island became evident in 1862, when Hatteras became the staging area for the successful army-navy expedition against Roanoke Island. Lessons learned during the Hatteras attack no doubt aided future combined expeditions against Port Royal, Roanoke Island, New Orleans, Mobile Bay, and Fort Fisher.

The capture of forts Hatteras and Clark was a timely victory for the Union. Coming soon after the disaster at Bull Run, it bolstered northern morale. The effect of the victory in New York, a columnist declared, "contributes to the cheerful feeling that prevails, by encouraging hope that the tide of victory is now turned from the rebels to the Union arms."⁷¹ In Washington, the Hatteras success strengthened the position of the Navy Department. Merchants and insurance officers of New York posted a congratulatory letter to Commodore Stringham, expressing their gratitude for the breakup of the Hatteras privateers.⁷² The victory "has gilded the weathercocks of the Navy Department. . .," observed a foreign correspondent.⁷³ "It gives us the advantage . . . of our navy, from which we have hitherto derived no benefit commensurate with its cost or its power," noted one Union newspaper.⁷⁴ Not only did the expedition quicken northern morale and gain prestige for the department, but it caused alarm in North Carolina and dejection throughout most of the South. According to Chief Engineer Thompson, North Carolina had relied upon its fortifications at the island, and, when these installations gave way, residents thought the whole thing was gone.⁷⁵ The Union Navy's timing had caught the southern coastal defenses, at least

⁷¹ New York columnist quoted in *Public Ledger* (Philadelphia), September 2, 1861.

⁷² *Public Ledger* (Philadelphia), September 4, 1861.

⁷³ *The Times* (London), September 23, 1861. Also see September 16, 1861.

⁷⁴ *Public Ledger* (Philadelphia), September 2, 1861.

⁷⁵ Butler's testimony, January 15, 1862, "Report of the Joint Committee . . .," *Senate Report*, No. 108, pt. iii, 37 Cong., 3 sess., 288.

at Hatteras, unprepared. The officers and men at the fort had gone about their daily affairs, satisfied with the success of the privateers, and had been unconcerned with strengthening the defenses.

Another important result of the victory was that the Navy's objectives, as outlined in 1861—to blockade the rebellious ports, to attack coastal strongholds, to choke privateer activity—were indeed fulfilled in the combined assault upon Hatteras Inlet. The rendezvous area quashed, Confederate marauders from Hatteras no longer preyed upon Union cargo ships plying the coast of North Carolina. Fortifications at another outlet, Ocracoke, were captured without a struggle in late September, 1861, by blue-jackets sent from Fort Hatteras. Two months later, schooners loaded with stone were sunk at Ocracoke, closing this outlet completely to Confederate commerce and raiders. These successful operations completed, the Union blockade, so important to the ultimate Union victory, was considerably strengthened.

PAPER MANUFACTURING IN SOUTH CAROLINA BEFORE THE CIVIL WAR

BY ERNEST M. LANDER, JR.

At the time that Dr. Charles Herty made his discoveries for manufacturing paper from southern pines very few paper mills were to be found in the Southeast and none in South Carolina. Yet long before the Civil War a small paper manufacturing industry sprang up in South Carolina, and between 1806 and 1860 at least nine mills were erected within the state, four by one company. However, during the Civil War and the years immediately following the industry disappeared entirely.

George Waring, of Columbia, constructed the first paper mill in the state and in November, 1806, announced that it would be in operation within a few weeks. He asserted that the success of "this expensive experiment" depended greatly on public aid in preserving old rags, which he would gladly purchase.¹ In partnership with his brother Benjamin he operated the factory until sometime after the War of 1812. Although the brothers carried on a rather extensive trade with Waring and Hayne, Charleston factors, nothing is known of the size of the establishment, the labor force employed, or the productivity of the mill.²

The second paper mill in South Carolina was likewise established near Columbia. J. J. Faust and Company, printers and publishers, constructed it on the banks of the Broad River within two miles of the town and started operations in January, 1827. Local newspapers immediately began to use the factory's newsprint, labeled by one editor as "excellent." He said that the proprietors intended to expand the facilities of the mill and produce a finer grade of paper.³ However, J. J. Faust and Company did not retain ownership of the establishment for long. Within a year James J. B. White, William A. Bricknell, and John B. White had secured control. They decided to renovate the plant and re-equip it with more up-to-date machinery. In February,

¹ *The South Carolina State Gazette and Columbian Advertiser* (Columbia), November 15, 1806.

² George Waring Papers, in possession of Dr. J. I. Waring, Charleston, S. C. A directory of business firms in Columbia listed the mill as late as May 14, 1816. *The Telescope* (Columbia). Benjamin Waring, a large planter, also operated a tanyard and had been a partner in the ill-fated cotton mill venture at Stateburg, 1790-1795. *Charleston Courier*, February 26, 1845; Joseph Johnson, *Traditions and Reminiscences Chiefly of the American Revolution in the South . . .* (Charleston, S. C., 1851), 196.

³ *South-Carolina State Gazette and Columbia Advertiser* (Columbia), April 28, 1827.

1831, with apologies to the public for delays and inconveniences caused, they announced it to be in "complete order and full operation." Their labor force consisted of "a number of" white journeymen and black slaves.⁴ Unfortunately, their efforts came to nought, for less than a year later fire destroyed the mill with all its new equipment at a loss of nearly \$10,000. Having no insurance, the partners made no attempt to rebuild the factory; consequently, their remaining outbuildings and workers' accommodations, costing another \$10,000, became practically a dead loss.⁵

In 1834 Andrew Patterson, a so-called "wealthy and persevering" paper manufacturer from Tennessee, purchased the site of Adam Carruth's old armory six miles below Greenville and announced that he would have a paper mill in operation within twelve months. He was overly optimistic in his forecast, for the factory did not turn out its first paper until August, 1836. In the meantime, James A. Patterson joined him in the venture. By 1840 the factory was employing thirty workers and annually producing \$20,000 worth of paper products. Although seemingly prosperous the Pattersons soon lost control of the property when their creditors, including Benajah Dunham, filed suit against them for over \$12,000. After considerable litigation the sheriff in February, 1842, sold the paper mill under the hammer. Dunham bought the property for only \$3,300.⁶

Benajah Dunham, sometime mayor of Greenville, decided to embark upon paper manufacturing on a large scale. In 1846 he secured a charter from the state legislature incorporating the Greenville Manufacturing Company with an authorized capital of \$50,000, and a year later a visitor reported that Dunham had one twenty-horsepower mill in operation making coarse paper, while at the same time "rebuilding" a larger one of thirty horsepower for manufacturing finer grades. A sawmill, a woodworking shop, and a blacksmith shop were connected with the establishment.⁷ Both paper mills were wooden structures, the larger

⁴ *Southern Times & State Gazette* (Columbia), February 23, 1831. In 1829 White, Bricknell, and White petitioned the General Assembly to relieve their workmen of road, patrol, and militia duty, all of which greatly hampered the efficient operation of the mill. They maintained that their establishment was of considerable benefit in keeping money at home that formerly went north for paper. MSS File—"Public Improvements: Manufacturing," South Carolina Historical Commission, Columbia

⁵ *Charleston Courier*, January 10, 1832.

⁶ *Sixth Census of the United States, 1840, Statistics* (Washington, 1841), 199; *Charleston Courier*, January 17, 1834, September 9, 1836; Greenville County, Deed Book V, 255-257.

⁷ *Statutes at Large of South Carolina* (12 volumes, Columbia, S. C., 1836-1874), XI, 426-27; *Charleston Courier*, October 15, 1847.

one being a four-story building.⁸ Another account stated that most of Dunham's papermakers and skilled mechanics were his own slaves.⁹

On February 10, 1849, Dunham suffered a severe setback when fire destroyed both paper mills, about 20,000 pounds of rags, and \$2,000 worth of paper. His total loss was at least \$20,000. Although he had no insurance, he immediately rebuilt a paper mill and the following year sold it with his tin manufactory for \$20,000 to the reorganized Greenville Manufacturing Company. Dunham took stock as payment and was elected president of the concern. His nephew James B. Sherman was named secretary-treasurer and Greenville agent for the factory. The corporation soon had two paper mills in operation again.¹⁰

On the Reedy River, a mile below Dunham's establishment, Vardry McBee in 1844 installed paper manufacturing machinery under the same roof with his cotton mill. By the end of the decade his factory, valued at \$10,000, was as productive as Dunham's. Each turned out 120,000 pounds of paper annually, McBee using fifteen workers and Dunham nineteen.¹¹

In 1849 a group of entrepreneurs, including several prominent Charleston businessmen, organized and procured from the General Assembly a charter for the South Carolina Paper Manufacturing Company. It was to be capitalized at \$20,000 with the privilege of extending its stock to \$60,000. Five years later the legislature amended the charter to permit the company to increase its capital stock to \$150,000.¹² The stockholders selected for their president Ker Boyce, a Charleston capitalist who was also a large investor in the Graniteville Manufacturing Company and one of the richest men in the state. Joseph Walker was named secretary-treasurer and agent in Charleston, and Sumner Brown, "a gentleman of large experience in the business" from Connecticut, was hired as superintendent.¹³

⁸ *The Spartan* (Spartanburg), February 13, 1849.

⁹ *The Southern Patriot* (Greenville), May 30, 1851.

¹⁰ *The Spartan* (Spartanburg), February 13, 1849; *The Southern Patriot* (Greenville), June 17, 1852; Greenville County, Deed Book W, 332. Dunham's will in 1853 showed that he had owned \$20,000 worth of stock in the company, \$5,000 worth of which was sold to Sherman. Greenville County, Wills, Apt. 13, No. 130.

¹¹ *Charleston Courier*, September 9, 1844, October 15, 1847; MS, Census 1850, Products of Industry, South Carolina: Greenville District, South Carolina Historical Commission.

¹² *Statutes at Large of South Carolina*, XI, 559-60; XII, 321.

¹³ *Charleston Courier*, February 12, 1851; *The Spartan* (Spartanburg), February 27, 1851. At the time of his death in 1854 Boyce owned \$15,000 worth of stock in the company and was probably the largest shareholder. His entire estate was valued at well above \$1,000,000. MS, Account of the Division of Ker Boyce's Estate, James Petigru Boyce Papers, Library of Congress. Other associates included Benjamin C. Pressley, Etsell L. Adams, A. V. Dawson, and James Purvis. Petition for incorporation by the South Carolina Paper Manufacturing Company, 1849, MSS File—"Pub. Imp.: Mfg.," South Carolina Historical Commission.

The South Carolina Paper Manufacturing Company located its plant on Horse Creek a few miles below Graniteville and within 100 feet of the South Carolina Railroad. Superintendent Brown contracted with Goddard, Rice and Company, Worcester, Massachusetts, to furnish more than \$10,000 worth of the latest type of machinery, and in February, 1852, Walker notified the machinists that the buildings were ready for the installation of the equipment.¹⁴

The establishment consisted of a large two-story brick building, 250 by 50 feet, with a one-story wing, 40 by 40, a stockhouse, 90 by 40, a depot, 60 by 30, and a number of cottages for the workers. The canal, running parallel with the railroad, was one-half mile long. The water it supplied turned five wheels, but that was still insufficient power for the machinery, and a small stationary steam engine was used as an auxiliary. The labor force consisted of about fifty employees, of whom one-half were women and girls and a dozen were slaves.¹⁵

The Bath Paper Mills, as the establishment became known after 1858, was the largest factory of its type in the South on the eve of the Civil War. Its capital investment was \$100,000 and it annually manufactured 900,000 pounds of paper valued at \$81,000.¹⁶

One other paper mill was established in the state before 1860. Philip C. Lester, a Greenville cotton manufacturer, in February, 1853, entered into a partnership with Thomas L. and P. T. Fowler to erect a plant on Rocky Creek in Greenville District. It was to be situated near his cotton factory. Each partner was to put up \$600 cash to be used for purchasing machinery when needed, but Lester was to retain title to the land until all debts had been extinguished.¹⁷

South Carolina paper mills turned out a variety of products, all of which generally received praise from the local press. The

¹⁴ Goddard, Rice and Company to Joseph Walker, December 10, 1851; Joseph Walker to J. H. Hayden, March 12, 1852, Hayden Family Papers, Library of Congress.

¹⁵ *Camden Weekly Journal*, March 8, 1853; *Charleston Daily Courier*, February 11, 1860.

¹⁶ *Eighth Census of the United States*, 1860, *Manufactures* (Washington, 1865), 554.

¹⁷ Greenville County, Deed Book X, 59-60. It should be noted that South Carolina counties were known as "districts" until 1868. Several other paper mills were projected from time to time, but none apparently began operations. In 1824 William Campbell, of Yorkville, formed a partnership with Thomas Falls, of Tennessee, to erect a paper mill in York District. *Pioneer and Yorkville Advertiser*, February 7, 1824. Ten years later a company was organized to build one near Vaucluse cotton factory in Edgefield District. The buildings, so it was reported, had been constructed and an agent sent north to buy the machinery. *Niles' Weekly Register*, XLVI (August 2, 1834), 384. In 1847 a partnership was reported to have been formed in Columbia for the same purpose. *The South Carolinian* (Columbia), June 1, 1847. Three years later the Hamburg Paper Mills was incorporated by the General Assembly. *Statutes at Large of South Carolina*, XII, 38-39.

Warings sent newsprint and wrapping paper to Charleston. White, Bricknell, and White produced newsprint, wrapping paper, and pasteboard. Dunham's agent in Columbia listed wrapping paper, brown and blue yarn paper, heavy bag paper, yellow envelope paper, and apothecaries blue paper. The South Carolina Paper Manufacturing Company turned out book paper, newsprint, and manila wrapping paper. This company advertised: "No pains or expense has been spared to render it equal to the best Northern mills, all the latest and most approved machinery having been introduced into the same."¹⁸

A correspondent who visited McBee's and Dunham's mills in Greenville District reported that they manufactured all qualities of paper from "the finest Letter Sheet to the common brown Wrappers and all sizes and colours."¹⁹ The *Greenville Mountaineer* called McBee's paper "a most excellent article and would do credit to any manufactory in the United States."²⁰ At one time when McBee's factory temporarily ceased operations the editor of the *Laurensville Herald* apologized to his readers for the poor quality of paper he had to use as a substitute. He proclaimed McBee's paper to be "far superior" to any he had procured previously.²¹

In the technique of manufacturing, as employed by McBee and Dunham, women and children first sorted the best rags for separate processing. The rags next passed through a wire sieve duster and into a boiling vat of strong lime water. After this an engine cut them into small pieces, and the rags went through another boiling, which included bleaching and dyeing. A machine and a mangling tub reduced the mass to pulp of the proper consistency to make paper. A stream of water then washed it down a trough against a revolving cylinder of fine wire which picked up the pulp and passed it onto a piece of woolen cloth brushing against the other side of the cylinder. The cloth with the pulp passed over two or three steam-heated cylinders which dried the pulp, thus making paper.²²

All the paper factories found a market for a considerable por-

¹⁸ George Waring to Waring and Hayne, November 30, 1809, January 13, 1810, George Waring Papers; *South-Carolina State Gazette and Columbia Advertiser* (Columbia), June 28, 1828; *The Daily Telegraph* (Columbia), February 3, 1848; *Charleston Daily Courier*, March 25, 1853.

¹⁹ *Charleston Courier*, September 9, 1850.

²⁰ May 2, 1845.

²¹ October 6, 1854.

²² *Charleston Courier*, October 5, 1849, September 9, 1850.

tion of their products within their home state. As already seen, the Warings sent much of their paper to Charleston. J. J. Faust and Company and its successors, White, Bricknell, and White, supplied newsprint for newspapers in the Columbia area and sent its products as far into the back country as Yorkville.²³ McBee boasted of numerous clients among the piedmont newspapers, and Joseph Walker was his agent in Charleston before the South Carolina Paper Manufacturing Company was organized.²⁴ Dunham shipped his paper either to Columbia or Augusta.²⁵

When the South Carolina Paper Manufacturing Company began operations with its output of 3,000 pounds of paper per day, it spread its sales to Augusta, Charleston, Savannah, and even as far away as New Orleans and Nashville.²⁶ The rapidity with which it could fill a large order was reported by the *Daily Courier*, September 11, 1858. On Saturday, September 4, the Charleston agent received notice of a ship sailing for New Orleans. He telegraphed the mill's manager in Augusta, and the latter sent down shipments nightly on the express freight train to Charleston. Up to Friday morning, September 10, nearly 600 reams of large printing paper valued between \$2,500 and \$3,000 had been delivered aboard the vessel.

For a time during the late forties and early fifties the South Carolina mills appeared to be unable to meet the demand. The *Carolina Times*, a Columbia paper, on one occasion found that it would have to wait for two months before it could obtain any newsprint from Joseph Walker, the agent for the South Carolina Paper Manufacturing Company. Its editor turned to an agent for one of the Greenville mills—probably Dunham's—and was informed that a commission merchant from the north had engaged all that the mill could manufacture in the next year. He finally had to purchase paper from outside the state.²⁷

One of the major problems the paper mill proprietors faced

²³ *Pioneer & South-Carolina Whig* (Yorkville), December 18, 1830. J. J. Faust received encouragement from the *Camden Journal*, May 12, 1827; but the *Pendleton Messenger*, November 7, 1827, explained that infrequent intercourse between Pendleton and Columbia forced it to buy its paper from Philadelphia. It was sent by water up the Savannah River.

²⁴ *Charleston Courier*, September 9, 1850. Among the newspapers that patronized McBee were the *Laurensville Herald*, October 6, 1854; *The Spartan* (Spartanburg), February 13, 1849; the *Greenville Mountaineer*, May 2, 1845; and *The Southern Patriot* (Greenville), February 28, 1851.

²⁵ *Charleston Courier*, September 9, 1850. Dunham's Columbia agent advertised 500 reams of his paper in *The Daily Telegraph* (Columbia), October 20, 1847.

²⁶ *Charleston Daily Courier*, February 11, 1860.

²⁷ Cited in *Charleston Daily Courier*, March 3, 1854.

from first to last was that of procuring rags. George Waring experienced some such difficulty. He advertised for rags, offering from \$1.00 per hundredweight for old woolen rags up to \$5.00 for clean linen rags.²⁸ To his kinsman Richard Waring in Charleston he wrote: "Let me know if it would be convenient for you to purchase or receive old Rags and send up here by Boat, I would always endeavor to have money in your hands for that purpose and allow you ten per cent on the cost of the Rags." That method apparently became standard procedure for obtaining raw materials. Several years later Waring wrote Waring and Hayne: ". . . the proceeds of the Paper, I wish to remain in your hands, for the purpose of paying for Rags, which you will do when you meet with any person who will deliver them on board of the Boat well packed, none will answer but clean Cotton or linen Rags, and I think best to be packed in Boxes."²⁹

Benajah Dunham's agents collected rags for him whenever they could procure them. He also sold paper in August for tin plate, which he manufactured into finished products in his tin manufactory. These in turn he sold in his store to local citizens for rags. Another source of raw materials for Dunham, as well as the other Greenville paper manufacturers, was through the Tennessee wagon trade, which brought in high quality flaxen rags to exchange for cotton yarn.³⁰ Besides these sources some of the mills purchased cotton waste from nearby textile mills. Even so, it was frequently difficult to obtain enough raw material to keep in full operation, and on one occasion McBee closed his factory for that reason. The scarcity of raw material may have been the prime factor in causing him to stop altogether in 1858 and offer his machinery for sale.³¹

All the South Carolina paper mills went through a period of reorganization just prior to the Civil War. How many, if any, could attribute their financial troubles to the panic of 1857 cannot be determined. William Gregg, the well-known cotton manufacturer, said in 1860 that they suffered from the lack of

²⁸ *The South Carolina State Gazette and Columbian Advertiser* (Columbia), November 15, 1806.

²⁹ November 12, 1806, January 13, 1810, George Waring Papers. J. J. Faust and Company offered to pay \$3.50 per hundredweight for all linen, cotton, and hemp rags or old sail cloth, *South-Carolina State Gazette and Columbia Advertiser* (Columbia), April 7, 1827.

³⁰ *The Southern Patriot* (Greenville), May 30, 1851; *Charleston Courier*, October 15 1847.

³¹ *Laurensville Herald*, October 6, 1854, January 29, 1858. The South Carolina Paper Manufacturing Company advertised widely for rags. Part of its raw material was waste from the nearby Vaucluse cotton factory. *Camden Weekly Journal*, July 11, 1854; MSS, Letterbooks, J. J. Gregg and Company, I, 326, South Caroliniana Library, Columbia.

home patronage. For that reason the South Carolina Paper Manufacturing Company "lost its first capital," as he put it.³² Be that as it may, in 1858 the company leased its plant for several years to John G. Winter, George W. Winter, and John McKinney, who operated it under a charter of their own: Bath Paper Mills Company.³³

When Philip Lester's partnership with the Fowlers expired in 1858, their mill had earned insufficient profits to reduce the indebtedness of the enterprise. Thereupon, all three owners agreed that the property should remain in Lester's hands. With the aid of his three sons Lester continued to run the factory, listed in 1860 as having a capital investment of \$8,000 and employing nine workers.³⁴

Benajah Dunham's establishment continued operations after his death in 1853, but under the name of J. B. Sherman and Company. However, its financial structure was insecure due to the fact that it was indebted to a considerable amount to Dunham's estate. In 1857 his executors brought suit against the company and forced it into bankruptcy. For a mere \$3,655 it was sold to two buyers who declared their intention of discontinuing paper making, but a few months later Robert Greenfield purchased the factory and resumed the business of manufacturing paper.³⁵

In sum, South Carolina had three paper mills in operation on the eve of the sectional conflict: the Bath Paper Mills, Greenfield's, and Lester's. They were capitalized at \$111,000, employed fifty-seven workers, and annually produced paper worth almost \$100,000. For the states destined to secede Virginia led in the number of mills and in the value of annual production with nine and \$270,000, respectively. North Carolina, Georgia, and South Carolina followed in the order given. In view of the production of the northern mills the South's output was negligible, for New York alone had 126 mills, and the total for the United States was 555, whose yearly production amounted to over \$21,000,000 worth of paper.³⁶

³² William Gregg, "Southern Patronage to Southern Imports and Southern Industry," *DeBow's Review*, XXIX (August, 1860), 230.

³³ *Charleston Daily Courier*, March 3, 1858; December, 1858; *Statutes at Large of South Carolina*, XII, 599-600.

³⁴ Greenville County, Deed Book Y, 661-66, 669; MS, Census 1860, Products of Industry, South Carolina: Greenville District.

³⁵ *Charleston Daily Courier*, September 28, November 9, 1857; *Keowee Courier* (Pickens), July 3, 1858.

³⁶ *Eighth Census*, 1860, *Manufactures*, cxxxii.

PAPERS FROM THE FIFTY-FIRST ANNUAL SESSION
OF THE STATE LITERARY AND HISTORICAL
ASSOCIATION, RALEIGH, DECEMBER, 1951

INTRODUCTION

BY CHRISTOPHER CRITTENDEN

The fifty-first annual session of the State Literary and Historical Association was held at the Hotel Sir Walter in Raleigh, Friday, December 7, 1951. Meeting concurrently with the Association were the North Carolina Folklore Society, the North Carolina State Art Society, the North Carolina Society for the Preservation of Antiquities, the North Carolina Society of County and Local Historians, and the Roanoke Island Historical Association. At the morning meeting of the Association, with President Robert Lee Humber of Greenville presiding, the following papers were read: "Old Brunswick, the Story of a Colonial Town," by E. Lawrence Lee, Jr., of Chapel Hill; "How it Feels to be a Writer," by Mrs. Frances Gray Patton of Durham; and "North Carolina Non-Fiction Works for 1951," by Frontis W. Johnston of Davidson. At the business session which followed, the Association voted, among other things, to raise the dues from \$2 to \$3 per year so that all members might receive copies of *The North Carolina Historical Review*.

At the evening meeting President Humber presided and delivered an address and Associate Justice S. J. Ervin, Jr., governor of the Society of Mayflower Descendants in North Carolina, announced that the annual Mayflower Cup award had been made to Jonathan Daniels of Raleigh for his book, *The Man of Independence*. The meeting was brought to a close by an address, "Unsolved Mysteries in the Life of George Washington," by Douglas Southall Freeman of Richmond, Virginia.

Two of these papers are included in the pages that follow, and it is believed that they will be read with interest both by those who did not have the opportunity to hear them in the first instance and also by those who, though they were present when the papers were delivered, will nevertheless enjoy the opportunity to refresh their memories as to what was said. In some cases

the editors have made certain revisions and the usual editing has been done, but in no instance has the original meaning been materially altered.

OLD BRUNSWICK, THE STORY OF A COLONIAL TOWN

BY E. LAWRENCE LEE, JR.

A visitor to the mouth of the Cape Fear River in early 1725 would have found an uninhabited wilderness. No white man lived within 100 miles,¹ and even the Indians who had once lived there were gone.² Other than the sea, only a trader's footpath connected the region with the outside world.³ The visitor might have chanced upon the ruins of former habitations, which would have been the remains of earlier efforts of the English to settle there.

In the 1660's several groups attempted to establish a settlement along the river. Apparently these ventures were ill-planned and resulted in much suffering and hardship. In 1667 the Cape Fear was abandoned, and the Lords Proprietors, to whom Charles II of England had granted the Carolinas in 1663, shifted their interest to other parts of their vast holdings. The infant settlement of Albemarle in northeastern North Carolina was encouraged by them, and to the south, at the confluence of the Ashley and Cooper rivers, Charles Town was founded. In order to concentrate population in these two areas, the Proprietors prohibited settlement within twenty miles of the Cape Fear River.⁴

From the opening of the 18th century, however, circumstances were developing which were to turn the eyes of Englishmen again to the Cape Fear. England, as a maritime nation, was dependent upon a constant supply of naval stores, which for years she had obtained from the Scandinavian nations. During Queen Anne's War, difficulties were encountered in obtaining these supplies, and she turned to her American colonies as a more dependable source. The colonial producers were granted bounties to offset the advantages of experience and shorter hauling distances enjoyed by the Scandinavian states. At first it was expected that American production would center in New England, but the milder climate and longer growing season of the South caused attention to shift to that section.⁵

¹ W. L. Saunders (ed.), *The Colonial Records of North Carolina* (Raleigh: P. M. Hale, 1886; Josephus Daniels, 1887-1890), III, 436. Hereinafter cited as *C. R.*

² Chapman J. Milling, *Red Carolinians* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1940), 226.

³ Joseph W. Barnwell, "The Second Tuscarora Expedition," *The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, X (January, 1909), no. 1, map facing 32.

⁴ *C. R.*, II, 118.

⁵ Justin Williams, "English Mercantilism and Carolina Naval Stores, 1705-1776," *The Journal of Southern History*, I (May, 1935), no. 2, 169-185.

The Cape Fear region was ideally suited to the production of naval stores in the form of pitch, tar and turpentine. Vast acres of pine trees provided the raw material, and a network of navigable streams, with the Cape Fear as the main artery, made the exploitation of these resources possible.

Among the far-sighted men who saw the potentialities of the region were George Burrington and Maurice Moore. Burrington came to North Carolina as governor in January, 1724, and before the end of three months he had arbitrarily lifted the Proprietors' ban against settlement on the Cape Fear.⁶ The following winter he went there at the head of several exploratory parties which sounded the river inlet and channel and otherwise prepared the way for occupancy.⁷

With the physical and legal impediments to colonization removed, the settlers entered with Maurice Moore in the lead. Moore was a member of a wealthy and influential South Carolina family who came to North Carolina in 1713 to assist in putting down the Indian insurrection. He remained and married the daughter of Alexander Lillington, and through this union became connected with many of the most prominent families in North Carolina.⁸ Because of his connections in both provinces he was able to influence a number of people to settle on the Cape Fear. Among those who came from South Carolina were his brothers, Roger and Nathaniel Moore, and Eleazar Allen and William Dry. From the Albemarle section came Edward Moseley, John Porter, John Baptista Ashe, Cornelius Harnett, the Elder, and others.⁹ Unlike the usual frontier immigrant, these men were not the poor and downtrodden, seeking relief from oppression. On the contrary many of them were men who had attained wealth and influence in their former homes and were seeking new opportunities to increase their economic and political well-being. They came with slaves and other property, and, beginning with the first recorded grants on June 3, 1725,¹⁰ acquired vast landholdings. Not only did they secure large quantities of land, but they chose

⁶ *C. R.*, II, 529.

⁷ *C. R.*, III, 138, 259, 434-435, 436.

⁸ Samuel A. Ashe (ed.), *Biographical History of North Carolina, From Colonial Times to the Present* (Greensboro, N. C.: Charles L. Van Noppen, 1905), II, 294; *North Carolina Land Grants* (office of the Secretary of State, Raleigh), I, 273.

⁹ Mabel L. Webber, "The First Governor Moore and His Children," *The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, XXXVII (January, 1936), no. 1, 17-19; "Documentary History of Wilmington—No. 1," *The North Carolina University Magazine*, V (August, 1856), no. 6, 244; *C. R.*, III, 338.

¹⁰ *New Hanover County Registry Records*, E, 242; *Land Grants*, II, 263, 272-273.

the best locations along the navigable streams.¹¹ The small landowner was not excluded, but he was discouraged from entering, and so the lower Cape Fear from the beginning became a region of large plantations, with an economy based not on agriculture, but on the pine forests with naval stores as the principal products.

In this growing settlement it was natural that the need of a commercial center would arise. Maurice Moore anticipated this need and the result of his foresight was the town of Brunswick. For this village Moore chose a location on the west bank of the river about fifteen miles above its mouth and approximately the same distance below the point where the stream divided into two branches. While the forks offered certain advantages as a location, Moore's decision was influenced by the fact that a shoal in the river, called the "Flats," several miles above his chosen site, blocked the passage of all but small craft.¹² Naval stores were bulky and could be shipped economically only in large vessels. Brunswick was located in order that such ships might be accommodated.

The village was situated on an elevated platform which offered a sweeping view of the river. The soil was sandy, but a good clay sub-soil provided a firm foundation. The location was generally level, though here and there were depressed beds of the small streams which drained the area. A slight indentation in the shore line offered some protection for shipping, and the depth of the channel at that point permitted vessels to anchor within a short distance of shore.

Lots were laid off and on June 30, 1726, the first property transaction in the village occurred when Moore contracted to sell two of these lots to Cornelius Harnett, the father of the Revolutionary hero of the same name.¹³ In the following year, Harnett, a tavern keeper, obtained a license to operate a ferry from Brunswick to the east side of the river.¹⁴ This ferry was a link on the only road connecting the northern colonies with South Carolina.

¹¹ *C. R.*, III, 254.

¹² Hugh Meredith, *An Account of the Cape Fear Country, 1731*, edited by Earl Gregg Swam (Perth Amboy, N. J.: Charles F. Heartman, 1922), 15-16; Evangeline W. and Charles M. Andrews (eds.), *Journal of A Lady of Quality* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1921), 282.

¹³ New Hanover County Registry Records, AB, 71.

¹⁴ *C. R.*, II, 698.

The village grew slowly, but by 1729 was of sufficient importance to be designated as the seat of government of New Hanover Precinct which was established in that year. Though the town was not provided with a system of municipal government, it was stipulated that a courthouse be built there, and that the precinct courts be held there, as well as all public and church elections.¹⁵

With this the village became the commercial and political center of the new settlement, but it was not long before a rival community began to develop a few miles upstream. The village of Newton had its beginning about 1733¹⁶ when a few traders settled on the east bank of the river near the confluence of the northeast and northwest branches. This was a natural development. In early America there were few roads, and those that did exist were inferior and often impassable. Water transportation went far to offset this deficiency, and all who could settled on or near navigable streams. The Cape Fear, with its many tributaries, served as a network of water highways and the point where the two branches of the river met was the logical trading place for the people who settled along these streams. Though large vessels could not proceed that far upriver, ships from the other North American colonies and from the West Indies could, and so it was as the center of local trade that Newton began and grew.

As time passed a bitter rivalry developed between the promoters of the two communities, but the die was cast in favor of the Newton faction when Gabriel Johnston arrived in the fall of 1734 to succeed Burrington as governor. Johnston acquired a lot in Newton as well as a tract of land adjoining the village and openly favored its development as opposed to that of Brunswick.¹⁷ The climax of this rivalry came in February, 1740, when Newton was incorporated as Wilmington. As a result of this action the seat of government of New Hanover County was transferred to Wilmington, as were all port officials. From this time on Wilmington was the center of the lower Cape Fear.¹⁸

¹⁵ Walter Clark (ed.), *The State Records of North Carolina* (Winston, N. C.: M. I. and J. C. Stewart, 1895-1896; Goldsboro, N. C.: Nash Brothers, 1898-1906), XXIII, 146-147, (hereinafter cited as *S. R.*); *C. R.*, IV, 486.

¹⁶ Kemp P. Battle (ed.), "Letters and Documents, Relating to the Early History of the Lower Cape Fear," *James Sprunt Historical Monograph No. 4* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1903), 60-61.

¹⁷ Nina Moore Tiffany (ed.), *Letters of James Murray, Loyalist* (Boston, 1901), 36; *S. R.*, XXIII, 133.

¹⁸ *S. R.*, XXIII, 146-149.

It was apparent to many persons whose scope of mind transcended mere political rivalry that this concentration of interest on Wilmington was a narrow policy. To them it was obvious that the continued existence of Brunswick as a deepwater harbor was of vital concern to the whole region. A well-populated port capable of furnishing adequate supplies and protection from enemy raids was the best means by which the entry of large vessels could be assured. The realization of this fact resulted in several steps being taken to encourage the growth of Brunswick.

The port officials who moved to Wilmington in 1740 were transferred back to Brunswick. This meant that all Cape Fear shipping was required to enter and clear at the lower town. In 1745 the General Assembly passed an act which contained provisions to strengthen property titles in the village, to govern its physical appearance, and to control moral conduct within its limits. A commission was appointed to administer the terms of the act, but this was not a municipal governing body in the commonly accepted sense of the term. Instead it was a self-perpetuating body with restricted authority.¹⁹ In 1766 the law was modified to allow the election of the members of this group by the inhabitants, but their powers remained the same. This was the closest the village ever came to attaining local government.²⁰

Other important factors in the political development of the town were the receipt of the right to representation in the lower house of the General Assembly in 1757,²¹ and its designation as the seat of government of Brunswick County upon its establishment in 1764.²² The right of representation was shared with only seven other North Carolina towns, and as a county seat Brunswick again became a political center of some importance.

In view of these conscious efforts to promote the importance of Brunswick, it is interesting to note that the most significant political phase of the town's history came about simply because the royal governors of North Carolina chose to make their home there from 1758 to 1770. North Carolina had no established capital at that time. The General Assembly meetings were held alternately at Wilmington and New Bern, but Brunswick, more

¹⁹ *S. R.*, XXIII, 239-243.

²⁰ *S. R.*, XXIII, 749-750.

²¹ *C. R.*, V, 890; VI, 228-229.

²² *S. R.*, XXIII, 622-627.

than any other place, might be termed the executive capital of the province during that period.

Regardless of Brunswick's political status, its accessibility was its greatest asset and upon this its being rested. The Port of Brunswick, which also included Wilmington, was the largest port in North Carolina. In terms of tonnage about two-thirds of the shipping of the port used the harbor facilities of the town of Brunswick, with the balance going to Wilmington. Though the two towns were separated by only a few miles, there was a wide divergence in the nature of their commerce. Generally speaking, almost all of the shipping from Brunswick went to England, while that of Wilmington was about equally divided between other North American colonies and the British West Indies.²³

As already stated the economic foundation of the Cape Fear was based on the products of the forest which consisted of naval stores, lumber and livestock. This last category is so classified because the pine mast, acorns, and wire grass of the wooded areas furnished the chief source of feed for the animals.²⁴ Contrary to popular opinion, little rice was exported.²⁵ In fact, the region produced little other than the staples noted above, and there seems to have been relatively little land cultivated.

Pitch, tar and turpentine were by far the chief exports. In the years immediately preceding the Revolution, almost half of the American exportations of these products were shipped from the Cape Fear. Almost this entire amount went from Brunswick to England. In the light of this fact and the English dependence on naval stores, it can be seen that the town was one of the strategic harbors of the British American colonies.²⁶

In general, the lesser products were shipped in vessels that could proceed to Wilmington, and, undoubtedly, most of them did so. This assumption is based on the more central location of Wilmington and the fact that it was a bigger town with larger merchants residing there.

The staple products of the Cape Fear furnished cash with which to buy goods produced elsewhere and as a result the

²³ British Public Records Office: Customs 16: I. Photostatic copy in the files of the Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress. (Hereafter cited as B. P. R. O.: Customs 16: I.)

²⁴ William Logan, "Journal of A Journey to Georgia, 1745." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, XXXVI (1912), No. 1, 15; *C. R.*, VIII, 71.

²⁵ [Lord Adam Gordon], "Journal of an Officer's Travels in America and the West Indies, 1764-1765," *Travels in the American Colonies*, edited by Newton D. Mereness (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916), 401; B. P. R. O.: Customs 16: I.

²⁶ B. P. R. O.: Customs 16: I.

Cape Fear always depended on the outside world for such goods as cloth, clothing, furniture, household utensils, hardware, gunpowder and shot, stationery, medical supplies, glass, spices, salt, tobacco, beer, rum, various foods, and numerous other things which served to make the lives of the people more complete and enjoyable. Even hay for livestock was brought in in sizable quantities.²⁷ The lack of domestic manufacturing with its attendant labor population, retarded the growth of Brunswick and of Wilmington as well. This, together with the sparse country population, due to the presence of large plantations, prevented the development of a commercial center on the lower Cape Fear capable of attracting the trade of interior North Carolina. Charleston, with its more favorable prices and better selections of merchandise,²⁸ assumed the role that Brunswick and Wilmington should have had in the colonial period, and that Wilmington might have had in later years.

A significant factor in the lives of the people of Brunswick, and particularly of the mariners who shipped out of that port, was an ever-present fear of the Spaniards. A trade rivalry had long existed between Spain and England, and each nation made frequent attacks on the trade lines of the other. This activity was concentrated in West Indian waters, but the possibility of attack by a strong Spanish garrison stationed at St. Augustine was a constant source of concern to all the southern colonies.²⁹

This rivalry culminated in 1739 with the outbreak of the War of Jenkins' Ear, and until the end of the conflict in 1748, the activities of both belligerents were greatly increased. Naval stores were among the English colonial products most highly prized by the Spaniards, and because of this the shipping of Brunswick suffered to a considerable extent.³⁰

The war was brought home to the people of the town on September 4, 1748, when two Spanish privateers with blazing guns appeared before the town. Four days later the enemy was finally driven away, but only after great property damage had

²⁷ Brunswick Port Records, 1767-1775, kept by William Dry, collector, typewritten manuscript in the Library of the University of North Carolina, from the original in the archives of the North Carolina State Department of Archives and History.

²⁸ Adelaide L. Fries (ed.), *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina, 1752-1822* (Raleigh: North Carolina Historical Commission, 1922-1930, 1941-1943; North Carolina State Department of Archives and History, 1947), I, 356, 377.

²⁹ *Virginia Gazette* (Williamsburg), September 24, 1736; December 31, 1736; March 4, 11, 18, 1737; April 22, 1737; August 19, 1737; March 18, 1738; June 6, 1738. *C. R.*, III, 362-363.

³⁰ *South Carolina Gazette* (Charlestown), October 3, 1741; March 20, 1742.

been done. During this raid a mysterious explosion destroyed one of the privateers and this fortunate incident must be listed with the courage of the defenders as the reasons for the successful expulsion of the Spaniards.³¹ This raid emphasized the exposed position of the town, and doubtless retarded its later growth.

Fort Johnston near the mouth of the river, under construction at the time, offered some future security, but the fear of the Spaniards continued as long as Brunswick existed.³²

According to local tradition the painting, *Ecce Homo*, hanging in the Vestry Room of St. James's Church in Wilmington, was among the objects of value obtained from the Spaniards as a result of their attack. Of greater significance is the fact that a portion of the proceeds from the sale of slaves and other goods obtained at the same time was used to complete the construction of St. Philip's Church in Brunswick, as well as St. James's Church.³³

Religion came to Brunswick with the earliest settlers. John Lapierre, who arrived in the new settlement during the winter of 1727-1728, was the first of an almost continuous line of Anglican ministers who served the people of the town.³⁴ This was the only communion that was ever active there. Though encouraged by sympathetic governors, these men of God were often faced with physical and economic hardships, and, worst of all, the religious apathy of a large segment of the people among whom they worked.³⁵ The walls of old St. Philip's Church stand today as a monument to the labor of these zealous men.

Though James Murray, a resident, mentioned a chapel as being in Brunswick in 1736,³⁶ apparently the first permanent place of worship did not exist until the winter of 1744-1745. This was a small frame chapel, sixteen by twenty-four feet, which was used for divine services on Sundays and as a school during the week. The garret provided living quarters for the minister. This structure continued in use until the completion of St. Philip's Church in 1768.³⁷

On Whit Tuesday, 1768, St. Philip's was dedicated in a solemn

³¹ *South Carolina Gazette* (Charlestown), October 31, 1748.

³² Fries, *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina*, I, 259.

³³ *S. R.*, XXIII, 537.

³⁴ *C. R.*, III, 391, 530, 623-624.

³⁵ *C. R.*, III, 530, 623-624; IV, 227, 621, 755, 791; VI, 730.

³⁶ Tiffany, *Letters of James Murray, Loyalist*, 26.

³⁷ *C. R.* IV, 605, 755; VI, 557, 730.

ceremony conducted by its rector, John Barnett, assisted by the Reverend John Wills of St. James's Church in Wilmington.³⁸ The completion of this church was the culmination of an effort extending back more than a decade. It was an ambitious project and was built at a great cost. In addition to funds derived from the Spanish spoils it was financed by private subscription and by lottery. More than once work on the structure was stopped until additional money could be raised.³⁹

Both governors Dobbs and Tryon encouraged the construction of St. Philip's, often when the outlook seemed darkest. Dobbs expressed his intention of making it the King's Chapel in North Carolina upon its completion and to donate to it the pulpit, Bible, Books of Common Prayer, and a special pew to be used by the governor and his council. In addition he was to furnish the Communion plate which he had been granted upon his appointment to office.⁴⁰ Unfortunately Dobbs died before the construction work was finished, and on March 29, 1765, his remains were interred in the incompleting structure.⁴¹ Tryon not only contributed cash, but also furnished the windows complete with glass.⁴² This latter donation stimulated the final work on the church.

St. Philip's as completed was approximately fifty-five feet wide and seventy-seven feet deep with walls almost three feet thick. The roof was crowned with a small belfry, but other than this the exterior lines were very severe. The interior, with its arched ceiling, was provided with the customary furnishings of an Anglican Church. The building was described by Governor Dobbs as the largest church in the province, and undoubtedly it was one of the fine churches of colonial America.⁴³

As might be expected the town of Brunswick developed in close proximity to its church. As early as June, 1726, Maurice Moore had completed the drawing of the plan of the town, and in 1745 the General Assembly directed that another be prepared.⁴⁴ Unfortunately neither of these plans has been located. However, county records and other sources provide information

³⁸ *C. R.*, VII, 789.

³⁹ *C. R.*, VI, 32-33, 103; *S. R.*, XXIII, 535-537; XXV, 391-392.

⁴⁰ *C. R.*, VI, 235, 237.

⁴¹ *South Carolina Gazette* (Charlestown), April 27, 1765.

⁴² *C. R.*, VII, 164, 515.

⁴³ *C. R.*, VI, 235; VII, 515.

⁴⁴ *S. R.*, XXIII, 239, 240. New Hanover County Registry Records, AB, 71.

which, to some extent, fills this deficiency. A plan based on these fragmentary sources correlates very closely with the map of the town drawn in 1769 by C. J. Sauthier.⁴⁵

As the site of the town Maurice Moore set aside 360 acres. A portion of this area was laid out in half-acre lots and specific areas were reserved for a church, cemetery, market place, courthouse and other public buildings.⁴⁶ The original plan apparently contained 336 lots which, with the streets, would have occupied only about half the allocated acreage. These lots were 82½ feet wide and 264 feet in depth. The city squares were seven lots across and two lots deep. There were twenty-four blocks in all; six along the river and four deep. In later years an additional square was laid off along the river to the north and possibly another to the west of this. The squares were separated by streets. Some of these ran north and south and were connected by others running east and west. About 150 to 200 feet from the river the first street of the town, known as the Street on the Bay or Front Street, ran parallel with the stream. The property between this street and the water generally was transferred with the lot that it fronted. All other streets of the town ran parallel or at right angles to the Street on the Bay. The next street to the west was known as Second Street, but otherwise the names of the streets are not known.

The scope of the town development was never in keeping with these optimistic plans. In the early years lots were sold along the entire waterfront as well as some interior lots chiefly within the first two tiers of blocks. As the years passed, however, the town became concentrated in the upper four squares along the river. The church was on the west side of Second Street just outside this area, and about midway between its northern and southern limits. The courthouse and jail occupied corner lots diagonally across from the church. With a few scattered exceptions the other buildings of the town were located between the church and the river.

The streets of Brunswick were unpaved and did not always conform to the neat pattern planned for them. This gave the village a more irregular appearance than it would have had

⁴⁵ C. J. Sauthier, Plan of the Town and Port of Brunswick, in Brunswick County, North Carolina, surveyed and drawn in April, 1769 (printed, not published).

⁴⁶ S. R., XXIII, 239.

otherwise.⁴⁷ Shade trees on the streets and in the yards and attractive fences around many of the homes provided a picturesque atmosphere.

Unfortunately little is known of the buildings of Brunswick. There always existed a requirement that the houses be a minimum of sixteen feet wide by twenty feet deep.⁴⁸ This regulation seems to have been enforced, though many of the houses appear not to have exceeded this minimum to any great extent. On the other hand, there were several large homes with elaborate gardens. While most of the buildings of the town were residences, there were also at least one tavern, a number of stores, and warehouses, as well as the church, courthouse, and jail.⁴⁹ It is not clear how many houses were frame and how many were brick, but there were some of both. We know the church was brick, but the earlier chapel was frame. The fact that the courthouse was blown down by a storm in 1769 indicates that it was of frame construction.⁵⁰ When the home of William Dry was burned, the shell remained standing and this indicates that it probably was built of brick.⁵¹ These fragmentary bits of evidence, however, tell us too little of the physical aspects of the town.

Population figures for the town are almost non-existent. In 1731 Hugh Meredith, a visitor, reported that Brunswick contained "not above 10 or 12 scattering mean Houses,"⁵² and in 1754 Governor Dobbs wrote that twenty families lived there.⁵³ At the same time he said Wilmington had seventy families.⁵⁴ If his figures are not exact, they at least reflect the relative size of the two towns. In 1773 J. F. D. Smyth, another traveller, reported fifty to sixty houses, but his figure undoubtedly included non-residential buildings.⁵⁵ Sauthier's map of 1769 indicates there were about thirty-five residential buildings. These scattered figures indicate that Brunswick, in the years just prior to the Revolution, contained about 200 white persons and possibly fifty colored persons, or a total population of about 250 people.

As the residents of a shipping and trading center, the people of Brunswick were predominantly engaged, directly or indirectly,

⁴⁷ Andrews, *Journal of A Lady of Quality*, 145.

⁴⁸ S. R., XXIII, 241; New Hanover County Registry Records, AB, 71.

⁴⁹ Logan, "Journal of A Journey to Georgia," 14; C. R., IV, 755; IX, 1239.

⁵⁰ C. R., VIII, 71.

⁵¹ *Virginia Gazette* (Williamsburg), April 5, 1776.

⁵² Meredith, *An Account of the Cape Fear Country*, 14-15.

⁵³ C. R., V, 158.

⁵⁴ C. R., V, 158.

⁵⁵ J. F. D. Smyth, *A Tour in the United States of America* (Dublin, 1784), 55.

in those trades. But other people lived there. Most of these ran business establishments or gained a livelihood through the sale of their services. A few others, like Edward Moseley, the eminent provincial leader who spent his last years there, probably were motivated by nothing more than a desire to reside in the village.

Among the early settlers were Dr. James Fergus, surgeon; Cornelius Harnett, James Espey, Hugh Blenning, and William Lord, tavern-keepers; John Wright, John Porter, Richard Quince, and William Dry, Sr., merchants; John McDowell and Edward Scott, sea captains; Thomas Brown and Edward Jones, carpenters; Richard Price, brickmaker; William Norton, blockmaker; Donald McKichan, tailor; and Hugh Campbell, clerk of court. A cross section of the population in later years reveals the same general make up. Among the residents at that time were William Gibson, Jonathan Caulkin, and Thomas Dick, house carpenters; David Smeeth, ship's carpenter; Christopher Cains, blacksmith; John Cains, shoemaker; Alexander McKitchan, tailor; Christopher Wotten, sail maker; James McIlhenny, tavern keeper; Stephen Parker Newman, Revell Munro, and Thomas Mulford, sea captains; William Dry, Jr., and William Hill, port officials as well as merchants; and John Fergus, physician.⁵⁶

By far the most distinguished residents were governors Dobbs and Tryon, though strictly speaking their residence, Russellboro, was not within the limits of the town but adjoined it to the north. Dobbs, who followed Johnston as governor, acquired the property in 1758 and lived there until his death seven years later. Tryon purchased the property from Dobbs's son and resided there until he moved into the Palace at New Bern in 1770. It then became the home of William Dry, who changed its name to Bellfont.⁵⁷

While the permanent residents of Brunswick appear to have formed a population essentially quiet and respectable, there was a lustier element in the life of the town. Much of the goods shipped out of Brunswick was brought down the river on rafts. The raftsmen were a vigorous group who worked hard and played hard. When these men joined the sailors from the vessels in the harbor the village no doubt resounded to the noise of their merry-making. We can be sure that they consumed their share of

⁵⁶ New Hanover County Registry Records, *passim*; Brunswick County Registry Records, *passim*.

⁵⁷ New Hanover County Registry Records, D, 327; E, 309; Brunswick County Registry Records, D, 85.

the large quantities of rum imported and were at least part of the reason why James Moir, the Anglican minister, described the taverns of the town as the worst on the face of the earth, in more ways than one. In time specific laws were passed designed to moderate this particular phase of the life of the community.⁵⁸

Probably the most widely publicized event in the history of Brunswick took place during Tryon's residence there. This was in connection with the Stamp Act imposed by the English Parliament upon the American colonies. The passing of this act resulted in protestations throughout the provinces. The resistance of the Cape Fear people began with several riots in Wilmington in the fall of 1765 and was climaxed the following February in Brunswick with armed resistance to the royal governor. The immediate cause of this action was the seizure of several vessels for violation of the act and their detention at Brunswick. Armed men from throughout the section gathered there, specifically to effect the release of the vessels, and more generally to bring the operation of the hated law to an end. They stationed a guard around the governor's home, against his wishes, which, in effect, placed him under house arrest. Some time later they threatened forceful entry into the home if Pennington, the comptroller of the Customs, who was there, continued to refuse to appear before their group. Under these circumstances the comptroller agreed to do their bidding, but only after Tryon had insisted upon and received his resignation. He then proceeded with the group to Brunswick to join the main body which numbered about 1,000 men. There the demonstrators formed a large circle and in the center placed Pennington along with the collector of customs and the naval officer. These three men were then required to take an oath that they would never enforce the Stamp Act. Immediately thereafter the commander of the English naval forces in the river released the seized vessels. Having accomplished their mission, the men dispersed to their homes. With this the tension was released, but revolution had already cast its shadow over Brunswick.⁵⁹

In the series of events that led to independence from England the activities in Brunswick followed the general pattern of the rest of America. The supplies sent from the Cape Fear in 1774

⁵⁸ *C. R.*, IV, 755; *S. R.*, XXIII, 239-243.

⁵⁹ *Virginia Gazette* (Williamsburg), March 21, 1766; *C. R.*, VII, 123-125, 127, 169-186.

to the aid of the beleaguered people of Boston following their "Tea Party" was but a single indication of sympathy with the trend of events. These supplies were shipped in a vessel furnished free of charge by a merchant of Brunswick.⁶⁰ The application of the various restrictions on British trade was a further reflection of this feeling. The people of Brunswick cooperated closely with those of Wilmington and of the nearby counties in determining the course of action followed.⁶¹

When Governor Martin, who had succeeded Tryon, fled from New Bern and arrived at Fort Johnston on June 2, 1775, Brunswick was thrown into the maelstrom of war. Martin began an active campaign to frustrate the efforts of the rebellious element in the colony, and to rally the loyal element around him. The following spring he was joined by the British generals, Clinton and Cornwallis, who came expecting to join the Loyalists in a move to subjugate North Carolina as well as the other southern colonies. The contemporary press reported that, in part, at least, this plan was designed to secure the lower Cape Fear as a source of naval stores for the fleet at Halifax, and the upper Cape Fear as a source of provisions for the British troops to the northward.⁶² But upon their arrival in the Cape Fear the two generals learned that their dreams of easy conquest had been ended on February 27, 1776, by the American victory over the Loyalists at Moore's Creek Bridge. In late May, 1776, the British sailed southward to Charleston with hopes of more successful activity.

The period in which the British were in the river was a fateful year for the town of Brunswick. At various times during this period local troops were placed in or near the village for its defense. At other times it was neglected. It had been the target of threats of destruction and of actual raids.

An example of these raids, though it did not occur within the actual limits of the town, was staged in the early morning hours of May 10, 1776. About 900 of the men of Cornwallis and Clinton slipped up the river under cover of darkness, passed Brunswick, and landed at the plantation of General Robert Howe, a short distance upstream. They beat back the American guards from

⁶⁰ *Virginia Gazette* (Williamsburg), September 1, 1774.

⁶¹ *South Carolina Gazette* (Charleston), August 13, 1770; April 3, 1775.

⁶² *Virginia Gazette* (Williamsburg), October 11, 1776.

the bank of the river and proceeded to an American post on the Charles Town Road a little north of the town. Finding that the American forces of about 100 men had fled before them, they burned the post, a mill, and returned to their ships down river. This attack in itself had slight significance, and probably was little more than a military exercise for the British.⁶³

Finally, under these conditions Brunswick was abandoned by its people, and English pillaging parties roamed its empty streets. At least part of the town was burned by the enemy, and among the residences destroyed was that of William Dry, the old home of Dobbs and Tryon.⁶⁴ Even after the English left it was still exposed to enemy attack, and because of this it held little attraction for other than a very few of its former inhabitants.⁶⁵

Many of the people of Brunswick sought the comparative safety of Wilmington. These included William Hill, Dr. John Fergus, Capt. Stephen Parker Newman, and others. William Dry moved to his up-river plantation, Blue Banks. Some, like Richard Quince, lay buried in their graves.

With the loss of its population the complete disintegration of the town followed. The state constitution of 1776 took away the right of representation,⁶⁶ and in the same year the office of customs collector was transferred to Wilmington.⁶⁷ In 1779 the political dissolution was completed with the removal of the county seat to a more secure location at Lockwood's Folly.⁶⁸ In later years we get an occasional glimpse of the old town through the eyes of passing travellers. Johann Schoepf in the early 1780's reported it as almost totally demolished and abandoned.⁶⁹ A few years later Robert Hunter wrote that the town had been partly destroyed by the British during the war, but many believed that they had been assisted by the slaves from the nearby plantation of General Robert Howe. He added that "only the ruins, with two or three houses that have been since built, are now to be

⁶³ *Virginia Gazette* (Williamsburg), June 29, 1776; *Connecticut Courant* (Hartford), June 17, 1776.

⁶⁴ *Virginia Gazette* (Williamsburg), April 5, 1776.

⁶⁵ *Virginia Gazette* (Williamsburg), March 22, 1776; April 5, 1776; Winslow C. Watson (ed.), *Men and Times of the Revolution; or Memoirs of Elkanah Watson* (New York: Dana and Company, 1856), 41.

⁶⁶ *S. R.*, XXIII, 980.

⁶⁷ *S. R.*, XXIII, 987-988.

⁶⁸ *S. R.*, XXIV, 248-249, 631-632.

⁶⁹ Johann D. Schoepf, *Travels in the Confederation [1783-1784]*, edited and translated by Alfred J. Morrison (Philadelphia: William J. Campbell, 1911), II, 145.

seen."⁷⁰ Bishop Francis Asbury, writing in 1804, gives us a later view by describing the once thriving village as "an old town; demolished houses, and the noble walls of a brick church: there remain but four houses entire."⁷¹ Even so, county records reflect occasional transfers of lots in the village as late as 1819.⁷² But the incorporation of the site of the town into Orton Plantation by a state land grant dated 1845 marks the final and complete passing of the town. The price paid to the state was \$4.25.⁷³

Brunswick ceased to exist because the principal reason for its being ceased to exist. The war brought the end of the British market for naval stores, and after the conflict the shipping out of the Cape Fear was chiefly coastal, and this trade could be, and was, handled through the harbor facilities of Wilmington. By the time the region regained a dominant role in the naval stores industry, Brunswick was but a memory.

It is obvious from this paper that there are many things not known about the town of Brunswick. This is especially true of its physical aspects. Some of these gaps might be filled by later documentation; others only by archaeological investigation. Brunswick is an ideal location for a project of this nature. It has not been occupied to any significant extent since the time it was a thriving colonial seaport. Today it is covered with wild growth and surface deposits accumulated over a period of almost two centuries. Excavation under this surface would yield several interesting results. It would reveal the form and layout of a colonial village unadulterated by later occupancy; foundations would reveal much about the architecture of the buildings, and of the nature of their construction; artifacts would tell us much of the everyday lives of the people. These findings, viewed as the remains of a type rather than of a single, isolated community, would have more than local significance. Brunswick could well be the North Carolina counterpart of the Jamestown excavations.

⁷⁰ Robert Hunter, Jr., *Quebec to Carolina In 1785-1786; Being the Travel Diary and Observations of Robert Hunter, Jr., A Young Merchant of London*, edited by Louis B. Wright and Marion Tinling (San Marino, Cal.: The Huntington Library, 1943), 287.

⁷¹ Francis Asbury, *The Journal of the Rev. Francis Asbury, Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, From August 7, 1771, to December 7, 1815* (New York: N. Bangs and T. Mason, 1821), III, 130.

⁷² Brunswick County Registry Records, H, 428.

⁷³ North Carolina Land Grants, CL, 150.

NORTH CAROLINA NON-FICTION WORKS FOR 1951

BY FRONTIS W. JOHNSTON

Once upon a time, long, long ago, I learned how to reduce fractions to the lowest common denominator. My mathematical education must have been tragically incomplete, for I never was taught how to reduce eighteen varied volumes to even a semblance of similitude. I am, even now, aware of no formula which will enable me to simplify prunes and plums—and we have some of each—into a reasonably orderly equation. The failure of mathematics to provide a neat and unified solution to our query means that we are still left with eighteen problems to solve, instead of one. So be it, for we cannot quarrel with statistics.

A bit of casual research has shown me that each of my recent predecessors in this spot on your annual program has testified to the difficulty of the assignment before him. In spite of the fact that a measure of mathematical efficiency has operated to subtract the fiction from the competition this year, I would like to join their ranks and make the testimony unanimous. The only unity these volumes before us can possibly have is the only one they need in order to be before us: each was written by a North Carolinian and now contends for the Mayflower Cup Award. The fact that five come from residents of Raleigh, five from Durham, two from Chapel Hill and two from Greensboro, whereas the remaining four are from the hinterlands, reveals only a geographic, not a literary, kinship. Some are published by national presses, some by university presses, and others by private printers. The fact that the fields of religion, history, literary criticism, economics, and autobiography dominate is both accidental and incidental. We may make what we will of such features, but the only meaning we may safely assume is—to return to mathematics—that the whole is equal to the sum of its parts. Since we have not solved the sum it is time we turned to the parts.

Religion, I suppose, should come first, even with a historian. Since it makes little difference where we begin, we shall reach in a thumb and pull out a plum called *God Makes A Difference* by Dr. Edwin McNeill Poteat. Here is an effort to draw up a treaty of peace between science and theology now that their long and fruitless warfare is over—a war which should never have been

declared. It suggests that the quest for truth should become a partnership, not a conflict; that "if to the scientist the fact has been his faith, to the religionist the faith has been his fact." The purpose of this book is to bring faith and fact together, at least in inquiry, if not in agreement. The book is an eloquent and learned plea for unity of search, believing that science, however correct its findings may have been, cannot encompass the totality of experience. The method of reconciliation proposed is not so much of eradicating the differences as of identifying the similarities. It contends that if "nature never did betray the heart that loved her," neither did God.

Dr. Poteat argues that both science and religion are based on hypotheses, or inventions, and that the invention of the idea of God is most inclusive for meaning in our world. God is the grand hypothesis of theistic faith, for "faith is the posture of the soul poised on hypothesis." Add this idea of God to the hypotheses of naturalism, and it makes a difference in our understanding of nature, of God himself, of history, and of man. The author shows how this difference will color our thinking and extend the areas in which good will and intelligence can meet. It will allow us to break out of closed systems of thought which, though they give satisfactions because of their neatness, may become cells of a prison which incarcerates the human spirit. Against this background Dr. Poteat discusses the idea of God in relationships which conventional theology does not employ: in home, school, society, court, market place; in love, law, pain, and death, as well as in redemption and immortality. Through the use of scientific discovery, Biblical interpretation, and classical philosophy there is constructed a bridge across which naturalism and theism may walk freely together. Nowhere in this learned discourse is this mutuality more ably argued than in that chapter on that knotty subject—to a rationalist at least—of immortality. If nuclear physics, in its concept of energy, gives us a sort of immortality that can be empirically established, it suggests also a convergence of scientific explanation and traditional thought forms that have so long contained the essence of religious faith.

This volume is not for bedtime reading. One cannot relax and read it too. The result of wide reading and deep thinking, it is written by a master of language who always finds the right word.

He gets at the essence of his idea with clarity, but also with charm and whimsy, as witness his discussion of the word *community*, or his probing into the real meaning of Judas. I do not know the personal habits of Dr. Poteat, but I do know that in his study of the "faith of nature and the nature of faith," his brain has not been his least-used muscle.

Speculative thought, such as Dr. Poteat offers, has no place in Clarence H. Brannon's *An Introduction to the Bible*. This archeological and historical analysis of the King James version comes to us from Raleigh, but from the devoted disciple and biographer of the late Dr. Allen H. Godbey of Duke. Accepting the theory of progressive revelation, it is a book-by-book examination based upon the latest scholarship. But scholars still quarrel over much of the Bible, and Mr. Brannon must pick his way with care. He has ideas and conclusions: David is definitely debunked; Elijah is a climatic failure; Moses is the great Old Testament hero; Jeremiah was great, though un-Semitic, and cannot properly be called the prophet of lamentations, for surely if he wept a little he whined and cursed a great deal more. Paul is, after Jesus, Christendom's greatest figure, though Jews will disagree about both. On Judas the author reminds us of Mr. Legette Blythe's *A Tear For Judas*, but neither writer pictures the historical figure and neither probes his ultimate meaning like Dr. Poteat. Jude is accepted as the author of *Hebrews*, following Dubarle. With Dr. Torrey of Yale, Mr. Brannon seems to accept the theory that much of the New Testament was written originally in Aramaic rather than in Greek. The Virgin Birth is dismissed as unimportant and there is no sympathy for anyone who would argue over Revelation. With many of these conclusions other scholars will quarrel. The treatment is non-theological and non-sectarian, though modern moralizing about atomic bombs inevitably creeps in. Though he is a Presbyterian elder, Mr. Brannon's views on election will not square with those of John Calvin. There is little comfort anywhere for the fundamentalist: there are doubtless some things for which Mr. Brannon would go to the stake, but Adam's rib is not one of them.

Numerous books by John Raymond Shute, long-time mayor of Monroe, North Carolina, and sometime president of the North Carolina League of Municipalities, have testified to his varied

intellectual interests. *The Seer*, like most of the others, defies neat classification. In part, it consists of hoary jokes dressed in the dignified language of parable, but, like the rose, by any other name they still smell, though not like the rose. In the main, however, we have the reflections of a vigorous mind which has broken with dogmatic creeds and departed the temples of childhood to seek solace among other gods, striving to live in tune with humanity around it. The book has about it the strangeness of familiarity. Khalil Gibran's *The Prophet* comes to mind again and again; it is perhaps as good a guess as any as to the inspiration of this strange medley. Its irony is poked at the practices and institutions of formal creeds, but it is often too subtle for its purpose and certainly too confused for clarity. Amid the verbiage of the parabolic method it seems to say, though I would not be too sure of it, that God is a human concept made to function in the mental pattern of man; that we are all divine; that the Kingdom of God is within us; that "man does not require authority for his religion if he makes religion his authority." This is as close as I can come to what I cannot resist the temptation to call the "Monroe Doctrine."

As we move from religion to history each of you may decide for himself whether we follow ascending or descending order. But, either way, it seems appropriate to begin with a work whose scope is an entire hemisphere. The pre-Columbian history of the Americas is being pieced together into an impressive panorama by the patient toil of learned anthropologists and diligent archeologists. In *Americans Before Columbus* Elizabeth Chesley Baity takes the learning and makes it intelligible to the layman. Informal and conversational in tone, the writing is dominated by the spirit of an informed imagination, restrained by a respect for the facts of the epic story. But by means of fact and imagination, and fifty pages of pictures, we are taken on the journey of those first Americans who, pushed south by the cold breath of the ice age, passed in restless generations for twenty thousand years across the face of America. Parts of our journey reveal the fascinating ways in which the remote past may even yet speak to him who has eyes to hear; other parts give us glimpses and insights of fabulous figures of yore, from "Minnesota Minnie" to the Incas of the Andean mountains. Here we

have both a detective story and a peep show, and we become grateful that earth kept a record until man became intelligent enough to read it.

It is not only the earth which has kept historical records—men and nations make them too. One of these men is Harry S. Truman, and one of the nations is the United States. Regardless of one's political opinions it would be hard to read Jonathan Daniels's *The Man of Independence* without wondering whether this is possibly what posterity will say about Harry S. Truman. The study reveals a "typical American" who has exhibited no evidences of imaginative leadership, instinctive wisdom, or lofty principles, but who nevertheless mirrors the average American in his personality, outlook, and experience. It is the Daniels thesis that the color and flavor of America is personified by Truman, and his book is therefore as much the biography of contemporary America as of its president, who becomes an example of how the American democratic faith sustains itself through the capacity of ordinary men to govern themselves. The country may have needed more than Truman, but it might have got—or get—worse.

This thesis makes for an interesting but highly controversial book. We have long known that Mr. Daniels not only has a mind of his own but, like his father before him, can speak it as well. He speaks it here in a style which is always distinguished, frequently beautiful, and sometimes brilliant. Written from intimate knowledge, and with perception and sympathy, the tone is one of admiration bordering on adulation, and some have thought it "so cloying in its sweetness as to curdle honey." The pun in the title is evident throughout. We cannot here summarize the author's position on the many controversial aspects of Truman's career. May we say, however, that on the subjects of Pendergast, Byrnes, Civil Rights, the 1944 convention, and a dozen other such questions, Jonathan Daniels tries hard to be fair. Perhaps, even, he is fair, but—try as he may—all his adjectives seem to fight on Truman's side.

From the hemisphere and the nation a certain logical order brings us to the state, and to our own state of North Carolina. In *The Negro and Fusion Politics in North Carolina, 1894-1901*, Dr. Helen G. Edmonds has written a competent monograph on a

subject which has needed investigation for fifty years. Examining a turbulent and controversial period of North Carolina's political history characterized by the resurgence of the Negro in political life, she has marshalled the irrefutable evidence of facts and figures to modify the verdict of the more emotional and prejudiced treatments of former years. She shows that the number of Negro office-holders was never large, and that Negro office-holding, on any political level, as an act in itself, provided fuel for the ousted Democrats to raise the cry of Negro domination. Dr. Edmonds is also aware of the economic motives behind the glare of race, and she admits the complexities of the period, but her emphasis remains upon the racial issue in politics. Her conclusions seem likely to meet the test of historical examination, for she has made a thorough use of both private and public documentary material, and these deserve a respectful hearing. Essentially a sound work, the book is undistinguished in style, and is occasionally marred by a contentious spirit which delights in quoting from the dead, remarks which they would now likely be too intelligent to repeat.

Logic would seem to say that from state history we should move to county history; so we shall follow logic and examine *Essays on North Carolina History*, by Clarence W. Griffin. The writings of Mr. Griffin of Forest City are familiar to almost every literate person in North Carolina who has any interest in the history of his state. These essays, gleaned from various sources, most of them official, recall the already familiar backdrop of the author's historical interest: old houses, old landmarks, and old characters of Rutherford. Not so solid or scholarly a volume as his earlier *The History of Old Tryon and Rutherford Counties*, it still affords us some good descriptions of appurtenances of bygone days, such as water-powered grist-mills and covered bridges; and we even learn why Republicans live in the mountains.

While Rutherford County is again, as usual, Mr. Griffin's special grazing ground, he allows himself occasionally to roam into the outer pastures of the surrounding area for the sake of a few wild oats. The title of the volume is a bit pretentious, for most of the essays are reprints from a newspaper column written in the water of the fourth estate more than two years ago.

Since these articles are not necessarily related to one another and follow no chronological—or any other kind of—order, one wonders if their original title might not be the more fitting one: “Dropped Stitches in Rutherford History.”

From county to town is an easy step, and we move to Fayetteville with John A. Oates. In *The Story of Fayetteville and the Upper Cape Fear* Mr. Oates presents two hundred years of local history of the most inclusive sort in a massive volume. It is safe to assert that virtually anything you wish to know about Fayetteville, and a good deal that you don't, is in this tome of almost nine hundred pages. But you probably cannot locate it, for the organization is bad and there is no index, and it has one chapter which is four hundred pages in length. Yet the men and women of a glorious past are made to live again, and their activities and ambitions in the political, educational, and religious life of the region are developed in proper perspective. The result of diligent research, it will prove a useful fountain of fact and folklore about the upper Cape Fear region.

History can become more local than the town, for communities develop institutions and these often deserve portrayal. We have three samples: one of a church, one of a school, and one of a secret order.

Biography of a Country Church is by Garland A. Hendricks and is a centennial history of Olive Chapel Baptist Church in Wake County. Written by the pastor, it traces the adventures of the church from the eleven-member beginning of 1850 to its membership of 560 a century later. But though we travel with this church for a full hundred years we wonder if we are ever taken inside. We learn, to be sure, of its physical growth, its building programs, and its fiscal progress, but there is little or nothing of its spiritual biography as a factor in the life of the community. There are, it is true, occasional glimpses of the rural heritage at work, and there are interesting accounts of key personalities, such as the “Prophet of the Ridge,” but there is, by contrast, little evidence of the passion for righteousness by which the cultural level of the community is said to have been raised. Though the crucial achievement of this church is claimed to be its success in “making the Christian religion a qualifying factor

in every aspect of community life," we must take this on faith which, according to St. Paul, is the evidence of things not seen.

The School of Textiles, N. C. State College, Its Past and Present, by T. R. Hart, is a labor of love written from the intimate knowledge of a third of a century at N. C. State College. Like most schools, this one is more than the lengthened shadow of any one man. Stimulated by the labors of such men as Heriot Clarkson and Daniel A. Tompkins at the turn of the century, and ably led by Dean Thomas Nelson in a later era, a separate textile school was established in 1925. Aided by the contributions of private industry and by the gratifying results of textile research, the school has today taken its place—which is one of significance—in the growing industrialization of North Carolina and the South. If one wishes to read a streamlined account of the establishment of this school, its administrative leaders, its faculty, facilities, curriculum, the location of its alumni, or its services to the textile industry, one can find it all in this competent volume by the present director of instruction.

Equally authentic is *Greensboro Lodge No. 76, A. F. & A. M.*, in which Early W. Bridges, author of *Masonic Governors of North Carolina*, past master of Greensboro Lodge No. 76, and curator of the Masonic Museum, offers a history of the lodge, done in the filiopietistic spirit of an official historian. The heart of the book is the series of sketches of masters of the lodge over its life of 130 years. Written largely from the minutes of the lodge, and from a number of secondary sources, it gives us the straightforward and largely unadorned account of the life and expansion of an important component part of the sweet land of secrecy. "Masonry is a profession," wrote Dr. Hubert Poteat. In this vein we have portrayed the "spirit of '76."

There remain two studies which we may include in the historical category, and their wide variance illustrates the inclusiveness of that discipline. *The Navy and Industrial Mobilization in World War II* illustrates how the recent global conflict taught us lessons on the industrial front as well as on the military. Robert H. Connery, professor of public administration at Duke University, gives us an impressive example of administrative history done in the soundest manner of thorough scholarship. His work is a history of the Navy ashore, and the story is dominated by the statesmanship of one man, James Forrestal. It was

he who led the material organization and greatly improved the administrative structure of the Department of the Navy. It was he who balanced civilian control and operational freedom to the satisfaction of both. The tremendous problems of industrial mobilization, and the organization to effect it, are described in faithful detail. How can a nation centralize policy-making and decentralize operations? How can that "magic blend of profit and patriotism" be attained? What is the relation between strategy and logistics? One may read the answers in the decisions concerning contracts, allocations, priorities, and procurements in an enterprise in which dollars were of no consideration after 1941. Above all else we learn two things from this story: there is a science as well as an art of mobilizing for war; and there is no easy or cheap way to win a global conflict. This is a hundred billion dollar story. On the morning of the tenth anniversary of Pearl Harbor it is pleasant to have such abundant evidence that the Navy recovered from that treacherous blow.

Equally impressive is *American Sociology* by Howard W. Odum. From the vantage point of the mid-century position a distinguished sociologist has told the story of the rise of his own subject from the groping frontier stage into a mature academic position. Some of the professional language is present, but the book is not written for the specialist so much as for the layman. Here is the tale of a dynamic discipline which has spawned a thousand Ph.D.'s and a jargon of its own. It is primarily the story of teaching, research, and writing, of societies and journals, with emphasis upon men more than upon movements. Here we may find the heritage and trends, the promise and prospect of a promiscuous mistress, for sociology has never achieved the integrity of *one* science. From Ward and Sumner and Giddings to Odum himself the procession marches on before us in full display, prolific and prolix. They have pioneered in social theory and industrial relations, in race and family and population studies, in regionalism, and in a dozen other categories. Religion as a social institution they appear to have neglected; or, to put it another way, they have avoided analysis of any value systems. And sociology has been very critical of the magnificent generalizations of a Spengler or a Toynbee. Sumner's *Science of Society* now disclaims being a science of

progress. It has sought no pot of gold at the rainbow's end. Yet, as Gerald Johnson has said, the average American regards sociology somewhat as he does penicillin: "It is obviously a necessity in the modern world. It has worked some marvelous cures and promises to work more, but it is tricky. Unintelligently handled, its toxicity can be terrific and the greatest experts don't know any too much about the after effects." But if anybody knows, it will likely be Dr. Howard Washington Odum. Certainly he knows everything else about American sociology.

From Duke University there are two studies of literary figures. In *The Literary Career of Nathaniel Tucker, 1750-1807*, Professor Lewis Leary, already the author of a most successful life of Philip Freneau, offers the story of the career of another failure. Nathaniel Tucker was an admittedly minor poet of the eighteenth century, distinguished only by a literary ambition and an itch for fame which he never realized. Coming from his native Bermuda to Charleston in 1771, "where gallantry was a pleasant avocation," he soon went to England where he spent the remaining thirty years of life in the literary exercise of "wrenching a rhyme into place" as an avocation, and engaging in the desultory practice of medicine as a vocation. His poems were emotional and furious but essentially without meaning and certainly without distinction. They were usually imitative and always didactic, attempting to discover amid the murky tangle of cruelty displayed by man to man some intelligent pattern which the virtuous might follow. Listen:

Great God of Nature, is it so,
Was man created but for wo?
Must all the pleasure he can share
Confirm and heighten his despair?

Some future period in thy plan,
Must justify thy ways to man.

Convinc'd, even while with grief deprest,
That all thy kind decrees are best.

This is retreat, and it is not surprising that in later life Tucker found in Swedenborg refreshment and solace, for the rational precision of the eighteenth century was incapable of explaining

the irrational conduct of man. This was the transcendentalism of escape, and Tucker might fittingly take a place in Edwin Arlington Robinson's gallery of conspicuous failures. But one man's poison is another man's meat; Professor Leary has made a critical success for himself out of the literary failure of another.

What there is at Duke which makes escapism attractive I do not know. But I do know that another Duke professor, Loring Baker Walton, in *Anatole France and the Greek World*, has examined the literary career of that expert amateur in antiquity who hypnotized himself with the beautiful past, not of Swedenborg, but of Homer and Spohocles and Phidias. Anatole France once said that when he died he knew the worms of scholarship would swarm over his literary corpse. Yet this worm has bored with a sympathy and an appreciation and a vast learning which must have eased the ordeal of the victim. The worm has turned up a carcass which had a voraciously curious mind, enthusiastic rather than systematic, and whose pen wrote as one who lived as well as loved the myths which saturated his being. The great charm of Anatole France was, as was the charm of the Greeks, that he was ever a grown-up child, brought up on myths and never tiring of them even when he ceased to believe them; they were beautiful veils thrown over the mystery of life. "The man who made a museum of his own home always felt at home in museums." In his nine journeys to the regions of antiquity, and in scores of vicarious ones, he learned to worship Greece as a substitute for the Christian faith he had lost. Militantly anti-clerical, he was ever hostile to the jealous Hebrew God of Christianity; he idolized polytheism and worshipped Greek humanity and beauty as the supreme achievement of the human race. In the panorama of life spread out behind us Greece was its most beautiful moment. But the Greek minds abhorred a miracle, believing they had the courage to face reality: France had no such courage. Aristotle admitted that the Greeks were not a happy people: neither was Anatole France. Professor Walton has written a beautiful book to clarify France's position as an exponent of the antique and to show the impact of Greek culture on modern French literature. Though the book is directed principally to France specialists and to literary historians we, who are neither,

can still be happy that we did not follow his frank admonition and skip a couple of chapters. We had to watch the worm turn.

Economics is represented by only one book, but it is well represented. Calvin B. Hoover and B. U. Ratchford, two more Duke scholars, have given us a great deal to chew on in their volume on *Economic Resources and Policies of the South*. Do not let the appearance of this book discourage you. It looks formidable because of its nearly one hundred statistical tables and its dozen charts, together with the staggering array of footnotes which testify to the scholarship of the authors. But there is reward for the serious reader as he journeys down the assembly line of facts about the productive resources of the South. For this volume is not simply a collection of facts, but an interpretation as well, particularly as the data bear on the problem of lifting income in the South, which is the central theme of the study.

The result is a sound and sensible analysis of the structure of southern economy which never claims overwhelming riches for the region, as some more careless enthusiasts have formerly asserted. On the contrary, it presents a picture of a region whose soil is relatively poor, whose income is low, whose educational system is inadequate, and which is short on its proportionate share of industry, machinery, and banking, and whose production and marketing system is faulty. Analysis is followed by conclusion: whereas the South does not have unlimited resources or great wealth, proper policies could raise the present level of income to a substantially higher figure. Education and carefully selected industry are suggested as the most feasible means, offering substantial rewards. This is the best of several analyses of southern resources, and it is the best because the findings have been digested as well as discovered. It is a reference to which scholars will continually turn for both knowledge and wisdom.

Wisdom of quite another kind is furnished us by the remaining two volumes of our original eighteen. It comes through the medium of autobiography.

In the September, 1951, issue of *The Woman's Home Companion* Turnley Walker, still not really recovered from polio, wrote as follows: "On the advice of two well-known editors and a family friend, I wrote a little book about what I was seeing and feeling and, though I still could not walk, I made myself walk at the close of the little book. When the words were down

on paper I knew that some day, in some manner, my nearly helpless legs would actually accomplish this."

The "little book," called *Rise Up And Walk*, became a Book-of-the-Month Club selection, its pages revealing even more convincingly than does the quotation, the valor of the victim. For it is the mental autobiography of a polio patient; it is a powerful personal testimony that polio is a lonely place, a quiet life where nothing moves but the wheels in the brain. It is not a medical answer but the reply of the human spirit to a shattering experience. This slender volume is beautifully written with an economy of words, and its simplicity carries conviction.

A Southern Lawyer by Aubrey Lee Brooks is the autobiography of an outstanding southern liberal who grew up with the "Hartford of the South," and who has made a reputation for himself not only as a lawyer but as an author and an editor as well. Mr. Brooks tells his story with simplicity and directness, and it is characterized by a certain mellow philosophy which contributes to its unflinching interest. It has about it an authentic southern flavor, more easily recognized than defined, and exudes the atmosphere of both Cavalier and Puritan attitudes which were the author's heritage. His life has about it, as he tells it, a certain quality of infallibility: if he ever made a mistake or committed an error of judgment it is not recorded here—at least not as an error. His book is filled with anecdotes and employs his intimate knowledge of many of the great and would-be-great in North Carolina and beyond. Fair-mindedness characterizes his accounts of numerous celebrated cases in North Carolina, such as the Lassiter case, the Cole case, the Cannon-Reynolds-Holman case, in each of which he played a conspicuous part. His account of the Richardson case is not exactly the way in which other Presbyterians might tell it. Still we may conclude that Mr. Brooks has achieved that quality of perspective which combined with age and wisdom and sincerity gives dignity to literature as well as to life.

It seems evident that we have found, in this analysis, no common denominator. But I, for one, am glad of it. North Carolina is celebrated as a state of varied resources, and if we could have boiled down her literary production into one pattern we would be out of tune with her principal characteristic—the infinite riches of variety.

LETTERS FROM NORTH CAROLINA TO
ANDREW JOHNSON

EDITED BY ELIZABETH GREGORY MCPHERSON

[Continued]

From William Scott Worth¹⁰⁴

By Telegraph

Greensboro N. C.
Oct. 2nd 1867.

Maj Jas P. Roy
Act'g Pro Mar Gen'l.
2nd Mil Dist
Charleston S. C.

Jesse C. Griffith has been sheriff and Zacharrias Hoper Jailor of Caswell County N. C. Since I have been in command of this Post, and I understand have held that position for the last two years.

Capt and Bvt Maj U. S. A.
Com'd'g Post.

A true copy
L. V. Caziarc
A. D. C. A A A A G.
Hdqs 2d mily Dist
Nov. 11, 1867

From Edgar W. Dennis¹⁰⁵

Copy

Headquarters Second Military District,
Judge Advocates Office,
Charleston S. C. October 4, 1867

Lieutenant Louis V. Caziarc,
Act. Asst. Adjt General

Sir:

The papers in the case of Wm. M. Johnson, are respectfully returned with the following remarks:¹⁰⁶

William M. Johnson is a citizen of Rockingham County, North Carolina, was a union man, belonging to the army of the so-called Confederate States. In the spring of 1863, he deserted from that army and endeavored to raise a company of men to cross with him to the Federal lines. He was closely pressed by rebel conscript hunters, and being without money, or food, he with two

¹⁰⁴ William Scott Worth of New York entered the army as a second lieutenant on April 26, 1861, and rose to the rank of brigadier general before his retirement on November 9, 1898. He was brevetted for meritorious service at Petersburg and in the campaign which terminated with the surrender of General Lee at Appomattox. Heitman, *Historical Register and Dictionary of the United States Army*, I, 1061.

¹⁰⁵ Edgar Whetten Dennis joined the New York artillery on December 27, 1861, and served as a private until February 20, 1862, when he was promoted to first lieutenant. On July 11, 1862, he was promoted to the rank of captain and on January 19, 1865, he became a major. He was brevetted a lieutenant colonel on December 2, 1865, and remained in the army until his resignation on May 22, 1869. He died on April 2, 1878. Heitman, *Historical Register and Dictionary of the United States Army*, I, 367.

¹⁰⁶ See General Canby's letter of November 14, 1867.

others, entered the house of one Moore, and without offering violence to any of the family, took therefrom for their immediate necessities about twenty dollars worth of bread and meat, and five dollars in Confederate money. His companions were captured, confined in the Rockingham County jail and indicted at the next session of the Superior Court, together with Johnson, for Burglary. The other two were tried; acquitted of the burglary, convicted of larceny and pardoned, on condition that they would join the rebel army, which they did.

Johnson himself, with the indictment for burglary hanging over him, escaped through the Union lines; entered the Federal service; was appointed 1st Lieutenant in the 10th. Tennessee Volunteers, and served faithfully with the Union forces, until the close of the war. He then returned to Rockingham county, was arrested on the old indictment of 1863, for Burglary, was refused bail, although those indicted for murder were allowed it, and confined to await his trial, subjected to every sort of indignity. He succeeded in having the place of trial changed to Caswell county, and at the Fall term of the court in 1866, was found guilty of Burglary, and sentenced to be hanged.

From the Superior Court, his case was appealed to the Supreme court, in the spring of 1867, and his sentence was there confirmed.

So soon as he was convicted, in the Superior court, he was thrust into jail, chained down in an iron cage, nine feet square by six feet high, without fire or sufficient clothing, or any means of warmth, during the winter season, in which condition he was forced to remain until about the 6th day of May, 1867, when he was released upon an absolute pardon, granted by Gov Worth, under date of the 27th, day of April, 1867.

This inhuman treatment was under the direction of Jesse C. Griffith, Sheriff of Caswell county, assisted by Zacharius Hooper, Jailor, and was imposed solely because Johnson was a Union man and had served in the Union Army.

Upon the trial in the Superior Court, the Judge, on a charge of *Burglary*, admitted the following evidence to wit:— that Johnson had acted as guide for Stoneman in his raid in North Carolina; that he had said he wished every damned secessionist was killed; that he (Johnson) had done them all the harm he could & c.

The Solicitor, Thomas Settle, who conducted the prosecution, was Johnson's former Confederate Captain and kept it prominently before the court and jury that the prisoner had been a deserter, and traitor to the Confederate cause. One of the prosecuting attorney's, in his remarks to the jury, is reported to have said Johnson "was a deserter from the Confederate army, and ought to be hung anyhow."

It is recommended that the said Griffith be tried by Military commission. It is not deemed advisable to join the Jailor of Caswell county, in the charge, for the reason that, by the laws of North Carolina, the Sheriff is principally responsible for the treatment of prisoners as may be confined in a county jail, the

jailor acting under the Sheriff's direction, and by his orders. Besides, it is not thought advisable to join such trials together.

A true copy

Louis V Caziarc

ADC Actctly

Hdqrs 2nd Mily Dist

Nov. 11. 1867

Very Respectfully
Your Obt. Servant
Bvt. Col. Judge Advocate U. S. A.
Judge Advocate 2nd Mil. Dist.

copy

From Jonathan Worth

State of North Carolina
Executive Department
Raleigh Oct 10th 1867.

Major Gen Avery.
Raleigh N. C.
General

I enclose letter just received from Mr Phillpott and request that you avail yourself of the facts stated to aid in the examination of the witness Susan Lewis.

I regret the decision of your Court, declining to allow the State to be represented on this trial on the ground that "it is contrary to all precedent and against the usage of the service."

I know nothing of precedent or the usage of the service in Military trials. I had supposed that so few instances had occurred of the nullification of the action of a Civil Court by order of a Military Commandant, on the ground of mal-conduct on the part of the Civil Court, that precedent or usage had scarcely been established, denying to the State the right to be heard in vindication of her judicial tribunals. It seems I was mistaken but with all due respect I must be allowed to say that I can conceive of no just ground on which such precedent or usage rests.

As the State is not allowed to be represented on a trial calling in question the action of one of her Courts, I desire to call your attention to the fact which I stated to you in conversation a few days ago, that Samuel A. Williams,¹⁰⁷ a pious man residing at Oxford, informed me in writing (which written statement I sent to Genl Sickles) that after the conviction of the prisoner, at Spring Term 1865, of Granville Superior Court, he visited the prison to pray with prisoner and prepare him for death— and that prisoner then, without any question by said Williams, of his own free will confessed, that he was guilty and ought to die, and desired said Williams to pray for him and prepare him for death— and that he (Williams) communicated to you the facts while you were investigating the facts of this case, to ascertain whether justice required the withdrawal of this case from the Civil authorities of the State.

¹⁰⁷ See Governor Worth's letter to Dr. Samuel A. Williams, May 21, 1867. Hamilton, *Correspondence of Jonathan Worth*, II, 961.

If there be color of doubt as to the guilt of the prisoner, or the evidence now before your Court, I respectfully ask that this witness be summoned and examined before your Court.

I have the honor to be
Yours Very Respectfully
Governor of N. C.

From G. N. Folk¹⁰⁸

Extract

Lenoir N. C.
Oct 12th 1867

Colonel Jno R. Edie USA
Comdg Post
Salisbury No Ca

My duty as Counsel constrains me to call your attention to certain criminal prosecutions now pending in the Superior Court of Law for Caldwell County against William Mck. Blalock. Blalock was a soldier of the United States, and during the war, from his intimate acquaintance with the country, and his knowledge of the union men of this section, was detailed to secure recruits for that portion of the Federal Army operating in East Tenn. He was provided with recruiting papers, and made several trips between the lines of the two armies. While engaged in collecting recruits, and guiding them into the union Lines, he was frequently compelled to avail himself of the premission given him by his commanding officer to provide himself and party with food, horses and forage from the country. For so doing, not less than twenty indictments, ranging from an indictment for forcible trespass to one for murder, have been found against him. I have defended him in many cases, and in no one of these has it ever been proved that he took a single thing maliciously, or for any other than the purposes indicated in his orders.

I have no sympathy with Blalock other than arises from my professional connection with him, having served throughout the entire war in the armies of the Confederate States. I can be actuated by no other desire than to do my duty to him as counsel, and to see that he has Justice.

I am, Colonel,
Very Respectfully
Your Obt Servt
Counsel for Blalock

Headquarters 2nd Mil District
Charleston S. C. No 13, 1867.

A true copy
Louis V. Caziarc
A. D. C. and A. A. A. G.

From Edward R. S. Canby

Copy

¹⁰⁸ G. N. Folk was a member of the legislature in 1874 and was among those who favored the calling of a convention in North Carolina. Hamilton, *Reconstruction*, 605.

Head Quarters 2nd Militry Dist
Charleston S. C. Oct 19th 1867.

His Excellency
Jonathan Worth,
Governor of N. C.
Raleigh N. C.
Sir.

I have the honor to transmit extracts from the report of the Judge Advocate of this District upon the case of Carney Spears, which formed the subject of your Communication of Aug 14th 1867.

The real merits of this case are very much confused but it appears to have been the intention of Captain Denny to terminate a service on the part of Spears that was indeffinite in period and in consideration. With this understanding and to this extent his action has been approved and is limited.

Very Respectfully Sir.

Your Obt Servant

Bvt. Maj. Genl Commanding

“Extract from report of Judge Advocate 2nd Military District dated Charleston, S. C. Oct. 10th 1867, in the case of Carney Spears.

“Continuing his statement Capt Denny says, that he found Spears by some arrangement, had been released from jail upon one Natt Atkinson becoming responsible to the Clerk of the Court for the cost of the suit, Spears to work with him until he had paid by labor the costs; but that no party know what the costs were at that time – not even the clerk of the Court and that no sum per month had been fixed as the compensation to be allowed to the blackman and that in fact there was no further understanding from that Atkinson became responsible for the costs, not knowing how much they amounted to, and the blackman was to work until he had re-imbursed Atkinson. Capt Denny then refers to General Orders No. 34. C. S. which provides that “Imprisonment for default in payment of costs, fees or charges of Court shall not exceed “thirty days” and “insists that the arrangement between Spears and Atkinson was a trick to evade the requirements of that order; and consequently he suspended the further operation of this agreement until he could communicate all the facts in the case”

Captain Denny continuing his report says, It will be borne in mind that I did not revoke the findings of the jury in this case. I suspended the operation of the virtual selling of Spears, because judgement had not been pressed against him and because nobody appeared to know what the costs were, or what compensation Atkinson was to allow him a month for services.

Inasmuch as it appears from a thorough examination of the case, that the binding out of Spears to Atkinson was totally without legal authorization because of its indefiniteness as to the amount Spears was to pay by his labor and the time he was to work for Atkinson, it is thought that the action of Capt Denny should not only be interfered with but confirmed; and that Spears

be released from his supposed obligation. This would seem the more proper course for the reason that Coleman in his statement asserts that the Court had nothing to do with the arrangement between Spears and Atkinson. In this view upon the facts before this Office there seems no need of any action touching the Civil and Judicial Officers whose names are connected with the case and none is desired."

Head Quarters 2nd Mil. Dist.

Oct. 19th 1867.

Affidavit of Elisha J. Tweed

State of North Carolina Madison County

I E. J. Tweed Clerk of the County Court in and for said County do certify that D. E. Freeman Esq before whom the foregoing affidavits were made was at that time and still is an acting Justice of the Peace duly commissioned and sworn as the law directs and that the signature purporting to be his is his genuine Signature.

In witness whereof I have hereto set my hand and affixed the seal of said Court at office in Marshall This the 19th day of October 1867

E. J. Tweed Clerk
of the County Court.

Affidavit of A. E. Deaver

[October 19, 1867]

State of North Carolina County of Madison

On this the 19th day of October 1867. Personally appeared before me, a justice of the peace for the aforesaid County One A. E. Deaver [*sic*] resident of the County of Madison, who being duly sworn, deposeth as follows:- I heard him remark at Ash[e]ville Buncombe County North Carolina in the Buck Hotel, to one Man Hensley—a resident of Marshall Madison County who was sojourning at Ash[e]ville at the time – in words as follows as near as I can recollect—I wish you to return to Marshall – I want four (4) Bushels of Liquor at the Election that is coming on, and I shall be present myself at this election, I shall not go off as I did before (This election illuded to the one for Union or Secession that was held on the 28th of Feby 1861. the election that he wanted to have the 5 Bushels of Liquor at was to come off on, the 13th May 1861.) This man Ransom P Merrell has always bourn a *bad* character as an overbearing *Desparado* and has always been a violent Secessionist

Sworn and subscribed before me D. E. Freeman J P

Affidavit of Elihu H. Rector

[October 19, 1867]

State of North Carolina County of Madison

On this 19th day of October 1867. Personally appeared before me a Justice of the peace, one Elghu [*sic*] H. Rector a resident of Madison County State of North Carolina who being duly sworn deposeth as follows.

I was at Marshall, on the morning of the election of the 13th

of May 1861. I heard the said Merrell *hurra* for Jeff Davis and the Southern Confederacy, this was done on the main street

Immediately after Hockley Morton a citizen in the aforesaid County of Madison came along for the purpose of *voting*, and whereupon interrogated by Ransom P Merrell as follows—What are you doing with your Gun? I do not remember what Norton replied; but Merrell presented his pistol and advanced upon Norton;— Norton gave way still followed by Merrell, pistol in hand— A crowd gathered around Merrell and Norton went off.

Immediately, and as soon as Norton retired out of his reach,— he turned around and presented his pistol at and in the direction of Nealy Tweed and Elisha J. Tweed his son, when Nealy Tweed saw the pistol presented towards him and his son, he dodged behind some other men,—Merrell took *deleberate* [*sic*] *aim*, and fired wounding (seriously) Elisha J. Tweed in the right arm & right side (Said Elisha J Tweed having just come from his farm for the purpose of voting) as soon as he shot Elisha J. Tweed he was taken to a House and locked up by some citizens in order to quell the *mob* and row.

After being locked in the house he went to one of the windows, up stairs, fronting the street and raised it—He then presented himself at the window up stairs fronting the street and raised it—He then presented himself pistol in Hand. and he said “Come up here all you damn Black Republicans and take a shot about with me.

I have known Ransom P Merrell for ten or twelve years, and although he was a Civil officer he was always apt or he did break the peace on several occasions.

Sworn and subscribed before me

D. E. Freeman J P

Affidavit of William R. Roberts

[October 19, 1867]

State of North Carolina County of Madison—

On thie 19th day of October 1867. Personally appeared before me a Justice of the Peace, for the aforesaid Madison County, one, William R. Roberts, a resident of Madison County, being duly sworn deposesh as follows—I heard Merrell say on the Morning of the Election before the poles were open that he (Merrell) entended to Rule the day and that if McDowell was not elected he (Merrell) entended to shed some man’s blood. (*McDowell was a Secession Candidate against Gudger Union Candidate*) I further saw Tweed shoot Merrell, and I also heard Merrell say after he was shot—Hurra for *Jeff Davis* & the Southern Confederacy—

his
William R X Roberts
mark

Attest G[e]orge W Freeman
Sworn and subscribed before me

D. E. Freeman J P

M A X Bradly [*sic*]

[October 19, 1867]

State of North Carolina County of Madison

On this 19th day of October 1867. Personally appeared before me a Justice of the peace, for the county of Madison One Mrs. M. A Bradley a resident of Madison County, State of North Carolina, who being duly sworn deposeth as follows:

Ransom P. Merrell Sheriff of Madison County came to my house on the morning of the 13th of May 1861. the day of the Election at Marshall,— and said as follows. I intend to *Rule* Madison County, at the election, and no Lincolnite or Black Republican or Tory shall vote Jack Gudger. (Said Gudger was the Union Candidate on that occasion and firmly opposed to Secession) I dont ask the Gudgers, Barnett's or Nochols, any odds for they are tories Said Merrell also told me, that he had a *dream*, which he said was as follows.—He dreamed that he had a large Rattle Sneak [*sic*] under his foot crushing it, and that he intended to use all Union men, in the manner, whenever he had an oppertunity [*sic*]

her
M A X Bradly [*sic*]
mark

Attest

T L Saup

Sworn to & subscribed to before thie the 19th day of October 1867
D E Freeman J P

Affidavit of William Randall

[October 19, 1867]

State of North Carolina County of Madison

On this 19th day of October 1867 Personally appeared before me one William Randell, [*sic*] a resident of Madison County State of North Carolina who being duly Sworn deposeth as follows—

I was at Marshall on the morning of the Election the 13th of May 1861. I heard the said Merrell *hurra* for Jeff Davis and the Southern Confederacy. this was done on the main street, whereupon Elsey Frisby, a citizen of Marshall hurra-ed for Washington & the Union—for which Merrell drew his Postol [*sic*] on said Frisby,—Frisby Retired from the said Merrell,—Merrell still following him up pistol in hand. I got between Merrell & Frisby, and drew Merrells attention from Frisby (Frisby then went off)

Immediately after Hackley Northon [*sic*] a citizen of Madison County came along for the purpose of *voting*, and whereupon interrogated by Merrell as follows.— What are you doing here with your Gun?—I do not remember, what Norton replied; but Merrell presented his pistol and advanced upon Norton— Norton Gave way still followed by Merrell pistol in hand — A crowd gathered around Merrell & Norton went off. Immediately as soon as Norton retired out of his reach,—he turned around and presented his pistol at and in the direction of Nealy Tweed and Elisha J. Tweed his son, when Nealy Tweed saw the pistol presented towards him and his son, he dodged behind some other men. Merrell took *deliverate* [*sic*] *aim* and fired wounding (seriously Elisha J. Tweed in the right arm and right side (said Elisha J. Tweed having just came from his farm for the purpose of

voting) as soon as he shot Tweed he was taken to a house and locked up by some Citizens in order to quell the row.

After being locked in the House he went to one of the windows up stairs fronting the street and raised it—He then presented himself at the window pistol in hand, and he said [*sic*] “Come up here all you Damn Black Republicans and take a shot about with me.

I have known Ransom P. Merrell ten or twelve years. and although he was a Civil officer, he was always apt or did *break* the *peace* on several occasions

his
William X Randall
mark

Witness G[e]orge W Freeman

Sworn & subscribed before me,

D E Freeman J P

[October 19, 1867]

Affidavit of Elisha J. Tweed

State of North Carolina

County of Madison

I Elisha J. Tweed Clerk of the County Court of Madison County certify to the following statements

That on the 13th day of May 1861 while an Election was being held in Marshall Madison County North Carolina that there was a great deal of excitement about the Election as it was an Election for the secession of the State and that one Ransom P. Merrill the Sheriff of Madison County N C as I was passing to the polls— and had not spoke a word to Merrill that day and as I pass near him Merrill he presented his pistol and fired on me without any cause or provocation the ball striking my right arm above the Elbow passing through and Entering the right side inflicting a severe wound supposed at that time to be a mortal wound whereupon my Father Neeley Tweed shot Merrill from which Merrill Died At the time Merrill shot me there was nothing between me and Merrill but political matters

Merrill being a violent Rebel and was cursing and abusing one E Frisby because he hallowed for George Washington and his Constitution he Merrill had his pistol drawn and after Frisby in the act of shooting Frisby but was prevented from so doing by some one near by Merrill was cursing and abusing the crowd in general as Tories and Black Republicans & C

My father soon afterwards went and joined the Federal army in Kentucky I soon afterwards went to the federal army and joined the army me and my Father belonged to the same company to wit Co. D. 4 Tenn Inf after wards changed to the 1st Tenn Cavalry

I heard my Father frequently speak of the matter of killing Merrill and he always said no one influenced him in any way in the matter but killed Merrill of his own accord and was willing and anxious for a fair trial by the civil laws of his country my

Father said to me that he had not saw one of the accused or spoke to him that day before the killing of Merrill viz M. W. Roberts my Father died while in the Federal army at Flat Lick Kentucky

I was afterwards 2nd Lieutenant Co. D. 1st Tenn Cavalry and remained in the army until after the surrender having served three years and 5 months in the army

I further state that I believe the prosecution against your Petitioners J. J. Gudger W. A. Henderson H. A. Barnard Thos. J. Rector W. R. McNew & M. W. Roberts to be malicious and I further state that owing to the union proclivities of your petitioners that they could not get justice in the state courts as they are now organized and that the purpose of the procecutors to be that of gain and that a fair and impartial investigation would relieve your petitioners from any further trouble & cost

Clk of the County Court

[To be continued]

NORTH CAROLINA BIBLIOGRAPHY, 1950-1951¹

BY MARY LINDSAY THORNTON

Bibliography and Libraries

- EASTERBY, JAMES HAROLD. Guide to the study and reading of South Carolina history; a general classified bibliography. Columbia, The Historical Commission of South Carolina, 1950. (South Carolina bibliographies no. 2) 289 p. \$2.00 pa. Includes some regional material.
- FRIEDERICH, WERNER PAUL. Bibliography of comparative literature, by Fernand Baldensperger and Werner P. Friederich. Chapel Hill, 1950. (University of North Carolina studies in comparative literature no. 1) xxiv, 701 p. \$12.50. Order Richard Jente, Box 537.

Philosophy and Religion

- BRANNON, CLARENCE HAM. An introduction to the Bible. [Raleigh (?), 1951] xi, 292 p. \$4.75.
- HENDRICKS, GARLAND A. Biography of a country church. Nashville, Tenn., Broadman Press, [1950] xiv, 137 p. illus. \$2.00.
- NASH, ARNOLD SAMUEL, editor. Protestant thought in the twentieth century: whence and whither? New York, The Macmillan Company, 1951. xii, 296 p. \$3.75.
- POTEAT, EDWIN McNEILL. God makes the difference; studies in the faith of nature and the nature of faith. New York, Harper [1951] ix, 242 p. \$3.00.

Economics and Sociology

- AMERICAN PSYCHIATRIC ASSOCIATION. CENTRAL INSPECTION BOARD. Report of the state mental hospitals of North Carolina. [Raleigh?] 1950. 136 p. tabs. Apply State Hospital, Raleigh, N. C.
- CHEEK, ROMA SAWYER. A preliminary study of government management in North Carolina. Raleigh, Office of the Governor of North Carolina, 1950. 127 p. Apply.
- CHERRY, ROBERT GREGG. Public addresses and papers . . . 1945-1949, edited by David Leroy Corbitt. Raleigh, Council of State, 1951. lxii, 1058 p. Apply State Department of Archives and History.
- CONNERY, ROBERT HOUGH. The navy and the industrial mobilization in World War II. Princeton, N. J., Princeton University Press, 1951. xi, 527 p. \$6.00.

¹ Books dealing with North Carolina or by North Carolinians published during the year ending August 31st, 1951.

- EDMONDS, HELEN G. *The Negro and fusion politics in North Carolina, 1894-1901*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, [1951] viii, 260 p. illus. \$5.00.
- EHRINGHAUS, JOHN CHRISTOPH BLUCHER. *Addresses, letters, and papers . . . 1933-1937*, edited by David Leroy Corbitt. Raleigh, Council of State, 1950. xxxi, 509 p. ports. Apply State Department of Archives and History, Raleigh, N. C.
- GRAY, GORDON. *Report to the President on foreign economic policies*. Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1950. vii, 131 p.
- HART, THOMAS ROY. *The School of Textiles, N. C. State College; its past and present*. [Raleigh, North Carolina State College Print Shop, 1951] 230 p. illus. \$5.00.
- HEARD, ALEXANDER. *Southern primaries and elections, 1920-1949* [by] Alexander Heard and Donald S. Strong. University, Ala., University of Alabama Press, 1950, 206 p. \$2.45.
- HOOVER, CALVIN BRYCE. *Economic resources and policies of the South* [by] Calvin B. Hoover [and] B. U. Ratchford. New York, Macmillan Company, [1951] xxvii, 464 p. \$5.50.
- KNIGHT, EDGAR WALLACE, editor. *Readings in American educational history*, by Edgar W. Knight and Clifton L. Hall. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, [1951] xxi, 799 p. \$4.50.
- LEWIS, HENRY W. *The General Assembly of North Carolina guidebook of organization and procedure*. Chapel Hill, Institute of Government, University of North Carolina, 1951. 125 p. Apply.
- McALLISTER, QUENTIN OLIVER. *Business executives and the Humanities*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1951. (Southern humanities conference Bulletin no. 3) 114 p. \$1.50 pa.
- MURRAY, PAULI, editor. *States' laws on race and color, and appendices containing international documents, federal laws and regulations, local ordinances and charts*. [Cincinnati, Woman's Division of Christian Service, Board of Missions and Church Extension, Methodist Church] 1950 [i.e. 1951] x, 746 p. \$4.00.
- NORTH CAROLINA UNIVERSITY. *ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION*. University of North Carolina all-time results in all sports, celebrating 100 Southern Conference championships, 1888-1950. [Chapel Hill, 1951] [48] p. illus. Apply.
- ODUM, HOWARD WASHINGTON. *American sociology; the story of sociology in the United States through 1950*. New York, Longmans, 1951. vi, 501 p. \$5.00.
- STEPHENSON, GILBERT THOMAS. *Your family and your estate*. [New York, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1951] 64 p. \$.88.
- U. S. BOARD OF ENGINEERS FOR RIVERS AND HARBORS. *The ports of Wilmington and Morehead City, North Carolina . . .* Washington, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1951. ix, 164 p. illus. Apply U. S. Engineers, Washington, D. C.
- WAGER, PAUL WOODFORD, editor. *County government across the nation*. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, [1950] xiii, 817 p. illus. \$7.50.
- WAGSTAFF, HENRY McGILBERT. *Impressions of men and*

movements at the University of North Carolina. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press [1950] ix, 110 p. \$2.00.

Philology

- LEAVITT, STURGES ELLENO. Sound Spanish [by] Sturgis E. Leavitt [and] Sterling A. Stoudemire. New York, Holt, [1950] vi, 119, xxviii p. \$2.50.
- SHEWMAKE, EDWIN F. Working with words: Form A. New York, Harper, 1951. vi, 122 p. \$1.00 pa.

Science

- COKER, WILLIAMS CHAMBERS. The stipitate hydnums of the eastern United States, by William Chambers Coker and Alma Holland Beers. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1951. viii, 211 p. 60 plates. \$5.00.
- CORRELL, DONOVAN STEWART. Native orchids of North America, north of Mexico . . . Waltham, Mass., Chronica Botanica [1951] (New series of plant science books, v. 26) 400 p. illus. \$7.50.
- LEE, WALLACE. Math miracles. [Durham, Seeman Printery, Inc., c. 1950] [8] 83 p. illus. \$3.00.
- PEARSE, ARTHUR SPERRY. Emigration of animals from the sea. Washington, Sherwood Press, 1951. xii, 210 p. illus. \$5.00.
- TAYLOR, HARDEN FRANKLIN and others. Survey of marine fisheries of North Carolina by Harden F. Taylor and a staff of associates. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1951. xii, 555 p. illus. \$10.
- TIPPETT, JAMES STERLING and others, editors. Understanding science, grades 1-4. Philadelphia, John C. Winston Company, 1951- . Published with various titles, authors, and prices.

Applied Science and Useful Arts

- GREEN, PHILIP PALMER, JR. Stream pollution in North Carolina, by Philip P. Green, Jr., Donald B. Hayman, Ernest W. Machen, Jr. Chapel Hill, Institute of Government, University of North Carolina, 1951. 216 p. Apply.
- HOFFMANN, MARGARET JONES. Miss B's first cookbook; 20 family-sized recipes for the youngest cook. Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, [1950] [48] p. illus. \$1.75.
- KIRKPATRICK, CHARLES ATKINSON. Salesmanship: helping prospects buy. Cincinnati, Southwestern Publishing Company, 1951. 483 p. illus. \$4.25.
- KRAYBILL, EDWARD KREADY. Electric circuits for engineers. New York, Macmillan Company, 1951. x, 212 p. illus. \$3.85.
- LANDON, CHARLES EDWARD. Transportation, principles, practices, problems. New York, William Sloane, 1951. xxii, 618 p. maps. \$4.75.

SEYMOUR, FRANCES ISABEL. Rice, dietary controls and blood pressure; with menus and recipes. New York, Froben Press, 1951. 206 p. \$2.95.

Fine Arts

ORR, LEWIS. [Etchings: Album X] [Greenville, N. C., R. L. Humber, 1951] Continuation of a series of etchings of historic North Carolina buildings. Each album contains 5 etchings and sells for \$50.

SANDBURG, CARL. Carl Sandburg's new American songbag. New York, Associated Music Publishers, Inc., 1951. vii, 107 p. \$2.50.

STRINGFIELD, LAMAR. Georgia Buck. Charlotte, N. C., Brodt Music Company, c. 1950. 9 p. 37 single sheets. \$3.50.

STRINGFIELD, LAMAR. Peace, a sacred cantata for mixed voices. Charlotte, N. C., Brodt Music Company, 1950. 36 p. \$1.25.

STRINGFIELD, MARGARET. "Occoneechee" fair maid of the forest; a Cherokee operetta in three acts. Waynesville, N. C., Author, [1950?] [11] 60 p. \$2.50.

Poetry

- BARKER, ADDISON. The magpie's nest. Mill Valley, Calif., Wings Press, 1950. 56 p. \$2.00.

BROCKMAN, ZOE KINCAID. Heart on my sleeve. Atlanta, Ga., Banner Press, Emory University, [c. 1951] 73 p. \$2.00.

BURT, NATHANIEL. Question on a kite. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1950. 43 p. \$2.00.

DAVIS, HANNAH (BARHAM). Heartleaves. Warrenton, N. C. The Author, [1951?] [10] 116 p. Order Author, Warrenton, N. C.

- EATON, CHARLES EDWARD. The shadow of the swimmer. New York, Fine Editions Press, 1951. 88 p. \$3.00.

HANES, FRANK BORDEN. Abel Anders, a narrative. New York, Farrar, Straus and Young, [1951] 209 p. \$2.75.

HARDEN, EARL LOUIS. Rhythmical treasure. Macon, Ga., J. W. Burke Company, [1950] xiii, 99 p. \$1.75.

JONES, GILMER ANDREW. Songs from the hills. [Franklin? N. C., Author, 1950] 57 p.

KETCHUM, EVERETT PHOENIX. George Washington's vision and other poems . . . by Everett Phoenix Ketchum and Lillian Floyd Ketchum. Asheville, N. C., Inland Press, [1950] 64 p. illus. \$5.00.

- KING, MARIE HALBERT. Call to remembrance. [San Antonio, Texas, Carleton Printing Company for the Author] c. 1951. 74 p.

LOVELAND, CHARLES WELLING. The mountain men and other poems. [Shelby, N. C., Author, 1950] 68 p. \$2.50.

- NORDEN, LAURA (HOWELL). On upward flight. New York, Exposition Press, [1951] 47 p. \$1.50.
- PINGEL, MARTHA M. Catalyst; an interpretation of life. New York, Exposition Press, 1951. 64 p. \$2.00.
- PRICE, MERLE. The heart has its daybreak. Emory University, Ga., Banner Press, [1950] 60 p. \$2.00.
- SMEDES, HENRIETTA RHEA. In many moods, verses by Henrietta R. Smedes and John Esten Cooke Smedes. New York, Exposition Press, [c. 1951] 96 p. port. \$2.50.
- WALTON, MARY ETHEL. Words have breath, poems. Philadelphia, Dorrance and Company, Inc., [1951] 127 p. \$2.50.

Drama

- GREEN, PAUL ELIOT. The common glory song book, songs, hymns, dances and other music from Paul Green's symphonic drama . . . edited by Adeline McCall. New York, Carl Fischer, c. 1951. 47 p.
- GREEN, PAUL ELIOT. Peer Gynt, by Henrik Ibsen. American version by Paul Green. New York, Samuel French, Inc., [1951] 167 p. \$2.50.
- HUNTER, KERMIT. Unto these hills; a drama of the Cherokee. [Chapel Hill] University of North Carolina Press [1951] 100 p. illus. \$2.00.
- SPECK, FRANK GOULDSMITH. Cherokee dance and drama by Frank G. Speck and Leonard Bloom. Berkeley, Calif., University of California Press, 1951. xv, 106 p. illus. \$2.50 pa.

Fiction²

- BLYTHE, LE GETTE. A tear for Judas. Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., [1951] 338 p. \$3.50.
- DARBY, ADA CLAIRE. Island girl. Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1951. vii, 215 p. \$2.75.
- DAVIS, BURKE. The ragged ones. New York, Rinehart and Company, [1951] 336 p. illus. \$3.50.
- HENRI, FLORETTE. Kings Mountain. Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1950. viii, 340 p. \$3.00.
- IRWIN, LAETITIA. The golden hammock. Boston, Little, Brown and Company, 1951. 373 p. \$3.00.
- MILLER, HELEN (TOPPING). The horns of Capricorn. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., [1950] 282 p. \$3.00.
- OUTTERSON, LESLIE A. Unto the hills, a novel. New York, Vantage Press, [1950] 216 p. \$3.00.
- ROGERS, LETTIE (HAMLETT). The storm cloud. New York, Random House, [1951] 309 p. \$3.00.
- ROSS, FRED E. Jackson Mahaffey, a novel. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, [c. 1951] 308 p.
- SLAUGHTER, FRANK GILL. Fort Everglades. Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday and Company, 1951. 340 p. \$3.00.

² By a North Carolinian or with the scene laid in North Carolina.

- SLAUGHTER, FRANK GILL. *The road to Bithynia, a novel of Luke, the beloved physician.* Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday and Company, 1951. 330 p. \$3.50.
- STREET, JAMES HOWELL. *The high calling.* Garden City, N. Y., Doubleday and Company, 1951. 308 p. \$3.00.
- TIPPETT, JAMES STERLING. *Tools for Andy; pictures by Kay Draper.* Nashville, Tenn., Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1951. 47 p. \$1.50. Juvenile.

Literature Other Than Poetry, Drama, or Fiction

- BIERCK, HAROLD A., JR., editor. *Selected writings of Simón Bolívar; compiled by Vicente Lecuna, edited by Harold A. Bierck, Jr., translation by Lewis Bertrand.* New York, Colonial Press, 1951. 2 v.
- BRINKLEY, ROBERTA FLORENCE, editor. *English prose of the seventeenth century.* New York, W. W. Norton and Company, 1951. xii, 919 p. \$4.00.
- CLARK, JOSEPH DEADRICK. *Handbook of English, speaking reading, writing, by Joseph D. Clark, Philip H. Davis, and A. Bernard Shelley.* Boston, Ginn and Company, 1951. viii, 487 p. \$3.00.
- COENEN, FREDERIC EDWARD. *Franz Grillparzer's portraiture of men.* Chapel Hill, [University of North Carolina] 1951. (University of North Carolina Studies in the Germanic languages and literatures, no. 4) xii, 135 p. \$2.50.
- LEARY, LEWIS GASTON. *The literary career of Nathaniel Tucker, 1750-1807.* Durham, N. C., Duke University Press, 1951. (Historical papers of the Trinity College Historical Society, ser. 29) ix, 108 p. \$2.75.
- LOUTHAN, DONIPHAN. *The poetry of John Donne; an explication.* New York, Bookman Associates, [c. 1951] 193 p. \$3.50.
- NORTH CAROLINA UNIVERSITY. *Studies in Mediaeval culture dedicated to George Raleigh Coffman.* [Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1951] (Studies in philology. July, 1951, v. 48, no. 3) 696 p.
- SHUTE, JOHN RAYMOND. *The Seer, his parables and tales.* Monroe, N. C., Nocalore Press, 1950. 94 p. illus. \$1.00.
- ULLMAN, BERTHOLD L., editor. *Colucci Salutati De Laboribus Herculis.* Zurich, Switzerland, "Thesaurus Mundi" (publisher), 1951. Two volumes, paged continuously, XIV, 660 p. Vol. I, xiv, 1-352 p.; Vol. II, 353-660 p. American agent, Philip C. Duschnes, 66 East 56 St., New York.
- WALTON, LORING BAKER. *Anatole France and the Greek world.* Durham, N. C., Duke University Press, 1950. ix, 334 p. \$6.00.

Genealogy

- BROCKMANN, CHARLES RAVEN. Adams, Caruthers, Clancy, Neely, and Townsend descendants composing the Adams, Legerton, Wakefield, Brockmann, and other twentieth century families of the Carolinas. Charlotte, N. C., The Author, 1950. 118 p. illus. \$8.50.
- BROUGHTON, CARRIE L., compiler. Marriage and death notices in *Raleigh register and North Carolina state gazette*, 1856-1867. [Raleigh, The State Library, 1950] 537-613 p. A continuation of earlier indices covering the years, 1799-1855. Apply.
- [BUIE, ROBERT BERNARD.] The Scotch family Buie. No place, privately printed, [1950] [80] p. illus. Apply Author, Box 1146, Stamford, Conn.
- HOLT, EUGENE. Edwin Michael Holt and his descendants, 1807-1948. [Richmond, Va., privately printed, 1949] xv, 221 p. illus. Apply Mrs. Ivor Massey, 2 Oak Lane, Richmond, Va.
- KELLAM, IDA (BROOKS). Brooks and kindred families. [Wilmington? N. C.] 1950. 384 p. illus. Order from Author, 219 S. 3rd St., Wilmington, N. C. \$7.50.
- LORE, ADELAIDE McKINNON. The Morrison family of the Rocky River settlement of North Carolina; history and genealogy, by Adelaide and Eugenia Lore and Robert Hall Morrison. [Charlotte? N. C., 1950] 543 p. illus. \$10.
- McBEE, MAY WILSON, compiler. Anson County, North Carolina, abstracts of early records. [Greenwood, Miss., The Compiler, c. 1950] vii, 180 p. \$11.
- McLEAN, HARRY HERNDON. The Wilson family, Somerset and Barter Hill branch. Washington, N. C., The Author, [c. 1950] 102 p. illus. Order from the Author, Box 716, Washington, N. C. \$5.00.
- RAY, WORTH STICKLEY. Tennessee cousins; a history of Tennessee people. Austin, Tex. [1950] viii, 811 p. illus. \$20.
- SONS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION. NORTH CAROLINA SOCIETY. Lineage book of past and present members. [Raleigh] The Society, 1951. vi, 322 p. \$5.00. Order W. A. Parker, 1522 Jarvis St., Raleigh, N. C.
- WYATT, WILBUR CARL. Families of Joseph and Isaac Wyatt, brothers, who were sons of Zachariah ("Sacker") and Elizabeth (Ripley) Wyatt, of Durant's Neck, Perquimans County, North Carolina . . . Washington, c. 1950. 206 p. illus. Apply Compiler, 5716 16th St., N. W., Washington 11, D. C.

History and Travel

- BAILEY, BERNADINE (FREEMAN). Picture book of North Carolina. Pictures by Kurt Wiese. Chicago, Albert Whitman and Company, c. 1950. [28] p. illus. \$1.00. Juvenile.
- BAITY, ELIZABETH (CHESLEY). Americans before Columbus; illustrated with drawings and maps by C. B. Falls and 32 p. of photos. New York, Viking Press, 1951. 256 p. illus. \$4.00. Juvenile.

- DULA, WILLIAM C., editor. Durham and her people, combining history and who's who in Durham of 1949 and 1950 . . . Durham, N. C., Citizens Press, 1951. 295 [7] p. illus. \$5.00.
- GRIFFIN, CLARENCE. Essays on North Carolina history. Forest City, N. C., Forest City Courier, 1951. xv, 284 p. illus. \$4.25.
- HAMLIN, TALBOT FAULKNER. We took to cruising; from Maine to Florida afloat [by] Talbot and Jessica Hamlin. New York, Sheridan House, [1951] 320 p. illus. \$3.50.
- LAZENBY, MARY ELINOR. Catawba frontier, 1775-1781; memories of pensioners. Washington, 1950. ix, 109 p. \$2.00.
- OATES, JOHN A. The story of Fayetteville and the upper Cape Fear. [Fayetteville, The Author, c. 1950] xxxi, 868 p. illus. \$10.00.
- PATTON, SADIE SMATHERS. Sketches of Polk County history. [Hendersonville, N. C. The Author, c. 1950] xiv, 161 p. illus. \$5.00.
- WOLFE, THOMAS. A western journal; a daily log of the great parks trip, June 20-July 2, 1938. [Pittsburgh] University of Pittsburgh Press, 1951. x, 72 p. illus. \$2.00.

Autobiography and Biography

- ADAMS, AGATHA BOYD. Paul Green of Chapel Hill. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Library, 1951. vii, 116 p. port. \$1.00 pa., \$2.50 bound.
- BAKER, NINA (BROWN). Sir Walter Raleigh. New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, [1950] 191 p. \$2.50. Juvenile.
- BECKER, KATE HARBES. Paul Hamilton Hayne: Life and letters. Belmont, N. C., Outline Company, 1951. xi, 145 p. \$3.50.
- BRINK, WELLINGTON. Big Hugh, the father of soil conservation; with a preface by Louis Bromfield. New York, Macmillan Company, 1951. xii, 167 p. port. \$2.75.
- BROOKS, AUBREY LEE. A southern lawyer, fifty years at the bar. Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, [1950] viii, 214 p. \$3.50.
- BURLINGTON, N. C., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE. Builders of Alamance. Burlington, N. C., 1951. 69 p. illus. Apply The Chamber of Commerce.
- DANIELS, JONATHAN. The man of Independence.³ Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott Company, [1950] 384 p. \$3.75.
- DE GRUMMOND, JANE LUCAS. Envoy to Caracas; the story of John G. A. Williamson, nineteenth-century diplomat. Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, [1951] xx, 228 p. illus. \$3.75.
- GIBSON, JOHN MENDINGHALL. Physician to the world; the life of General William C. Gorgas. Durham, N. C., Duke University Press, 1950. ix, 315 p. illus. \$4.50.

³ Winner of Mayflower award, 1951.

- HOCUTT, HILLIARD MANLY. Struggling upward; a brief story of the upward struggle of Rev. and Mrs. J. D. Hocutt and their fourteen children of Burgaw, North Carolina, with special emphasis upon the record of the family in Christian education. [Asheville, N. C., The Author, 1951] 76 p. illus. Apply Author, 112 Belmont Ave., Asheville, N. C. pa.
- MANGUM, WILLIE PERSON. Papers, edited by Henry Thomas Shanks. Raleigh, N. C., State Department of Archives and History, 1950- . v. 1, illus. Apply.
- PASCHAL, JOEL FRANCIS. Mr. Justice Sutherland, a man against the state. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1951. xii, 267 p. port. \$4.00.
- POUND, MERRITT BLOODWORTH. Benjamin Hawkins, Indian agent. Athens, Ga., University of Georgia Press, [c. 1951] ix, 270 p. \$4.00.
- REYNOLDS, QUENTIN JAMES. The Wright brothers, pioneers of American aviation; illustrated by Jacob Landau. New York, Random House, [1950] 183 p. illus. \$1.50. Juvenile.
- SHIPP, CAMERON (with LIONEL BARRYMORE). We Barrymoores . . . as told to Cameron Shipp. New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1951. 296 p. \$3.50.
- SLAUGHTER, FRANK GILL. Immortal Magyar: Semmelweis, conqueror of childbed fever. New York, Henry Schuman, 1950. (Life of scientists library, no. 15) 211 p. illus. \$3.50.
- TIPPETT, JAMES STERLING. Abraham Lincoln, humble and great. Chicago, Beckley-Cardy Company, 1951. (Forever great series) 154 p. \$1.48. Juvenile.
- TREASE, GEOFFREY. Sir Walter Raleigh, captain & adventurer. New York, Vanguard Press [1950] 248 p. \$2.50. Juvenile.
- WRIGHT, WILBUR. Miracle at Kitty Hawk; the letters of Wilbur and Orville Wright, edited by Fred C. Kelly. New York, Farrar, Straus and Young [1951] ix, 482 p. illus. \$6.00.

New Edition and Reprints

- CELL, JOHN WESLEY. Analytic geometry. 2nd ed. New York, John Wiley, 1951. xii, 326 p. \$3.75.
- COULTER, ELLIS MERTON. College life in the old South. 2nd ed. Athens, Ga., University of Georgia Press, 1951. xiii, 320 p. illus. \$4.50.
- FLETCHER, INGLIS. Roanoke Hundred. London, Hutchinson and Company, 1951. 284 p. 6 s.
- FLETCHER, INGLIS. The young commissioner, a tale of the African bush. London, Hutchinson and Company, 1951. 264 p. 6 s.
- KNIGHT, EDGAR WALLACE. Education in the United States. 3rd rev. ed. Boston, Ginn and Company, 1951. xvi, 753, xiv p. illus. \$4.50.
- WALDMAN, MILTON. Sir Walter Raleigh. Toronto, Canada, William Collins Sons and Company, 1950. \$2.00.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Negro and Fusion Politics in North Carolina, 1894-1901. By Helen G. Edmonds. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 1951. Pp. viii, 260. \$5.00.)

To the growing shelf of studies on southern politics Dr. Edmonds who is professor of history at North Carolina College at Durham has added a scholarly and interesting book on a highly controversial period in the history of this state. After explaining some of the difficulties encountered in studying the Fusion years, the author proceeds to compare the Democratic and Republican parties as they faced each other between 1876 and 1896. A conservatively controlled Democratic party continuously dominated the state government, but, as such leaders as Vance and Ransom dropped out, new "liberal agrarian anti-monopoly" spokesmen such as Josephus Daniels, Walter Clark, and L. L. Polk began to contest the Bourbon leadership. Confronting the Democrats was a strong Republican party, which received between forty and forty-nine per cent of the vote in forty-seven counties and regularly carried twenty-six counties, ten in the west (where the party remains strong) and the rest in the north central and eastern portions of the state, where the Negro population was high. Such was the situation in 1890. By 1901, the turmoil of the intervening decade had resulted in the reduction of Republican strength, largely because of the almost total exclusion of the Negro from politics, and in the consequent inauguration of a period of Democratic rule that has already lasted half a century. Dr. Edmonds's book clarifies the circumstances that produced this striking result.

By 1890 the plight of the farmers in North Carolina, as elsewhere in the nation, produced strong farm organizations, notably the Farmers' Alliance, brought such new leaders into the field as L. L. Polk and Marion Butler, and, in the end, led to the establishment of the Populist party. The showing made by the new party in 1892 indicated that if it were to join hands with the Republicans, the Democratic party could be overcome. Such was, in essence, the course followed successfully by the two minorities in 1894 and 1896 with the result that the General Assemblies of 1895 and 1897 were controlled by Fusion majorities, while a Republican, Daniel L. Russell, occupied the Executive Mansion from 1897 to 1901.

Fusion of Populists and Republicans was possible largely because the economic and political reforms desired by the two groups were harmonious. Dr. Edmonds devotes some attention to the efforts to achieve these reforms, giving an entire chapter to the Fusion election laws of 1895 and 1897, but she is concerned primarily with the position of the Negro in the Fusion movement and with the bitter and ultimately successful fight greatly to reduce his share in state and local government. Populists, most of whom were dissatisfied Democrats, in cooperating with Republicans found themselves working with a party whose majority was reputedly Negro and may have been so in fact. The Fusion victories of 1894 and 1896 necessarily increased Negro participation in politics, and the author devotes three very interesting chapters to Negro officeholders. She treats with understanding and in detail many such officials as George H. White (congressman), John C. Dancy (collector of customs at Wilmington), James H. Young, William H. Crews, Isaac Smith, J. H. Wright (four state legislators), Dr. James E. Shepard (subsequently president of North Carolina College), and Thomas S. Eaton (register of deeds in Vance County). Although Negro politicians revealed a high degree of race consciousness, the author shows that many of them possessed above average qualifications and that they generally conducted themselves properly.

The political spurt that Fusion gave the Negro proved the combination's weakest spot, for many Populists were opposed to Negro participation in government and were therefore ready to give credence to the cry of "Negro domination." From the Frederick Douglass resolution and the Abe Middleton affair of the 1895 General Assembly through the "white supremacy" campaign of 1898 and the ultimate Democratic recapture of the entire state government in the election of 1900, the race question steadily became more prominent in the tactics of the Democratic party, and Dr. Edmonds's account of the campaign against the Negro shows how potent the race issue was in the politics of the period. The Wilmington race riot of November, 1898, is described with objectivity and fullness of detail. Much food for thought will be found in the chapters on the Democratic legislature of 1899, which proposed disfranchising changes in the state constitution, and on the campaign of 1900, which saw Fusion ended and disfranchisement achieved.

It was no easy task to secure the adoption of the suffrage amendment in 1900. As the campaign progressed, resistance became strong in the western counties where the illiteracy rate was high and Negroes were few. It became increasingly apparent that not even the "grandfather clause" would save large numbers of whites from disfranchisement. It was at this juncture that Charles B. Aycock, the Democratic gubernatorial candidate, campaigning in the western counties, began to put main emphasis on his plan to devote the forthcoming administration to the abolition of illiteracy in North Carolina. Aycock and the amendment both won, and, as Hugh T. Lefler has said, "a new day dawned for [public] education" in North Carolina.

Dr. Edmonds's extensive bibliography includes a list of personal interviews and her index is adequate. The maps and charts, which are integrated with the text, and the statistical data and documentary material, which make up the appendix, add greatly to the book. Taken all in all, *The Negro and Fusion Politics* should prove a valuable reference tool for scholars and rewarding reading for any person interested in the history and politics of North Carolina and the South.

Preston W. Edsall.

North Carolina State College,
Raleigh.

The Negro and the Communist Party. By Wilson Record. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 1951. Pp. x, 340. \$3.50.)

In this book, Texas-born Wilson Record¹ provides a careful, detailed, and straight-forward account of the unsuccessful efforts of the Communist party to gain the support of the American Negro and utilize him in building up power here and in other parts of the world. To those who know the nature and techniques of Communism but lack familiarity with the country's principal race problem and to those who are familiar with Negro protest without having a corresponding acquaintance with Communism, Record's account offers a way to more rounded understanding. For those who are unfamiliar with both Communism and the Negro protest, the book goes far toward providing a working

¹ Educated at Texas Wesleyan and the Universities of North Carolina and Texas, Mr. Record has had experience in the labor movement and with the Federal government. He received a Rosenwald grant in 1947 and now teaches sociology at San Francisco State College.

knowledge of both and of their many organizations and leaders. While the volume lacks a bibliography, it is thoroughly documented and has a moderately adequate index.

Mr. Record begins by putting the Negro question into historical perspective and contemporary context. It is interesting that both the Socialist party and the Communist party with its Kremlin-dominated leadership have failed to capture extensive Negro support, though for fundamentally different reasons. Whereas Socialists persisted in offering Negroes only what they tendered wage-earners generally ("We have nothing special to offer the Negro," Debs declared), Communists saw America's Negroes as a large down-trodden minority of potentially political value and international usefulness, and therefore offered much in domestic programs, organization work, and leadership opportunity, but did so without really comprehending the Negro's immediate concerns or ultimate goals. Consistency, moreover, has not characterized the general conduct of the American Communist party and was strikingly absent from its dealings with the Negro. This lack of consistency has arisen in main from the fact that the party has been obliged to conform to a frequently changing, Moscow-dictated "party line" laid down by a series of international congresses. Mr. Record devotes six information-packed chapters to tracing the tortuous course of the "party line," showing how it affected all aspects of the party's effort to win Negro support and control Negro action. Space does not permit an adequate summary of the complicated but clearly presented story these chapters tell; their titles must suffice: "The Early Pattern of Red and Black, 1919-1928"; "The Kremlin Sociologists and the Black Republic, 1928-1935"; "Build the Negro People's United Front, 1935-1939"; "This Is Not the Negro's War, 1939-1941"; "All Out for the War of National Liberation, 1941-1945"; "American Negroes! Stop Wall Street Imperialism, 1945-1950." Finally, in a concluding chapter, "Red and Black: Unblending Colors," the author offers a very wise analysis and a body of conclusions that add value to the book.

Mr. Record does not allow the failure of the Communist party to gain general Negro support to obscure certain positive results of Communist action. Such protest organizations as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Na-

tional Urban League, while successful in escaping Communist domination, have nevertheless been forced to "initiate changes in their policies and programs" in order to maintain their leadership in the Negro protest movement. A number of prominent Negro leaders, writers, and intellectuals have been attracted to the Communist cause, and the Party has had its impact on the Negro press, on the trade union movement, and, indeed, on our major political parties, particularly where civil rights issues are at stake.

Why have three decades of Communist effort failed to make more than a handful of Negro converts? (Record estimates the maximum number at 8,000.) The answer is that the party has blundered in various ways, particularly in analyzing the Negro's aspirations. He does not want a sovietized America; he does not want either an independent national existence or separate statehood in the American union; he does not care for "the Party's umbilical attachment to the Kremlin." He wants equality of opportunity in democratic America. "Negroes in the United States," Record declares, "have had plenty of provocation to revolt. But they have chosen to protest within the constitutional framework. . . . And because the aspirations of the American Negro are essentially egalitarian, a 'bourgeois' document like the American Constitution has a liberating potential in the Black Belt of Alabama and in the ghetto of Harlem that the *Communist Manifesto* could never hope to have." We make a serious mistake, Record argues, in identifying "organized discontent with an alien ideology"; instead we should realize that "America has a great weapon against Communism among racial and ethnic minorities." This weapon is the Constitution, and "we would do well to apply its equalitarian potentials."

Preston W. Edsall.

North Carolina State College,
Raleigh.

Durham and Her People. By W. C. Dula and A. C. Simpson. (Durham: The Citizens Press. 1951. Pp. 297. \$4.95.)

As explained in the preface, this book is not an orthodox history. It is rather a personalized history, written primarily to

preserve the story of Durham and her people, with special attention to present-day facts and details that would never be recorded in an orthodox history.

There are twenty-four headings in the table of contents, but the volume has only two general divisions. First, there are brief sketches of many phases of the business and social life of Durham, including origin, story of tobacco and the tobacco industry, public utilities, insurance companies, churches, schools, and others. The second division, roughly four-fifths of the pages, is a who's who of about 550 individuals and business establishments in Durham at the present time.

The authors have written a book especially useful and valuable to business-men who are seeking new areas in which they might expand their field of operation. Although lacking in critical evaluations and weak in general organization of materials, it records facts upon facts which clearly prove the City of Durham to be a most remarkable success story that is both inspirational and informative. Durham is symbolic of the New South.

If there is a central theme in the book, it is growth. Whether the town itself, the large and small corporations, the schools and churches, or the great tobacco industry, they have all started humbly and grown magnificently. "The Golden Weed," the authors point out, is the foundation of Durham's wealth.

The volume is attractively printed and has an adequate index.

D. J. Whitener.

Appalachian State Teachers College,
Boone.

Survey of Marine Fisheries of North Carolina. By Harden F. Taylor and a Staff of Associates. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1951. Pp. xii, 555. \$10.00.)

Survey of Marine Fisheries of North Carolina is the first critical analysis of local fisheries which has been carried out and published by a state government.

The subject is introduced by a description of the North Carolina marine waters by Dr. Nelson Marshall. The complex nature of the waters is explained, with information on currents, temperatures, salinities, and nutrients supplemented by charts and graphs. He suggests that greater yields might be obtained by

utilizing animals low in the food chain. Part II covers a discussion of the marine commercial species.

The section on menhaden by William A. Ellison, Jr., which is the next topic covered, is based on limited reports, many published before 1910. Mr. Ellison discusses migrations but concedes that extensive tagging experiments must be undertaken. Most of his presentation, however, is written as though migration routes had been worked out carefully.

Mr. Roelofs does a creditable job of condensing information on edible finfishes. He stresses the need for research and feels that with present facts it is impossible to tell whether a given species is being fully utilized.

The oyster and other mollusks are covered adequately by A. F. Chestnut. He shows that mollusk culture can be profitable and suggests that oyster production can be increased almost immediately. The section on shrimp by Carter Broad discloses a complex pattern of species intermingled in the catch. His section is enlightening, since it clarifies popularly held misconceptions that shrimp are being depleted. John Pearson concludes that the blue crab has not been fully utilized in North Carolina but points out that competitive production costs with the Chesapeake industry may make expansion of the fishery unsound.

According to Dr. R. E. Coker, there is promise in the breeding and rearing of diamond-back terrapins in privately managed terrapin pens, dependent on a high selling price. He feels this could serve as a basis for future development of the industry. He finds insufficient information on wild stock to draw any valid conclusions.

The last two sections of Part II cover the seaweeds by Dr. Harold H. Humm and marine angling by Francesca LaMonte. Dr. Humm describes the new industry which has developed along the Carolina Coast utilizing seaweeds to produce agar. Mr. LaMonte surveys sports fishing in coastal waters. This chapter, while interesting, seems somewhat out of place, preceded by rather technical discussions of seaweeds and agar, and followed by a lengthy economic study of commercial species. It might better have been published as a separate bulletin.

Almost half of the book is devoted to Part III, entitled "Economics of the Fisheries of North Carolina," by Dr. Harden F.

Taylor. This heading is misleading, since Dr. Taylor's economic studies have led him to analyze the fisheries far beyond the confines of North Carolina.

His introduction explains the economic conditions and standard of living of the coastal region of North Carolina, and he concludes that ". . . the main impediment to what we call progress is that the human qualities of creative enterprise and desire and ambition for more and better things have not had adequate stimulation."

The book deals with the fisheries in a general and qualitative way. Dr. Taylor points out that the productivity of the sea is untapped, as compared to land, and that proteins and fats so essential for human welfare can be produced at far lower cost at the marine production point than at the production point of land animals.

The author states that it is "impossible to exterminate a species or a fishery for profit, since the profit disappears before the fish is exterminated."

Marketing, distribution, and consumption of fish in the United States are covered with explanatory statistical tables, graphs, and charts. A section on manufacturing follows, covering methods of processing which include canning, freezing, and filleting. By-products are also discussed.

The next major heading is a quantitative consideration of world fisheries and those of the United States. Dr. Taylor has standardized statistical procedures and has re-worked statistical data compiled by the Federal government from 1887 to 1940.

His findings show that "the fisheries of this country as a whole have been able to afford and continue to afford a production increasing in pace with the growth of the population." Dr. Taylor concludes that "production of food fisheries follows an economic rather than biological trend." "No evidence is seen that abundance or scarcity of any kind, or of all kinds, of fish had any effect on the total quantity or value of the product of the food fisheries."

Little advance has been made in any fishery in North Carolina except in the menhaden. Dr. Taylor feels that none will be made unless the thinking is clarified and possibly re-oriented, "or the emphasis shifted in a direction which will afford to the fisheries

the same kind of encouragement to efficiency as is given to agriculture; unnecessary restraints should be removed and assurance given that the use of any improved techniques that may be developed will not be forbidden without scientific justification."

This composite volume is a most valuable contribution to the undertaking of our fisheries. While many may disagree with the conclusions reached by Dr. Taylor, none can question the thoroughness of the study or the fresh thinking brought to bear on the handling of our marine resources. This book should serve as a guide for future research on North Carolina fishes.

David H. Wallace.

Annapolis, Maryland.

The Southern Humanities Conference and Its Constituent Societies. By J. O. Bailey and Sturgis E. Leavitt. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 1951. Pp. 68. \$1.00.)

This booklet represents an effort of the Southern Humanities Conference to give publicity to the history of the conference and its constituent societies, with a view toward encouraging research in the field. It opens with a history of the organization. According to this historical sketch, the Southern Conference originated in the American Council of Learned Societies, working largely through two of its leading members—Waldo G. Leland and Sturgis E. Leavitt. They and other leaders planned the formation of a committee in the South. Mr. Leland, director of the American Council of Learned Societies, seems to have been chiefly responsible for creating an All-Southern Committee.

Correspondence was carried on in 1944 with potential constituent organizations and editors suggesting a Humanities Conference in the South in 1945. Though many favorable replies were returned, war conditions led the American Council to delay action.

After the close of the war, Mr. Leavitt resumed action and in 1947 again communicated with southern leaders regarding a possible conference to form a "Regional Committee on the Humanities" to promote the cause. Responses were so favorable that, with the active support of the American Council, representatives of southern societies held meetings at the University of North Carolina and Duke University, as a result of which a

permanent organization was formed to be called the "Southern Humanities Conference" and ten organizations were invited to become members. The representative of the American Council stated that the organization hoped, through the Southern Humanities Conference, to "make effective impact upon the life of the South" (p. 7). He urged that support from southern foundations be sought for the program.

Activities were reported for making a survey of the humanities in the South, for preparing an index of southern societies in the fields of the humanities, and for making a survey of resources for advanced study in the South.

The next meeting, in Chapel Hill in April, 1948, heard reports on research in progress in the South. Data showed about 1,000 research-scholars active on about 1,500 research-projects ranging from encyclopedias to analyses of current events. Work was reported on a Guide to Manuscript Resources. The group also discussed three important problems: ways to attract the best men to teach in the humanistic fields, of retaining the best teachers in the South, and of encouraging creative scholarship.

It was decided later by the Executive Committee that the Stroup Survey on Research in Progress should be published as Bulletin No. I of the Southern Humanities Conference, the first of a series to be published by the University of North Carolina Press.

Annual sessions were held at Chapel Hill and the University of Virginia in 1949 and 1950. Such subjects as Societies in the South Interested in the Humanities, the Relationship of Library Resources to Graduate Work, Encouragement of Research by Southern Institutions, Collections of Manuscripts, and non-academic "Friends of the Humanities" in the South were discussed. Colleges and universities were invited to become institutional associate members. The conference for 1951 was planned to convene at Washington and Lee University.

Following the history of the organization are sections on Meetings and Officers, Histories of the Constituent Societies, Associate Members of the Southern Humanities Conference, and the constitution consisting of eight articles.

The first two bulletins of this scholarly organization reveal genuine achievement in vitalizing the humanities in the South.

The first bulletin contains eighty-six pages of *titles only* of work in progress in the humanities in a single year, and research in sociology and economics is not even listed. Had the research of men like Howard W. Odum, Rupert Vance, and Calvin Hoover been included, the record would have been even more impressive. It is an inspiring record—clear evidence of an intellectual awakening. It proves false H. L. Mencken's jibe of a generation ago to the effect that the South is ignorant and contented. The history of the Southern Humanities Conference and its constituent organizations as recorded in this second bulletin is still more inspiring information on the intellectual South. Every institution of learning that is interested in cultural progress of the South should add this series of bulletins to its collection. More power (and financial support) to Mr. Leavitt and his productive colleagues.

M. L. Skaggs.

Greensboro College,
Greensboro, N. C.

Bourbon Democracy in Alabama. By Allen Johnston Going. (University, Alabama: The University of Alabama Press. 1951. Pp. ix, 256. \$4.00.)

The purpose of this study is to fill the gap in the history of Alabama between the Reconstruction era, so well described by Walter L. Fleming, and the Populist period, which has been treated by John B. Clark. In Alabama this period extended from 1874 to 1890 and was characterized, politically, by the dominance of the Democratic party in the affairs of the state. This party was labeled "Bourbon" by its Radical enemies in order to stamp their Democratic opponents as anti-progressive and ultra-conservative. However accurate or inaccurate the label might have been, the phrase still supplies us, by common usage, with a name for an era in southern history.

It is this era in Alabama which Mr. Going proposes to analyze and describe, but his conception of his task is a narrower one than that held by Fleming or Clark. The study is confined to an analysis and description of the state government of Alabama; it is written largely from a spectator's seat in the state legislature; there is in it almost nothing of the social, economic and industrial development of the state in this period. Because the author set out to do no more than describe the history of the Democratic

party his work inevitably has about it the flavor of incompleteness. Though the task he proposed to perform has been done, the larger history of Alabama for this period remains to be treated.

Though the term "Bourbon" is shown to be inaccurate if applied to all factions of the party, yet the general pattern of Democratic government in Alabama is revealed to conform to the general characteristics of Bourbonism over the Southland. Divided by the war quarrels, the party was united by the issues of race and economy and came to victory in 1874. Hardly challenged by other political parties thereafter, its victory was consolidated by the constitution of 1875, and political domination was subsequently maintained largely by control of the election machinery. What were the attitudes and policies of this party toward the pressing questions of the time?

The answers are given in Mr. Going's book and are found to conform, for the most part, to the emerging pattern of the Bourbon South. The state debt was partially repudiated, expenditures and taxation were reduced, and economy in government became a potent slogan. As a result of economy social services were reduced or eliminated, public education was neglected, and there was no state action to alleviate the grievances of the farmer. Toward business and industry the Democratic party adopted a dual role in which industry was both impeded and encouraged. This same duality prevailed in regard to railroads, for though the Constitution of 1875 prohibited direct state aid to internal improvements the railroad commission which was established in 1881 was never so strict or powerful as in some other states. Also within the general southern pattern of the times were the attitudes of the party toward the penal system, where reform was hardly an object, and toward the Negro, who was certainly effectively controlled, though not disfranchised. The total picture is one of a government which was honest and economical but which was also weak and inefficient.

But if the author paints this general picture he also makes it clear that there was continual disagreement and opposition within the party on matters of policy. Many pressures from sectional and economic groups prevented the full realization of an agrarian, conservative program. Important modifications of Bourbon attitudes were forced on such questions as debt repudiation,

encouragement to immigration and industry, and the party shibboleth of a strictly economical government. But poverty and the prevailing philosophy of *laissez-faire* prevented any serious alterations in the Bourbon program before 1890.

The principal sources employed in this study are official documents and newspapers, though some manuscript collections have been found useful. The research has been thorough and the organization of the material is clear and logical. The style is undistinguished, even pedestrian, but the subject matter treated doubtless supplies extenuating circumstances. A useful appendix furnishes needed summaries of elections and eighteen maps enable the reader to visualize the sectional and party divisions within the state throughout the period. An excellent bibliography and an adequate index complete a sound and useful account of Bourbon democracy in Alabama.

Frontis W. Johnston.

Davidson College,
Davidson.

The Territorial Papers of The United States. Compiled and edited by Clarence Edwin Carter. Volume XV. The Territory of Louisiana-Missouri, 1815-1821. (Washington: United States Government Printing Office. 1951. Pp. 834. \$5.00.)

This is the last of a series of three volumes dealing with the Territory of Louisiana-Missouri, 1803-1821, a project commenced by the Department of State and later transferred by an executive order to the National Archives and Records Service. Volume XV includes a period of six years, 1815-1821, and is divided into four sections. Section one deals with the first administration of Governor William Clark, 1815-1816, which is a continuation from Volume XIV, *The Territory of Louisiana-Missouri, 1806-1814*. Section two deals with the second administration of Governor William Clark, 1816-1820, while section three deals with his third administration. The last section deals with the period of transition, 1820-1821, that is, the changing of the status of Missouri from that of a territory to statehood.

This is a volume of documents collected from many sources, arranged in chronological order. The source from which each document has been taken is given in headnotes, most of which may be found in various collections of the National Archives. The

volume opens with a document relating to mail routes and closes with a letter from Governor Alexander McNair to John Q. Adams, secretary of state, acknowledging the receipt of a letter, declaring the "admission of the State of Missouri as a member of the Union to be complete." The numerous footnotes add much to the usefulness of the volume, as they help clarify many of the documents included and give reference to other valuable material.

There are in the book approximately six hundred and seventy-five documents, and other valuable enclosures such as letters and petitions relating to problems growing out of pioneer conditions. Among the pressing problems confronting the three administrations of Governor William Clark none seem to be of greater concern to the people of the Missouri Territory than the land problem. Many of the documents deal with land surveys, land claims and the sale of the public domain. Such problems were of great concern to the officials in charge of the Missouri territory and the residents of the region.

The first three sections of the book include much material relating to problems concerning the Indian. This problem along with the issues growing out of the public domain gave a great concern to those entrusted with the administration of the territory. These documents reveal the growing importance of Indian affairs in the Missouri Territory during the last few years preceding statehood.

The fourth section contains many political documents relating to Missouri's move for statehood. This part of the book is interesting reading, for it gives an excellent picture of the social and economic conditions as well as the political activities immediately preceding Missouri's admission to the Union.

This volume should be quite useful to the research scholars, especially those interested in the issues growing out of the disposal of the public domain, and in problems relating to Indian affairs.

Walter H. Ryle.

Northeast Missouri State Teachers College,
Kirksville, Mo.

The People's General: The Personal Story of Lafayette. By David Loth.
(New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1951. Pp. viii, 346. \$3.50.)

In *The People's General* David Loth gives the intimate story of an ambitious young man motivated by feelings of emotional insecurity with which nearly all of us can sympathize. Beginning with his early childhood, the reader is shown the family background, the education, and the youthful associations—even the accidental occurrences—which shaped the character of Marie Joseph Paul Yves Roch Gilbert du Motier, Marquis de Lafayette. The contrast is sharply drawn between his boyhood home in the Auvergne and the Noailles Palace in Paris where according to his marriage contract he was compelled to live, when he was not with his regiment, among his court-loving in-laws. Then follows an account of the difficulties Lafayette encountered in leaving for America, the satisfying father-son type of relationship with Washington, and his adventures as an officer in the American Revolution. The difficult political and military rôle he played before, during, and after the French Revolution occupies the third part of the book, and his return to the United States and his retirement and old age conclude the work.

Although it is apparent that Loth has a great affection for his hero, he gives a frank, objective analysis of Lafayette's motives, even allowing for Lafayette's lapses of memory in relation thereto, and never indulges in hero worship. His background as a newspaperman qualifies the author as a raconteur—his story is a succession of interesting events—but does not incline him toward documentation. Sources are listed in the appendix and in the author's acknowledgments, but no footnote references are given. Letters are quoted in the text, some with dates and places and some without these aids. One wonders how David Loth knows what feelings Lafayette experienced as he stood outside the Tuileries soon after his return from America. There are awkward skips in the narrative for which no explanation is given. Although the book is relatively free from typographical faults, there are some factual discrepancies. For example, an eighty-day voyage was started on April 20, 1777 (page 67), and ended June 13, 1777 (page 72). A woman who is "a couple of years" older than the hero on page 26 has become three years older by page 45.

The book is printed in large, readable type and has an adequate index. There is one illustration, a portrait frontispiece, and an unusually attractive dust jacket. Mr. Loth is to be commended

for presenting history in its most readable form, if not its most useful.

May Davis Hill.

State Department of Archives and History,
Raleigh.

Records of the Accounting Department of the Office of Price Administration. Compiled by Meyer H. Fishbein and Elaine C. Bennett. Preliminary Inventories of the National Archives, No. 32. (Washington, 1951. Pp. vii, 108. Processed.)

Records of the Bureau of Ordnance. Compiled by William F. Shonkwiler. Preliminary Inventories of the National Archives, No. 33. (Washington, 1951. Pp. v, 33. Processed.)

Records of the Solid Fuels Administration for War. Compiled by Edward F. Martin. Preliminary Inventories of the National Archives, No. 34. (Washington, 1951. Pp. v, 39. Processed.)

These preliminary inventories are the latest in a series begun by the National Archives in 1941 with the ultimate aim of describing in detail the material in the 260-odd record groups to which its holdings are allocated. Although designed primarily for staff use—as finding aids in rendering reference service and as a means of establishing administrative control over the records—they should prove equally useful to the researcher interested in the record group inventoried.

In addition to describing the records themselves by series, each inventory contains a statement of the history and functions of the agency. In the case of the two World War II agencies, these valuable guides to their administrative complexities are supplemented by brief administrative histories of their several offices or divisions. Where related records exist, the introductory statements indicate the record groups in which they are to be found in the National Archives or the agency that has retained them for current use.

The records of the accounting department of the Office of Price Administration, 1940-1947, pertain to the administration and enforcement of the price, rent, and rationing programs. Those of the Solid Fuels Administration for War, 1941-1947, deal with the control of coal and packaged and processed fuels. Inventoried with the latter are the closely related records of the Coal Mines Administration, 1943-1945, and the Coal Mines Administration-Navy, 1946-1948, which operated the mines during

the four periods when they were seized by the Federal government.

The inventory of the Bureau of Ordnance, Department of the Navy, describes the records that had been transferred to the National Archives by June, 1951. They include many items relating to the invention, manufacture, and testing of ordnance equipment and incomplete records of various ordnance boards. There is also a collection of maps, photographs, and drawings, 1818-1943.

Dorothy Dodd.

Florida State Library,
Tallahassee.

HISTORICAL NEWS

A committee has been set up to conduct a campaign to establish at Kitty Hawk a museum relating to the Wright brothers of Dayton, Ohio, who made the first airplane flight, December 17, 1903. Members are Mr. David Stick of Kitty Hawk, chairman; Mr. Ronald F. Lee, assistant director of the National Park Service, Washington; Mr. Paul Garber, curator of the National Air Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, Washington; Mr. Harold S. Miller of Dayton, executor of the Wright estate; Mr. Harold S. Manning, head of the Southeastern Airport Managers' Association, Augusta, Georgia; Dr. Christopher Crittenden of Raleigh; and Mr. Victor S. Meekins of Manteo. The committee met with officials of the National Park Service and others in Washington, February 15, and made plans for the campaign.

The Tryon Palace Commission has signed a contract with the Boston firm of architects, Perry, Shaw and Hepburn, Kehoe and Dean, which was in charge of the restoration of colonial Williamsburg, for the reconstruction of the Tryon Palace, colonial and first state capitol of North Carolina, in New Bern. For this purpose the late Mrs. J. E. Latham of Greensboro donated approximately \$1,500,000, and the state appropriated funds for the purchase of at least a part of the necessary land.

The Department of Archives and History has arranged for the Genealogical Society of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints to make microfilm copies of the older records in Camden, Hyde, Jones, Montgomery, Moore, Person, Richmond, and Wilkes counties. Many records of the other North Carolina counties have previously been filmed by the society. In each case the master negative is retained by the society and a positive print is sent to the Department of Archives and History.

The State Records Microfilm Project, coördinated under the Department of Archives and History, has been in operation since August, 1951. Projects are now being conducted in the Board of Education, the Personnel Department, and the office of the State Treasurer.

The older records of the A. S. Cox Manufacturing Company, Winterville, have been accessioned by the State Department of Archives and History. The company, founded in 1875, made cotton planters that were distributed as far west as Texas.

The State Department of Archives and History, through the courtesy of Mrs. Elizabeth H. Cotten of Chapel Hill, has acquired the Virginia Dare desk, a gift of Mrs. George Ross Pou of Raleigh. The desk was made by North Carolinians out of white holly from Roanoke Island as the contribution of the women of the state to the women's building at the Chicago World's Fair in 1893. The carved panels represent scenes and symbols connected with Virginia Dare, including the legendary white doe, scuppernong vines, and the coat of arms of Sir Walter Raleigh. The desk has since been preserved by the State Library, the Raleigh Woman's Club, and the late George Ross Pou, State Auditor. Mrs. Cotten has given the Department a gavel which accompanied the desk when it was originally presented.

The Southern Appalachian Historical Association has chosen the name "Daniel Boone Theater" for the outdoor theater which is to be built at Boone for its production, "Horn in the West," by Kermit Hunter. The play is scheduled to open June 27 and its theme is the change effected by the mountains of North Carolina on a dyed-in-the-wool royalist in the period between 1776 and 1780.

The Department of Archives and History has a limited number of copies of the *History of the 113th Field Artillery, 30th Division*, published by the History Committee of the 113th Field Artillery, Raleigh, in 1920. The book consists of 262 pages and is illustrated with photographs, maps, and other material. Any library may obtain a copy of this volume by sending twenty-five cents for wrapping and mailing to the Division of Publications, Department of Archives and History, Box 1881, Raleigh.

At North Carolina State College, Dr. Stuart Noblin has been promoted to the rank of associate professor, and Dr. Charles F. Kolb and Dr. Marvin L. Brown, Jr., have been promoted to the rank of assistant professor.

Dr. Preston W. Edsall, head of the department of history and political science at North Carolina State College, attended the annual meeting of the Southern Political Science Association in Chattanooga, Tennessee, on November 8, 9, and 10 and served as a discussion leader in the panel of "The Rule of Law Today."

Dr. William B. Todd, professor of English at Salem College, has published "Bibliography and the Editorial Problem in the Eighteenth Century," *Studies in Bibliography*, IV (1951), 41-55; the following articles in *Papers of the Bibliographical Society of America*, XLV (1951): "Press Figures and Book Reviews as Determinants of Priority: A Study of Home's *Douglas* (1757) and Cumberland's *The Brothers* (1770)," 72-76; "Another Attribution to Swift," 82-83; "Two Issues of Crabbe's *Works* (1823)," 250-251; "Twin Titles in Scott's *Woodstock* (1826)," 256; and "A Hidden Edition of Whitehead's *Variety* (1776)," 357-358; and two articles in *The Library*, 5th ser., VI (1951): "The Bibliographical History of Burke's Reflections on the Revolution in France," 100-108, and "The First Printing of Hume's *Life* (1777)," 123-125.

Miss Sarah McCulloh Lemmon has recently published the following article: "The Ideology of the Dixiecrat Movement," *Social Forces*, December, 1951. Miss Lemmon is assistant professor of history at Meredith College.

Dr. Elisha P. Douglass, now professor of history at Elon College, has been appointed assistant professor of American history at the University of North Carolina, beginning September 1, 1952. Professor Douglass received his A. B. from Princeton, his M. S. in journalism from Columbia, and his Ph. D. from Yale in 1949. He is a member of the Advisory Committee on Historical Markers.

Dr. Wallace E. Caldwell, chairman of the department of history at the University of North Carolina, has just published (with W. C. McDermott) *Readings in Ancient History* (Rinehart), a collection of source readings.

Dr. Loren C. MacKinney delivered the inaugural lecture of the "J. C. Trent Society of the History of Medicine" at the Duke University Medical School, February 19, 1952.

Dr. Harold A. Bierck, Jr., of the University of North Carolina has been elected secretary-treasurer of the Conference on Latin American History of the American Historical Association.

The fiftieth anniversary of *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, the nation's second oldest literary-general quarterly, was celebrated by the publication on March 21 of *Fifty Years of the South Atlantic Quarterly*, edited by William B. Hamilton, and a special January anniversary issue of the *Quarterly*, which was founded in 1902 by John Spencer Bassett, history professor at Trinity College, forerunner of Duke University. Dr. William T. Laprade, chairman of the Duke history department, is the present editor of the *Quarterly*.

Mr. John E. Tyler of Roxobel has been named district vice-president for the Albemarle District of the North Carolina Society of County and Local Historians. The Albemarle District consists of the counties of Bertie, Beaufort, Camden, Chowan, Currituck, Dare, Edgecombe, Gates, Halifax, Hertford, Hyde, Martin, Nash, Northampton, Pasquotank, Perquimans, Pitt, Tyrrell, Washington, and Wilson.

Mrs. Seth L. Smith of Whiteville has been named vice-president for the Cape Fear District, which includes the counties of Bladen, Brunswick, Carteret, Columbus, Craven, Cumberland, Duplin, Greene, Jones, Lenoir, New Hanover, Onslow, Pamlico, Pender, Robeson, Sampson, and Wayne.

Mr. John E. Monger of Sanford is vice-president for the Central, which includes the counties of Alamance, Caswell, Chatham, Durham, Franklin, Granville, Guilford, Harnett, Hoke, Johnston, Lee, Montgomery, Moore, Orange, Person, Randolph, Richmond, Rockingham, Scotland, Vance, Wake, and Warren.

Dr. J. E. Hodges of Maiden has been elected divisional vice-president, in charge of activities in the Piedmont District. This district is composed of the counties of Alexander, Alleghany, Anson, Cabarrus, Catawba, Cleveland, Davidson, Davie, Forsyth, Gaston, Iredell, Lincoln, Mecklenburg, Rowan, Stanly, Stokes, Surry, Union, Wilkes, and Yadkin.

Mr. Clarence W. Griffin of Forest City is vice-president for the Western District, which includes the counties of Ashe, Avery, Buncombe, Burke, Caldwell, Cherokee, Clay, Graham, Haywood,

Henderson, Jackson, McDowell, Macon, Madison, Mitchell, Polk, Rutherford, Swain, Transylvania, Watauga, and Yancey.

A large number of North Carolinians attended the annual meeting of the American Historical Association in New York, December 28-30. Taking part in the program were Miss Frances Acomb, Dr. Paul H. Clyde, Dr. Ray C. Petry, Dr. Charles S. Sydnor, and Dr. Richard L. Watson, Jr., all of Duke University, and Dr. Fletcher M. Green of the University of North Carolina.

Mr. Martin Kellogg, Jr., of Manteo was named chairman of the Roanoke Island Historical Association at a meeting of the Board of Directors held in Raleigh January 4. Other officers elected were as follows: Mr. Russell M. Grumman of Chapel Hill, vice-chairman; Mr. I. P. Davis of Winston-Salem, secretary; and Mr. C. S. Meekins of Manteo, treasurer. Mr. Chester Davis of Winston-Salem and Mr. Grumman were presented as new members of the board.

On January 11 Mr. D. L. Corbitt of the Department of Archives and History spoke before the Bloomsbury Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution. His subject was Richard Caswell. On January 17 he addressed the Junior League of Raleigh on "The Background of Raleigh."

On January 16 Mrs. Joye E. Jordan of the Department of Archives and History attended the preview of the Brush-Everard house in Williamsburg, Virginia; on January 23 she attended the opening of the Southern Furniture Exhibition at the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts in Richmond; and on February 5 she spoke on "Quilt Patterns as Modern Art" at a luncheon meeting of the Junior Woman's Club of Raleigh.

On January 16 Dr. Christopher Crittenden addressed the Sesame Club of Faison on "Museum Opportunities for All Citizens"; on February 14 he spoke at the chapel exercises of St. Augustine's College, Raleigh, on "John Chavis, Free Negro Teacher and Preacher of the Early Nineteenth Century"; and on February 15 he attended a meeting of the Executive Board of the National Council for Historic Sites and Buildings in Washington. He has been reappointed chairman of the Society of American Archivists' Committee on Long-Range Planning.

The Warren County Historical Society was organized in Warrenton on January 14. After a talk by Mr. D. L. Corbitt of the Department of Archives and History, who had been invited to help organize the group, the following officers were elected: Mr. Arthur Nicholson, president; Dr. Lena Hawks, vice-president; and Mrs. Arthur Williams, secretary and treasurer. Mr. Charles M. Heck of Raleigh and Dr. D. T. Smithwick of Louisburg also attended the meeting.

At an organizational meeting of the Pitt County Historical Society on February 14, the following officers were elected: Judge Dink James of Greenville, president; Mrs. J. Paul Davenport of Pactolus, Mr. C. V. Cannon of Ayden, Mr. Walter Latham of Bethel, and Mrs. C. A. Lawrence of Falkland, vice-presidents; Mrs. Tabitha Visconti of Farmville, secretary; and Mrs. Bessie W. Scott of Greenville, curator. Mr. D. L. Corbitt and Mr. J. L. Jackson of Raleigh, natives of Pitt County, assisted in the organization.

The Sir Walter Raleigh Day Commission met in Raleigh on February 21 to make plans for the celebration later in the year of the four hundredth anniversary of Sir Walter's birth. The following committees were named: Executive Committee: Mr. Robert Lee Humber, Dr. Christopher Crittenden, Mrs. W. T. Bost, Mr. H. A. Scott, and Mr. A. T. Spaulding; Committee to Cooperate with Superintendent Erwin on Raleigh Day in the Schools: Mr. A. B. Gibson, Mr. Joe Nixon, Mrs. E. B. Hunter, and Mr. A. T. Spaulding; Committee on Dramatic Productions: Mr. Paul Green, Mrs. E. B. Hunter, and Dr. J. Y. Joyner; Committee to Confer with London Commission on Raleigh Quadricentennial: Mr. Robert Lee Humber, Mr. Paul Green, and Dr. Christopher Crittenden; Committee on Stamp for Raleigh Quadricentennial: Mr. William T. Polk, Mrs. Elizabeth D. Reynolds, and Mrs. W. T. Bost.

The expanded program of the State Literary and Historical Association, announced at its annual meeting last December, is getting under way. The following chairmen of committees have been appointed by President Frontis W. Johnston of Davidson: Awards, Professor Richard Walser, Raleigh; Local Historical Societies, Mr. D. L. Corbitt, Raleigh; Meetings and Programs, Dr. D. J. Whitener, Boone; Membership, Mr. Russell M. Grum-

man, Chapel Hill; To Publicize North Carolina History, Mr. Clarence W. Griffin, Forest City. A full list of committee members will be published later. On February 22 the association's Executive Committee met in Raleigh with the chairmen of the other committees and certain other interested members to hear reports of progress and to make plans for the future. The program is meeting with enthusiastic response throughout the state.

The Ashe County Historical Society was formed at Jefferson on February 22. Mr. A. L. Fletcher of Jefferson and Raleigh was named temporary chairman and Mrs. Ed M. Anderson of West Jefferson was named secretary of a seven-member board in charge of organization. Permanent officers have not yet been selected.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

Miss Fannie Memory Farmer is administrative assistant in the State Board of Public Welfare in Raleigh.

Dr. John Chalmers Vinson is an assistant professor of history at the University of Georgia, Athens.

Dr. Charles Grier Sellers, Jr., is an assistant professor of history at the University, Princeton, New Jersey.

Mr. James M. Merrill is a doctoral candidate in American history at the University of California, Los Angeles.

Dr. Ernest M. Lander, Jr., is an associate professor of history and government at Clemson College, Clemson, South Carolina.

Dr. Christopher Crittenden is director of the State Department of Archives and History, Raleigh, and secretary of the State Literary and Historical Association, Raleigh.

Mr. E. Lawrence Lee, Jr., is a doctoral candidate specializing in colonial American history at the University of North Carolina. At the present time he holds the William Richardson Davie memorial scholarship in history for North Carolina, which is awarded by the North Carolina Society of the Cincinnati.

Dr. Frontis W. Johnston is head of the department of history at Davidson College, Davidson.

Dr. Elizabeth Gregory McPherson is a reference consultant of the Manuscript Division of the Library of Congress, Washington.

Miss Mary Lindsay Thornton is librarian, North Carolina Collection, University of North Carolina Library, Chapel Hill.

CONTENTS OF LAST NUMBER
JANUARY, 1952

- ADELAIDE LISETTA FRIES *Douglas LeTell Rights*
A BOOK PEDLAR'S PROGRESS IN NORTH CAROLINA *James S. Purcell*
HENRY MCCULLOH: PROGENITOR OF THE STAMP ACT . *James High*
SOME ASPECTS OF SOCIETY IN RURAL SOUTH
CAROLINA IN 1850 *Joseph Davis Applewhite*
THE FREEDMEN'S BUREAU AND NEGRO
EDUCATION IN VIRGINIA *William T. Alderson, Jr.*
UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF
CALVIN HENDERSON WILEY *Mary Callum Wiley*
LETTERS FROM NORTH CAROLINA TO
ANDREW JOHNSON *Elizabeth Gregory McPherson*
BOOK REVIEWS
HISTORICAL NEWS





