

THE PROCEEDINGS
of
The South Carolina
Historical Association
1959

CONTENTS

The Twenty-Ninth Annual Meeting.....	2
The Horizontal Axis: Italo-Yugoslav Relations as Af- fected by the <i>Anschluss</i> , 1937-1938.....	5
DAVID B. McELROY	
The South Carolina Public Records as Sources for Revisionist Interpretation of the American Revolu- tion	18
WYLMA WATES	
The Opinions of Editor William Gilmore Simms of the <i>Southern Quarterly Review</i> , 1849-1854.....	25
FRANK W. RYAN	
The Up-Country Academies of Moses Waddel.....	36
HUGH C. BAILEY	
Members of the Association.....	44

S. C.
975.7
South
1959
Copy 3

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION, 1959-1960

President..... ERNEST M. LANDER, Clemson College

Vice-President..... NEWTON B. JONES, Presbyterian College

Secretary-Treasurer... ROBERT S. LAMBERT, Clemson College

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

(In addition to the officers named above)

MILDRED C. BECKWITH, Winthrop College

ALBERT N. SANDERS, Furman University

Editor of Proceedings

HARRY L. HARVIN, JR., Columbia College



The South Carolina Historical Association supplies the *Proceedings* to all its members. The Executive Committee elects the Editor. Beginning with 1935, every fifth number contains an index for the preceding five years. The price of the *Proceedings* to persons not members of the Association is \$2.00 per copy. Orders should be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer, Clemson College, Clemson, S. C.

THE PROCEEDINGS
of
The South Carolina
Historical Association
1959

HARRY L. HARVIN, JR.
Editor

COLUMBIA
THE SOUTH CAROLINA
HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1961

S. C. STATE LIBRARY

THE TWENTY-NINTH ANNUAL MEETING

The twenty-ninth annual meeting of the South Carolina Historical Association was held Saturday, April 4, 1959, in Charleston on The Citadel campus and at the Fort Sumter Hotel. Fifty members and a number of guests attended.

Registration and the coffee hour was followed by the morning session at which papers were read by David B. McElroy, The Citadel, on "The Horizontal Axis: Italo-Yugoslav Relations as Affected by the *Anschluss*, 1937-1938," (discussed by John W. Davis, Clemson College), and Wylma Wates, South Carolina Archives Department, on "The South Carolina Public Records as Sources for the Revisionist Interpretation of the American Revolution," (discussed by Elmer Puryear, College of Charleston).

At the noon luncheon and business session the treasurer's report was heard. It was announced that in response to a tentative invitation from Columbia College, that the 1960 meeting would be held in Columbia. Dr. W. Edwin Hemphill, recently appointed editor of the project to publish the papers of John C. Calhoun, was introduced. On motion the president appointed a committee to draw up a resolution on the death of Dr. R. L. Meriwether to be included in the *Proceedings*. Thanks were tendered to The Citadel for its role as host to the meeting. Officers for 1959-1960 were nominated and elected as follows:

President: E. M. Lander, Jr.

Vice-president: Newton B. Jones

Secretary-Treasurer: Robert S. Lambert

Executive Committee Member: Albert N. Sanders

At the afternoon session papers were read by Frank Ryan, University of North Carolina, "William Gilmore Simms as Editor of *The Southern Quarterly Review*," (discussed by Mrs. A. D. Oliphant), and by Hugh C. Bailey, Howard College, "Dr. Moses Waddel and His Academies," (discussed by Daniel W. Hollis).

The Association banquet was held at 7:00 P.M. at the Hotel Fort Sumter. E. Merton Coulter, Emeritus Professor of History in the University of Georgia, gave the main address.

ROBERT LEE MERIWETHER

Dr. Robert Lee Meriwether, founder and director of the South Caroliniana Library of the University of South Carolina, died of a coronary thrombosis on August 24, 1958. He was 68 years of age. At the time of his death Dr. Meriwether was serving on the Board of Editors of the *Journal of Southern History*.

A native of Allendale County, South Carolina, he attended Wofford College and studied history under the late David D. Wallace. After graduating in 1912 he taught in the public schools before beginning graduate study at the University of Chicago. After service as a lieutenant in World War I he joined the University of South Carolina history department in 1919 and began teaching courses in American and South Carolina history. He resumed graduate work and received the Ph.D. from Columbia University. In 1929 he succeeded Yates Snowden as head of the history department.

While teaching State history and writing his *Expansion of South Carolina, 1729-1765*, Dr. Meriwether became greatly concerned with the problem of collecting South Carolina's historical materials. His dedication to this project resulted in the establishment of the South Caroliniana Society in 1937. When the University of South Carolina erected a new library in 1940, the lovely old library building, erected in 1840, became the South Caroliniana Library. Its excellent and growing collection of books, manuscripts, and newspapers remain as a permanent monument to the dedication of its founder.

For the previous seven years Dr. Meriwether had devoted most of his time to collecting and editing the enormous number of papers of John C. Calhoun. By unremitting labors he acquired approximately 40,000 original manuscripts, photostats, microfilms, books, and pamphlets. The task of collecting was largely completed and the material organized and classified. In addition, the first of the projected fifteen volumes to be published had been edited at the time of his death.

Although his duties as librarian and editor caused him to relinquish the department chairmanship in 1949, nothing could force him to give up teaching his favorite courses. A founder of the South Carolina Historical Association in

4 THE SOUTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1930, he was also one of the original members of the Southern Historical Association. A man of ability, energy, and integrity, he will be missed in days to come, but the Caroliniana Library and the Calhoun Papers will always preserve his memory.

THE HORIZONTAL AXIS: ITALO-YUGOSLAV
RELATIONS AS AFFECTED BY
THE ANSCHLUSS
1937-1938

DAVID B. McELROY

Prior to 1936, Yugoslavian foreign policy was oriented toward France, the League of Nations, and membership in the Little Entente and the Balkan Entente. This orientation was designed to counter any territorial aspirations of Italy, Hungary or Bulgaria, and to block a Habsburg restoration in Austria. Yugoslav belief that a merger of Austria with Germany might be the best way to prevent a restoration was one reason why Yugoslavia was not unalterably opposed to the *Anschluss* idea.¹ Fear and suspicion of Italy was another. Mussolini's revisionism and encouragement to Hungary, his support of Croat separatism, and his view of Roman Catholicism as an instrument of Italian policy, were all seen as threats to Yugoslavian national consolidation. Belgrade regarded the Legitimists of Austria with apprehension and the Schuschnigg regime as the herald of the Habsburgs. This enmity was strengthened by Austrian dependence upon Italy and by the Rome Protocols of 1934 signed by Rome, Vienna and Budapest. Yugoslavs and Austrian Nazis found common cause against Italy and against the Habsburgs. These factors blinded Yugoslavia to the probable consequences of an Austro-German *Anschluss*.

Between 1933 and 1936, following her resurgence, Germany implemented a policy of economic penetration into the Balkans.² Yugoslavia was able to profit thereby and at the same time to play off Germany against Italy. But these halcyon days came to an abrupt end with the signing of the Austro-German Agreement of July 1936, and the formation of the Rome-Berlin Axis in October of the same year. This shift in the balance of power necessitated a change in Yugoslav policy. Good relations with both parties to the Axis

¹ Austrian Legation to Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Guido Schmidt, Belgrade, September 12, 1936, *Der Hochverratsprozess gegen Dr. Guido Schmidt vor dem Wiener Volksgericht: Die Gerichtlichen Protokolle mit den Zeugnisaussagen, unveröffentlichten Dokumenten sämtlichen Geheimbriefen und Geheimakten* (Wien, 1947), 544. Cited hereafter as *Hochverratsprozess*.

² For a summary of German-Yugoslav economic relations, see Memorandum by Deputy Director of the Economic Policy Department, Berlin, January 7, 1938, *Documents on German Foreign Policy, 1918-1945*, Series D, Vol. V (State Department publication No. 3277, Washington, D.C.), 217-219, Doc. 159. Cited hereafter as *German Documents*.

became a matter of expediency to Belgrade for political and economic reasons.

Germany had her own reasons for closer relations with Belgrade. Her objective was the isolation of Czechoslovakia by detaching Rumania and Yugoslavia from the Little Entente. Germany urged Italy to establish good relations with Yugoslavia as soon as possible³ and to attempt to direct Hungarian irredentism against Czechoslovakia rather than Yugoslavia so as to draw the latter away from French and British influence.⁴ This improvement in relations with his neighbor was timely for Mussolini who was beginning to entertain serious doubts about future German policy and to desire to strengthen his own. The immediate result was the Yugoslav *rapprochement* with Italy in March 1937.

Mussolini, speaking at Milan on November 1, 1936, extended the olive branch to Yugoslavia when he declared that "by now necessary and sufficient conditions exist, of a moral, political, and economic character, to place on a new basis of concrete friendship the relations between the two countries."⁵ Milan Stojadinovic, the Yugoslav Premier, accepted this gesture of friendship and an exchange of views followed.⁶ By March 1937, the basic negotiations for an agreement had been completed; and Count Ciano, the Italian Foreign Minister, made his first visit to Belgrade to conclude the pact. During the conversations in Belgrade, Stojadinovic repeated to Ciano that he considered the *Anschluss* inevitable but that it must be delayed as long as possible. However, he could view the pan-German problem with "greater equanimity" since there had developed the possibility of an agreement with Italy and the prospect of a future alliance. "Once the *Anschluss* is an accomplished fact," he speculated, "all those countries who must oppose the German descent towards the Adriatic or along the Danube valley, will polarise around the Rome-Belgrade axis. The bloc which will arise will be such as to dissuade the Germans from any mad attempt."⁷ Stojadinovic argued

³ Malcolm Muggeridge, (ed.), *Ciano's Diplomatic Papers*, trans. by Stuart Hood (London, 1948), 54. Cited hereafter as *Ciano's Papers*.

⁴ Bulgaria also was to be used as a means for seducing Yugoslavia away from the Balkan Entente.

⁵ John W. Wheeler-Bennet, Stephen A. Heald, et al., (eds.), *Documents on International Affairs, 1936* (London, 1937), 345-346.

⁶ See Ciano's Minute of Conversation with the Yugoslav Minister to Rome, December 18, 1936, *Ciano's Papers*, 70, and Minute of Conversation with Yugoslav Minister, Rome, December 28, 1936, *ibid.*, 70-71.

⁷ Minute of the Conversation with the Yugoslav Prime Minister, Stojadinovic, Belgrade, March 26, 1937, *Ciano's Papers*, 100.

that Germany would not have encouraged the Rome-Belgrade agreement—a union which would come into operation in the event of a German threat—had her intentions been other than favorable.

On March 25, there was signed a political and economic pact guaranteeing the *status quo* in the Adriatic for five years, granting concessions to Yugoslav minorities in Italy, and committing each government not to tolerate any activity directed against the territorial integrity or the established order of the other country. In the words of Ciano, "A new era of political relations between Italy and Yugoslavia began today, an era of friendship and loyal cooperation."⁸ This pact was regarded as a great success for Stojadinovic, who considered it a point of departure rather than a point of arrival. It removed the friction with Italy, secured the western frontier and provided the possibility of increased exports. It was even more successful for Mussolini. He had maneuvered so as to cooperate with Germany in weaning Yugoslavia away from the Little Entente and at the same time to weaken Yugoslavia's economic ties with Germany. Furthermore, this was the first point of contact between two groups of nations—the Rome Protocol states and the Little Entente—which had hitherto regarded each other as enemies. Mussolini informed Chancellor Schuschnigg of Austria, during the latter's visit to Venice in April, that it might be possible shortly to make Yugoslavia adhere to the agreements among Italy, Austria and Hungary.⁹ But apparently Stojadinovic was temporarily satisfied with his Italian agreement, for he cooled noticeably toward a *rapprochement* with Hungary, which had been offered by the Hungarian Foreign Minister, Kálman Kánya,¹⁰ and urged by both Germany and Italy.

Nor did Germany fare much better in securing closer relations with Yugoslavia. The Reich Minister of Foreign Affairs, Constantin von Neurath, followed Ciano to Belgrade in June. The purpose of the visit, according to Neu-

⁸ *New York Times*, March 26, 1937.

⁹ Minute of the Conversation between the Duce and Chancellor Schuschnigg, in the presence of Count Ciano, Venice, April 22, 1937, *Ciano's Papers*, 114.

¹⁰ Memorandum by the Press Attaché of the Legation in Switzerland of a Conversation with the Hungarian Foreign Minister, M. de Kánya, on September 21, 1937, Geneva, *German Documents*, Series D, V, 186, Doc. 141. Stojadinovic's attitude was also affected by the public demonstration during the visit of President Benes of Czechoslovakia in April, 1937. See Minute of the Conversation with Durányi and Kánya, Budapest, May 19-22, 1937, *Ciano's Papers*, 118.

rath, was to signify German interest in the Danube area for the benefit of France and Austria and to assist Stojadinovic in his domestic politics by calming those who feared a one-sided relation with Italy. Neurath did not receive as favorable a reception as he had expected, and the Yugoslavs showed little inclination for a closer relationship. Such, at least, were the conclusions of the British, Italian and Austrian representatives in Belgrade. Neurath's visit was perhaps ill-considered, since emphasis on German influence tended to arouse Serbian distrust. The trip also served as a propaganda venture against Austria. Neurath told the Austrian Minister to Belgrade, Lothar Wimmer, that the future looked very dark with regard to Austro-German relations.¹¹ He gave the Hungarian minister a similar evaluation of the political situation in Austria and suggested that as a result the Hungarians should not divide their strength against three fronts but rather should concentrate against Czechoslovakia.¹² Stojadinovic later informed Wimmer that there had been complete understanding between Germany and Yugoslavia on the restoration question.¹³ Even the Greek ambassador, Rosetti, conveyed to Wimmer Stojadinovic's belief that the *Anschluss* was threatening and that the Yugoslav Premier only wished to postpone it as long as possible because of the danger to peace.¹⁴ This attitude and judgment was common among the foreign diplomats.

Later that year, during the secret negotiations concerning the anti-Comintern Pact, Mussolini discussed the Austrian question with Ribbentrop and stated that he was "tired of mounting guard over Austrian independence, especially if the Austrians no longer want their independence. . . . We cannot impose independence upon Austria which, by the very fact that it was imposed, would cease to be independence."¹⁵ Stojadinovic was clearly aware of

¹¹ Memorandum by Chief of the Presidential Chancellery on the Reception of the Hungarian Minister President de Darányi and Hungarian Foreign Minister de Kánya by the Führer and Chancellor on November 25, 1937, *German Documents*, Series D, V, 201, Doc. 149. Minute of the Conversation with the Yugoslav Prime Minister, Stojadinovic, Belgrade, March 26, 1937, *Ciano's Papers*, 101.

¹² Austrian Legation to the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Guido Schmidt, Belgrade, June 12, 1937, *Hochverratsprozess*, 547.

¹³ For a summary of Neurath's visit to Belgrade, see Austrian Legation to the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Guido Schmidt, Belgrade, June 10, 1937, *Hochverratsprozess*, 545-547.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 547.

¹⁵ Minute of the Conversation with the Duce and Herr von Ribbentrop. Rome, November 6, 1937, *Ciano's Papers*, 146.

developments. He knew that he must rely on the Belgrade Agreements to secure his western flank in the event of German expansion into Central Europe—an event which he took for granted. He also needed the prestige of Rome in connection with internal policy. Croat autonomists and the Serbian Liberals formed the United Opposition in October 1937 as a common front against the Yugoslav Radical Union of which Stojadinovic was chairman. Nevertheless, he went to Paris in October and renewed the 1927 treaty of alliance with France and then went on to visit London. He did not overextend himself, however, for he rejected a French invitation to adhere to a mutual assistance pact between France and the Little Entente. During the visit of the French Foreign Minister, Delbos, to Warsaw and the Little Entente capitals, Stojadinovic decided to return to Rome on the occasion of the visit of the Italian Foreign Minister, Ciano, in the previous March. He ostentatiously remained in Italy until December 9, hastening back to Belgrade just in time to receive Delbos, who was arriving from Bucharest.

Ciano had personally handled the details of the Yugoslav Premier's visit to Rome to give him an exceptional welcome. Ciano, perhaps more than Mussolini, regarded the Belgrade Pact as fundamental for Italian policy and felt that this alliance with the Serbs allowed Italy "to view with calmness the possibility of the *Anschluss*."¹⁶ In Rome, Stojadinovic had assured Mussolini that Yugoslavia intended to follow the path laid down by the Belgrade Agreements. He concurred with the Italian view of the Austrian question,¹⁷ and both agreed on a more intense collaboration and continuous strengthening of friendship. It was also decided to send a number of Yugoslav military and technical missions to Italy for more direct contact between the armed forces.¹⁸ Although nothing new was put on paper, Ciano felt that the conversations had laid the foundations for a possible alliance: "An alliance which might be aimed in various directions. Possibly northwards even, one day."¹⁹

¹⁶ Entry for December 5, 1937, Galeazzo Ciano, *Diary, 1937-1938*, trans. by Andreas Mayor (London, 1952), 41. Cited hereafter as *Ciano's Diary, 1937-1938*.

¹⁷ This is not substantiated by the German sources which state that Stojadinovic was not sympathetic to the idea of *Anschluss*. See the Minute by the Chargé d'Affaires, Plessen, to the Foreign Ministry, December 8, 1937, *German Documents*, Series D, V, 205, Doc. 153.

¹⁸ Minute of the Conversation with M. Stojadinovic, Yugoslav Prime Minister, Rome, December 11, 1937, *Ciano's Papers*, 149-152.

¹⁹ Entry for December 10, 1937, *Ciano's Diary, 1937-1938*, 42.

By the beginning of 1938, the French system of alliances had been breached, the Little Entente badly shaken, and the Rome Protocols superceded. Yugoslavia, courted by Italy and Germany, had settled her differences with all her neighbors except Hungary and had benefited economically. Stojadinovic was not prepared to sacrifice his favorable position for either Czechoslovakia or Austria unless he could rely upon the direct and effective intervention of both France and Great Britain and the neutrality of Italy in the event of military action by Germany. He still did not wish to abandon the friendship with France, but this was chiefly because it was deeply rooted in extensive circles in Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia also continued to maintain good relations with England but avoided any commitments at the expense of Italy.

The Yugoslav Premier went to Berlin in January 1938, for talks with Hitler and Neurath. Extensive briefs, both political and economic, were drawn up by the German Foreign Office in preparation for the occasion. In one of these, care was taken to caution against the expediency of discussing with Stojadinovic the connections "between economic interdependence and political development, because . . . the fear is already being voiced that Yugoslavia could, through economic collaboration, become too dependent on Germany politically."²⁰ Stojadinovic was told by Neurath that the Austro-German question was as unsatisfactory as ever.²¹ However, Hitler assured him that Germany was in favor of a strong Yugoslavia and that German friendship with Italy in no way conflicted with German friendship with Yugoslavia. He further stated that he had no sympathy with Hungarian revisionism on the Hungarian-Yugoslav border and encouraged a *rapprochement* for which Germany was prepared to assume the role of guarantor.²²

During the course of the conversations, Minister President Göring announced that "Yugoslavia could rely upon it that, if Austria should sometime join with Germany and Germany should thus become a neighbor of Yugoslavia, Germany would never make territorial demands on Yugo-

²⁰ Memorandum by the Deputy Director of the Economic Policy Department, Berlin, January 7, 1938, *German Documents*, Series D, V, 218, Doc. 159.

²¹ Memorandum by the Foreign Minister, Neurath, Berlin, January 15, 1938, *German Documents*, Series D, V, 222, Doc. 162.

²² Memorandum by the Minister to Yugoslavia, Berlin, January 17, 1938, *German Documents*, Series D, V, 224-225, Doc. 163.

slavia." Hitler fully agreed that whatever happened, the present Yugoslav border would remain as inviolate as the Brenner Pass. The German minority in Yugoslavia was entirely loyal to Belgrade, and a good minorities policy was the best protection for Yugoslavia. Stojadinovic assured them that "the Austrian question was for Yugoslavia a purely domestic German question."²³ Hitler ended the conversations by pointing out that "just as Yugoslavia, in her relations with Germany, had now removed the French spectacles, Germany, too, in her relations with Yugoslavia, was now no longer using Viennese spectacles."²⁴

Coinciding closely with Stojadinovic's Berlin visit, the Foreign Ministers of the Rome Protocol states met in Budapest. Ciano personally did not attach much importance to the meeting for he felt that the Protocols had been superseded.²⁵ At the conference, the Austrian Foreign Minister, Guido Schmidt, requested a declaration about the independence of Austria which, as Ciano notes, "out of consideration for Germany I felt we could not make." Hungarian desire for a declaration about minorities was also refused because, while directed primarily at Rumania, it would have annoyed Yugoslavia more than anyone; and this was the one thing Italy wanted to avoid.²⁶ At a time when the Little Entente was going through a crisis, Italy did not want to give them a new motive for solidarity. From this meeting, the two smaller states of the Rome bloc lost much without gaining anything. Neither secured declarations from Italy in favor of their primary objectives, but both compromised their own positions by submerging their individual foreign policies to that of the Axis. The Budapest Conference was the foreign political prelude to Berchtesgaden.

On February 12, 1938, Schuschnigg met the Führer at Berchtesgaden. During this long and dramatic meeting, Schuschnigg was forced to accept a political program which called for complete Nazification of Austria. Even the Italian government was surprised by this blow to Austrian independence. Ciano and Mussolini saw the *Anschluss*—if

²³ *Ibid.*, 228. Also see Austrian Legation to the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Guido Schmidt, Belgrade, January 29, 1938, *Hochverratsprozess*, 549-550.

²⁴ Memorandum by the Minister to Yugoslavia, Berlin, January 17, 1938, *German Documents*, Series D, V, 229, Doc. 163.

²⁵ Entry for December 8, 1937, *Ciano's Diary, 1937-1938*, 45.

²⁶ See entries for January 10, 11, 12, and 13, 1938, *Ciano's Diary, 1937-1938*, 63-64.

not complete—certainly far advanced. On the sixteenth, Ciano remarked to Bosko Cristic, the Yugoslav Minister in Rome, that their countries were in an identical position with regard to pan-Germanism, though Yugoslavia was the weaker militarily and in the event of *Anschluss* did not have a solid natural barrier for a frontier. "But," Ciano pointed out, "as the Austrian cockerel has found his way—or almost—into the German pot earlier than necessary, it is indispensable that the bonds between Rome and Belgrade should be further strengthened. . . . I think we should forthwith study the question of an alliance with Yugoslavia. A horizontal Axis will make possible the existence of the vertical Axis."²⁷ Mussolini was irritated at the Germans for the manner in which they acted in the Austrian affair, but Italy was faced with a *fait accompli* and there was no alternative but to approve what Schuschnigg had done.

It is interesting to note the sense of futility and finality contained in Wimmer's Belgrade dispatches to his chief after Berchtesgaden. He observed that the Yugoslavian attitude depended upon the axiom that the *Anschluss* and the restoration were undesirable "but that of these two evils the *Anschluss* represents the lesser." At the same time, Yugoslavia could not be asked to do more for the independence of Austria than the large powers were doing—especially Italy. Therefore, Stojadinovic did nothing. Wimmer reported that there was no lack of warning voices against the danger of a common frontier with Germany but that they belonged to the opposition. Stojadinovic alone was responsible for the foreign policy of the government, and his personal confidence in Germany and dependence on Italy encouraged his belief in the possibility of side-tracking Hitler and stopping the Germans at the gates of the Balkans.²⁸

A few days before Schuschnigg announced his intention to hold a plebiscite, the Yugoslav Minister in Berlin once again assured Ribbentrop that the Austrian question was an internal German affair. Stojadinovic was willing to accept a "German solution" as the only permanent guarantee against Habsburg and Italian machinations in Austria. But there was far from unanimous support of this official pol-

²⁷ Entry for February 17, 1938, *Ciano's Diary, 1937-1938*, 76.

²⁸ Austrian Legation to the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Guido Schmidt, Belgrade, February 26, 1938, *Hochverratsprozess*, 552-555.

icy, especially in Slovenia and Croatia where clerical influence led to a definitely negative attitude toward *Anschluss*.²⁹

The Austrian plebiscite was scheduled for March 13. Every Austrian would have the opportunity to vote for or against "a free and a German Austria, an independent and a social Austria, a Christian and a united Austria."³⁰ Hitler, of course, could not permit the plebiscite to take place. An ultimatum was sent demanding, under threat of invasion, a cancellation of the plebiscite and the resignation of Schuschnigg. The capitulation came in the evening of the eleventh. The new Chancellor, acting upon previous instructions from Germany, requested German troops "to maintain order" in Austria,³¹ and the following morning German troops crossed the Austrian frontier.

As a result of the *Anschluss*, there were strong repercussions both in Yugoslavia and in Italy. The Italians were convinced that Germany had betrayed Italy.³² The United Opposition in the Yugoslav parliament vigorously attacked Stojadinovic for his attitude in the Austrian affair.³³ In his parliamentary defense of his position, Stojadinovic claimed that Yugoslavia was now surrounded by friends;³⁴ but this was a weak explanation, and Cincar-Markovic had to ask Hitler to stress the inviolability of the new German-Yugoslav frontier in one of his speeches in order to help Stojadinovic against the Opposition.³⁵ Stojadinovic of course, had foreseen the event and was relying on the personal assurances of the Führer and his understanding with Italy, but even he was surprised and shaken by the precipitous action taken by Germany.

Cristic hurried back to Rome and informed Ciano that Stojadinovic wished to meet with him. The Yugoslav minister reported that his Premier intended to continue his past policy—"relations of very good neighbourliness with Germany, close, cordial and profound understanding with

²⁹ Memorandum by the Foreign Minister, Ribbentrop, Berlin, March 4, 1938, *German Documents*, Series D, V, 242, Doc. 174. See footnote on Minister Heeren's dispatch of February 22, 1938, from Belgrade.

³⁰ *Reichspost* (Vienna), March 10, 1938.

³¹ Telegram from Seyss-Inquart to Hitler, March 11, 1938, *German Documents*, Series D, I, 580, Doc. 358.

³² *New York Times*, March 12, 1938.

³³ *New York Times*, March 16, 1938.

³⁴ *New York Times*, March 10, 1938.

³⁵ Memorandum by the State Secretary Mackensen, Berlin, March 17, 1938, *German Documents*, Series D, V, 259, Doc. 184.

Italy."⁸⁶ Ciano agreed to a meeting with Stojadinovic but, for obvious reasons, not too soon. Ciano was "now thinking of the second pact which we shall have to forge with Yugoslavia, which will unite the destinies of the two countries in the common defence of our respective worlds—but without altering our friendship with Germany. So long as there are eighty million Germans in the heart of Europe, for Rome and for Belgrade, German friendship is a fatality, oppressive perhaps, but very real."⁸⁷

With the annexation of Austria, Hitler was now in a position to isolate Czechoslovakia and to dominate the Danube Basin. Germany was in direct touch with Italy, Yugoslavia and Hungary, and was within a hundred miles of the former Adriatic ports of the Habsburg Empire. The significance of these facts was not overlooked in Prague, Belgrade, Budapest, or in Rome. Hitler had also lost much sympathy in Yugoslavia and Italy by the brusque manner in which he effected the *Anschluss*. Mussolini became increasingly concerned, especially with the irredentist demonstrations among the German element in the South Tyrol. He even feared the possibility of a Slav-German alliance based on a common irredentism. Ciano disagreed because of Yugoslav fear of Germany but did see the possibility of a German invasion of Yugoslavia, against which precautions were needed. He wanted to explore the possibilities for an immediate military understanding with Belgrade.⁸⁸ At the same time, Stojadinovic was interested in learning the intentions of the Fascist government in the event of a second German *coup* in Central Europe.

The meeting between Ciano and Stojadinovic took place in Venice in the middle of April 1938. This was viewed as a move by Mussolini to make Italy less dependent on his working agreement with Hitler. Actually, no further steps were taken toward a military alliance, but Stojadinovic requested Ciano to inform the Duce that Yugoslavia was a state "bound to Italy by ties stronger than those which could result from a written pact of alliance, which . . . should circumstances require it, could be achieved in the course of a few hours."⁸⁹ Stojadinovic assured Ciano that

⁸⁶ Minute of the Conversation with the Yugoslav Minister, Rome, April 15, 1938, *Ciano's Papers*, 201.

⁸⁷ Entry for March 13, 1938, *Ciano's Diary, 1937-1938*, 88.

⁸⁸ Entry for April 21, 1938, *Ciano's Diary, 1937-1938*, 104-105.

⁸⁹ Minute of the Conversation with Yugoslav Prime Minister, Stojadinovic, Venice, June 18, 1938, *Ciano's Papers*, 213-214.

in the event of a Czechoslovakian crisis, should Italy decide against action, Yugoslavia would follow suit; but he requested Ciano to use his influence in Budapest to prevent Hungary from taking the initiative because in such a case Yugoslavia would be obliged to abide by its pledges to the Little Entente. The Premier made no secret of the fact that the *Anschluss* had caused a marked reaction in Yugoslav public opinion and claimed that the result had been to give friendship with Rome maximum popularity. A new reinforcement of Germany by the incorporation of three million Sudetens would not be desirable, and the two states must continue to watch Germany policy at all times.⁴⁰ Ciano, too, felt that the two countries were certainly more closely united as a result of the *Anschluss*.⁴¹

The extent to which Yugoslavia had withdrawn from the Little Entente can be seen in the April meeting of the Permanent Council. At that meeting, Stojadinovic refused even to recognize the Sudeten German question as a subject of negotiation;⁴² and at the meeting of the Chiefs of the Operation's Divisions of the three states, Yugoslavia refused to make any military commitment in the event of Hungarian aggression—the excuse being she dared not leave the Italian border exposed.⁴³

When the Czechoslovakian crisis came in September, 1938, Cristic again conveyed to Ciano Stojadinovic's intention to make the attitude of Yugoslavia conform with that of Italy. Speaking personally, Cristic said that Yugoslavia would not support Germany in a war but neither would she oppose Germany. He underlined the necessity that Hungary not be the first to take up arms against Prague, which would oblige Yugoslavia to keep faith with its Little Entente pledges. With regard to the internal situation in Yugoslavia, Cristic reported that Stojadinovic's position was continually growing stronger.⁴⁴ But Cristic over-estimated the strength of Stojadinovic and the popularity of his policies. Yugoslavia and Rumania, owing to popular pressures in both instances, reaffirmed their ties to the Republic and

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 215.

⁴¹ Entry for June 17, 1938, *Ciano's Diary, 1937-1938*, 128.

⁴² *Documents on International Affairs, 1938*, I, 281-282. See also Minister in Roumania, Fabricus, to the Foreign Ministry, Bucharest, May 6, 1938, *German Documents, Series D, V*, 275, Doc. 199.

⁴³ Minister in Roumania to the Foreign Ministry, Bucharest, May 6, 1938, *German Documents, Series D, V*, 275-276, Doc. 200.

⁴⁴ Minute of the Conversation with the Yugoslav Minister, Rome, September 13, 1938, *Ciano's Papers*, 233.

to the people of Czechoslovakia, warning the Magyars that "in case of an attack of Hungary against Czechoslovakia, they would be obliged to fulfill their engagements as members of the Little Entente."⁴⁵ But the Czechs were doomed, and with them the Little Entente.

Within four months after Munich, two further events occurred which spelled the end of the embryonic horizontal axis. The first event was the arrival in Rome on October 27 of Ribbentrop. He came on a personal mission for the Führer to offer a military alliance between Italy, Germany and Japan. Such an alliance would preclude the possibility of a bilateral military pact with Yugoslavia. The fundamental guiding policy was henceforth to be the vertical, not the horizontal, Axis. Yugoslavia, of course, would be expected to form still closer bonds with the Axis but her gravitation would now be toward Germany—not Italy. By this date Yugoslavia could not do otherwise but follow Italian policy. She had disavowed her Little Entente obligations, rejected the Balkan Entente and isolated herself from France and England.

The Steel Pact, which Ribbentrop offered, was not consummated for another six months. Ciano opposed a military alliance with Germany and continued to agitate for the horizontal Axis. He spoke of including Prague and Warsaw in the horizontal axis in October,⁴⁶ and again in Budapest in December, he said that "from every point of view it is good that a close bloc should be formed between Italy, Yugoslavia, and Hungary."⁴⁷ But Mussolini was no longer as concerned with the implementation of a horizontal axis as he was worried about weakening Italo-Yugoslav friendship to the advantage of Germany,⁴⁸ particularly in view of Italy's plant of action for Albania. This was the reason for Ciano's fourth and final visit to Belgrade in January 1939.

The second event in the destruction of the horizontal axis was the fall of Stojadinovic. Neither Germany nor Italy realized the total effect of the *Anschluss* and the Czech crisis on Yugoslavia. In October 1938, Heeren, the German Minister in Belgrade, had warned the German Foreign Minister that Germany had lost Yugoslavic good will, which

⁴⁵ *New York Times*, September 15, 1939, dates the warning on September 14. *L'Europe Centrale*, October 1, 1938, p. 639, dates it on September 24.

⁴⁶ Entry for October 5, 1938, *Ciano's Diary, 1937-1938*, 174.

⁴⁷ Entry for December 19-20, 1938, *Ciano's Diary, 1937-1938*, 207.

⁴⁸ Entry for December 6, 1938, *Ciano's Diary, 1937-1938*, 203.

would take considerable time to regain. Heeren did not believe, however, that public opinion would make itself felt in government policy.⁴⁹ He, like most of the foreign diplomats, continued to underestimate the strength of opposition to the Belgrade government. In the December elections, the United Serb-Croat Opposition polled forty per cent of the vote. This was due largely to the Croat question, but certainly foreign affairs were not without influence; and the result was considered distinctly unfavorable to the government.

Ciano met with the Yugoslav Premier between January 19 and 23, 1939. This visit convinced Ciano that Yugoslav public opinion was "dominated . . . by two feelings: a sense of profound satisfaction at the consolidation of friendly relations with Italy, and widespread and deep anxiety at the short and long range aims of German expansionism."⁵⁰ The latter was true but the former only insofar as the Yugoslav government was concerned. When Stojadinovic announced that one of the basic directives of Yugoslav policy was "increasingly marked attachment to Rome and thereby inclusion in the Axis,"⁵¹ he also stated one of the reasons for his fall. Ciano thought Stojadinovic was as firmly in control as ever, but ten days later Stojadinovic was out of office.

The *Anschluss*, the Czech crisis, and the Munich agreement had been a rude shock to Yugoslavia. The increasing hold of Germany over Hungary, Italian loss of foreign policy direction to Hitler, the systematic buying up by Germans of land and property in Slovenia,⁵² Ciano's extremely unpopular visit to Belgrade at a time when the Balkan Entente was stiffening with the growing strength of the Western Powers, all contributed to the fall of Stojadinovic and with him the horizontal axis. His successors continued to follow the outline of policy laid down by Stojadinovic, but the alignment was toward Germany, not Italy; so the horizontal axis disappeared while the vertical axis tipped northward.

⁴⁹ Minister in Yugoslavia to the Foreign Ministry, Belgrade, October 7, 1938, *German Documents*, Series D, V, 312, Doc. 232.

⁵⁰ Report on Ciano's journey to Yugoslavia and of the conversation with the Prime Minister, Stojadinovic, January 18-23, 1939, *Ciano's Papers*, 268.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 270.

⁵² See R. Jelacin, "Achat de Terrain par les allemands en Slovénie," *Voix Européenne*, March 1938, pp. 136-138.

THE SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC RECORDS AS SOURCES FOR REVISIONIST INTERPRETATION OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

WYLMA WATES

The American Revolution has been subjected to more than its fair share of interpretation—and misinterpretation. Writing in the *William and Mary Quarterly*, Edmund S. Morgan analyzes what he considers to be the three main ideas that have inspired historical research into the American Revolution in the last years.¹

The first is the idea "that American colonial history must be seen in the setting of the British Empire as a whole," and Dr. Morgan names George Louis Beer, Charles McLean Andrews, and Lawrence H. Gipson as its chief exponents.² The second is "that the social and economic divisions of a people will profoundly influence the course of their history," and he identifies, among others who have applied it, Carl Becker, Charles Beard, and J. Franklin Jameson.³ The third, and last, of the three ideas is a more complex one growing out of the research of Sir Lewis Namier in British politics during this period. Its effect, says Dr. Morgan, "has been to attach a new importance to local as opposed to national forces."⁴

The application of these three ideas—the imperial, the social and economic, and the Namierist—has had beneficial results, Dr. Morgan admits. But he feels, quite properly it would appear, that some confusion has ensued. There is a basic contradiction between the exponents of the imperial idea, who contend that British colonial policy was sound, and the Namierists who say in effect that England had no colonial policy, while social and economic motives have been over-emphasized in some cases.

It is against this background that Dr. Morgan urges exhaustive research in the individual colonies comparable to the study of local institutions fostered by Herbert Baxter Adams half a century ago:

We need to know how the individual's picture of society was formed. We need to study the social group-

¹ Edmund S. Morgan, "The American Revolution: Revisions in Need of Revising," *William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, XIV (1957), 3-15.

² *Ibid.*, 3.

³ *Ibid.*, 3-4.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 4.

ings in every colony: towns, plantations, counties, churches, schools, clubs, and other groups which occupied the social horizons of the individual colonist. We need to study political parties and factions in every colony. We need to study county courts and the justices of the peace. We need to study the distribution of land and other forms of wealth from decade to decade and from place to place. We need to know so elementary a thing as the history of representation and history of taxation in every colony. We have always known that the Revolution had something to do with the phrase, 'no taxation without representation,' and yet, after two generations of modern scholarship, how many scholars have studied the history of taxation in the colonies? Who really knows anything about the history of representation?⁵

The purpose of this paper is quite humble. I do not propose to analyze the books already written about the Revolution in South Carolina by David Ramsay, Edward McCrady and Anne King Gregorie, or the books which we hope will be published as a result of the labors of Robert W. Barnwell, Carl L. Epting, W. Richard Walsh,⁶ Richard M. Brown, and Lucille Griffith, and then attempt to tell you which interpretations they present. Nor do I intend to say anything about the resources, or rather what I understand is a serious lack of resources, in the way of private papers of the Revolutionary period. I know as yet very little about these subjects, but in the course of seven years' connection with the State Archives I have learned something about the official, public records of South Carolina, both those in the Archives Department itself and those which for one reason or another are preserved today in other repositories. I am going simply to describe the principal collections relating to the years between 1763 and 1790 as if I were trying to persuade you to pick up the gauntlet thrown down by Edmund Morgan. I shall also venture to give a few examples of tentative conclusions reached by students already familiar with these records that are at variance with long accepted views—views which may be presented some day as documented, revisionist interpretations.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁶ Richard Walsh, *Charleston's Sons of Liberty: a Study of the Artisans, 1763-1789* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1959).

Let me say in the beginning that local records as we understand the term today, are not found in any great quantity in the study of South Carolina in the eighteenth century. Neither the town nor the county was a record-keeping agency until some years after the Revolution. If the local justices of the peace kept any records they have long since been lost.

On the positive side, however, are the parish registers and vestry minutes, now largely in the custody of the Episcopal Bishop of South Carolina. When we consider that the Church of England, however it might be at variance with our twentieth-century ideals of freedom of religion, was a strong arm of the state enforcing the law, controlling public elections, protecting the poor, and directing the operation of free schools, we realize what mines of information these parish records are. Particularly if they are supplemented with the reports sent by the parish clergy to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and to the Bishop of London, they compensate in great measure for the lack of town and county records.

It should not be concluded from what I have said that the parish records are the only sources of local history. Actually there are a number of approaches through land records, court records (especially after the circuit courts went into operation in 1772), and the journals of the General Assembly. Although some are inclined to apologize today for the fact that South Carolina had a highly centralized system of government during the colonial period, it has not been without its advantages for historians. It meant that records of all sorts of local matters dealt with by the central government have survived in fair abundance, information that might have perished if the records had been widely scattered.

A surprisingly large number of the documents created in the course of shaping the policies and carrying on the business of the central government between 1763 and 1790 have survived. The three classes of legislative records familiar to students under the titles, journals, acts, and legislative papers are well represented in the Archives' collections. The journals are complete for both houses with the exception of those of the upper house from 1776 to 1780 and those of the lower house from 1777 to 1779. The acts are virtually complete. The legislative papers of the period before the Revolution appear to have been destroyed, prob-

ably while being evacuated from Charleston on the eve of the British invasion in 1780. Those of the years following the war are intact, in spite of exposure to a similar hazard in 1865. Historians may well be thankful for this act of fortune, for later clerks were less inclined than their predecessors to copy long texts of petitions and reports in the journals.

It has long been the practice to mourn the loss of the early records of the executive branch of the South Carolina government and its administrative subdivisions, but as the slow work of identifying the extant records with the offices of their origin proceeds, the conclusion is being reached that far greater numbers of these documents have survived in the form either of originals or of copies than was formerly believed. For example, now that we understand more clearly the distinction between the Council as an executive body acting in the capacity of an advisor to the Governor, and the Council, with the same personnel, serving as the upper house of the General Assembly, we are beginning to realize that literally hundreds of the papers of the governors were entered and are now available to us in the Council journals. There is, besides, the massive collection of South Carolina documents now preserved in the British Public Record Office. A great number of these were copied for the state in the 1890's, and when I spoke of copies I had in mind particularly the governors' correspondence to be found in this collection. There is strong evidence, however, that there is much additional material which may be obtained from the Public Record Office and other British repositories.

Back in WPA days it was definitely established that the South Carolina colonial government employed the registry system of recording public records. This means that documents originating in several different agencies were entered, or filed, in the office of the Register or Secretary of the Province and have been passed down to us through the lineal descendant of that official, the Secretary of State. In fact, the great body of records made in the course of granting the public lands to private parties still remains in the custody of the Secretary of State. It should be borne in mind, however, that this central core of land records is supplemented in important ways by the voluminous collection of original surveys or plats, the warrants for survey, the Revolutionary War bounty grants, and the returns made by landowners for the quit rent levy which are now

in the custody of the Archives Department. Records of conveyances made from one private party to another are to be found in the office of the Register of Mesne Conveyance of Charleston County.

Genealogists have long made effective use of another multi-volume set of records of the Secretary of the Province which deserve the most careful scrutiny by the historian. They bear that catch-all label "Miscellaneous Records," and their indexes do not arouse much enthusiasm; but they contain hundreds of such documents as commissions of civil and military officers, deeds of trust, business contracts, bills of sale, servant's indentures, and manumissions, which are vital to an understanding of our past.

Little can be said as yet of the records of the Public Treasurer, for the greater number of those documents have not yet been accessioned by the Archives Department. A few ledgers that have been in use for some years tell us much about trade in the period before the Revolution and a little about financial transactions in the actual war years, but the bulk of the records of the war and post-war years still lie in the vault of today's Treasurer unopened by the modern historian.

Records of a special nature created during and immediately after the war include the journals of the Provincial Congress and its agencies: the Council of Safety, the General Committee, and the Secret Committee; a fragment of the journal of the Privy Council covering the years 1783 to 1789; the accounts of claims made for military service and supplies; and the papers of the Commissioners of Forfeited Estates. These are better known to historians, but, with one or two exceptions, they have not been extensively used.

As with historians of other states, those who work with early South Carolina documents can hardly be said to have made a beginning in the study of court records, and this lack of interest has been unfortunately reflected until recent years in the attitude of those whose duty it has been to preserve these documents. So little is known of their content and the uses to which they may be put by the historian that I can only report here that the records of the Court of Admiralty are now in the custody of the United States Record Center at East Point, Georgia; that the records of the Courts of Chancery, Common Pleas, and General Sessions are now in the custody of the South Carolina Archives

Department; and that the records of the Court of Ordinary are still held and treated today as active records in the Charleston County Probate Court. We may all agree with Dr. Anne K. Gregorie and Dean J. Nelson Frierson, who have said that there are "some amazing human documents" in this material,⁷ but we must frankly confess that they are, as yet, as little known to historians as the ruins of old Dorchester.

The major efforts of the Archives Department's staff are now being devoted to the editing and publishing of letterpress editions of the South Carolina public records of outstanding research value and to arranging and microfilming others of secondary value. If the editorial function is to be properly performed, the documents must be viewed in the light of prevailing interpretations of the history of the period to which they belong. If the editor is to write adequate introductions he, or she, should be able to say whether the documents support or contradict these interpretations, whether the information they contain is in accord or at variance with the information on which these interpretations are based.

Thus far our work has been restricted largely to the years preceding the period of the Revolution. We have only recently completed the preliminary tasks of editing the Journal of the Provincial Congress of 1775-1776, the Journal of the Privy Council of 1783-1789, and the Journal of the House of Representatives of 1779-1780. But already it is becoming obvious that the standard accounts of the Revolution in South Carolina are in need of revision. A picture which has never been sharp and clear now looks to be even more blurred.

We see, for example, less of a struggle in progress between merchants and planters, less of a conflict between low country and up country, and less of a rigidity in the class structure than we have been led to expect. In other words, we feel at this stage of our study of the public records that the results of the application of the social and economic idea to South Carolina thus far obtained are much in need of modification.

We find on the other hand some evidence perhaps not hitherto sufficiently emphasized to support the view that

⁷ Anne King Gregorie and J. Nelson Frierson, *Records of the Court of Chancery of South Carolina 1671-1779* (Washington, 1950), 10.

South Carolina was fairly treated as a colony in the British Empire. But, if we accept the findings of the exponents of the imperial idea, how can we account for the fact that South Carolina made the decision to withdraw from the empire?

We do not believe on the basis of the evidence which has so far been analyzed that political parties or organized factions operated within the South Carolina General Assembly. We think, then, that this powerful political agency is a fertile field for investigation by the Namierists.

Let me close with one concrete example of a revision that will certainly have to be made. In keeping with the general belief that the South Carolina political system at the time of the Revolution was highly undemocratic, historians have cited the property qualifications for voting as evidence of a restricted electorate. However, the large number of land grants and land plats indicate that this was no such restriction as we have been led to believe.

THE OPINIONS OF EDITOR WILLIAM GILMORE
SIMMS OF THE *SOUTHERN QUARTERLY
REVIEW*, 1849-1854

FRANK W. RYAN

The outstanding non-fiction periodical of the Old South was the *Southern Quarterly Review* (1842-1857), and the outstanding editor of the *Southern Quarterly Review* was William Gilmore Simms (1849-1854), who guided the *Southern Quarterly Review* to its peak of quality, circulation, and influence. Simms himself contributed to his magazine at least thirty full-length articles and hundreds of short "Critical Notices," thus demonstrating his broad interests and his tremendous productivity.¹

Simms wrote relatively little about such fundamental subjects as religion, philosophy, and science. Though avoiding religious controversy, he displayed in many of his articles a strong attachment to Protestant Christianity. He fully believed in the Christian concept that man, being a mixture of vice and virtue,² of earth and spirit, cannot "shake off" his "crown of thorns" but must "stoop to his toils, and bend to his yoke."³ Denying the necessity for conflict between Christianity and science, he charged that any such clash grew out of the stupidity and bigotry of vain and dishonest men.⁴ Though seldom venturing opinions about science, he did express hesitant approval of mesmerism⁵ and violent disapproval of spiritualistic "table-tipping."⁶

As might be expected, Simms was primarily interested in literature, especially in English literature. He frequently exercised his critical faculties on the English novelists. Not surprisingly, his favorite of favorites was Walter Scott, whom he regarded as the model novelist,⁷ "more perfect, more complete and admirable, than any writer of his age."⁸

¹ Frank W. Ryan, "The *Southern Quarterly Review*, 1842-1857" (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina, 1956), 454-497.

² *Southern Quarterly Review*, April, 1849, 121. Since all footnote references are to the *Southern Quarterly Review*, the title of the magazine will henceforth be omitted. Because of twice beginning new series, the magazine had a confusing system of numbering volumes, so, for the sake of simplicity, the footnotes will give only the date of the specific issue that is being cited.

³ July, 1850, 360.

⁴ April, 1850, 266; January, 1851, 264, 267; July, 1854, 272.

⁵ January, 1852, 229-230.

⁶ January, 1851, pp. 287-288; January, 1852, pp. 231-232, 239-240; July, 1853, p. 276; October, 1853, pp. 480-501.

⁷ April, 1849, 46.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 82-83.

He predicted that Scott, "world various and world sufficing," was "destined to new editions daily."⁹ Simms complained that Charles Dickens, who excelled in describing the "low life" of London alleys, taverns, cellars, and garrets, convinced readers that this world contains only cunning and stupidity, filth and disease, fraud and crime.¹⁰ Invariably Simms found the novels of G. P. R. James interesting and readable.¹¹ He thought the works of Thackeray clever and droll.¹² He berated Bulwer for "vices of thought and manner,"¹³ censured Captain Marryatt for being "little of a gentleman,"¹⁴ and criticized Harrison Ainsworth for weakness in plot and characterization.¹⁵

Simms did not neglect England's female novelists. He punned that Mrs. Shelley's *Frankenstein* was "monstrous."¹⁶ He admired the originality, insight, and passion of *Jane Eyre*¹⁷ and later expressed surprise upon learning that the "very masculine pen" of Currer Bell belonged to Charlotte Bronte.¹⁸ He dismissed Emily Bronte's *Wuthering Heights* (which he erroneously attributed to Charlotte) as "clumsy" and "frequently absurd."¹⁹ He heaped ridicule upon "inherently vulgar" Mrs. Trollope, whose appetite was her inspiration, whose digestion was superior to her intellect, whose best thoughts could be "traced to the region of the diaphragm," and whose name was wonderfully appropriate, for "Trollope she is, all over."²⁰

Simms often commented on the English poets. He paid lengthy tribute to Wordsworth's vigorous mind, vivid imagination, calm temperament, and "instinct of contemplation."²¹ He respected Robert Southey's versatility and truthfulness.²² He psychoanalyzed Thomas Campbell as a weak genius who had achieved success too soon and had thereafter lived in dread of damaging his early reputa-

⁹ July, 1852, 270.

¹⁰ January, 1854, 224-228; see also April, 1851, 568 and January, 1854, 224-228.

¹¹ April, 1850, 237; September, 1850, 271; April, 1851, 568; July, 1851, 266-267; January, 1852, 252; April, 1853, 515.

¹² July, 1850, 538; April 1851, 559; April, 1853, 515, 521-522.

¹³ July, 1853, 266.

¹⁴ October, 1849, 268-269.

¹⁵ April, 1849, 73-74.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 72-73.

¹⁷ April, 1849, 77-78.

¹⁸ April, 1850, 255; see also April, 1850, 255 and July, 1853, 267.

¹⁹ April, 1849, 78.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 66; see also January, 1851, 284.

²¹ September, 1850, 1-23.

²² October, 1849, 268; April, 1850, 251.

tion.²³ He saluted Coleridge as a "remarkable" psychologist²⁴ of rich knowledge²⁵ and hailed Henry Taylor as a teacher of reverence for beauty and truth.²⁶ He ranked Robert Browning among the "master minds" of poetry²⁷ and placed Tennyson at "the head of the English poets."²⁸

Among English authors too wide-ranging to be classified as either novelists or poets, Oliver Goldsmith, Samuel Johnson, Thomas de Quincey, and Thomas Carlyle won high praise from Simms. He admired Goldsmith for his versatility,²⁹ Johnson for his strength of character,³⁰ DeQuincey for his psychological penetration,³¹ and Carlyle for his defense of slavery.³²

Simms devoted some attention to Continental literature. In general, he disliked French writers, mainly because of their extravagant romanticism but partly because of their shocking familiarity with adultery.³³ He did, however, have kind words for the literary criticism of Francois Guizot³⁴ and for the "lively" novels of Alexandre Dumas.³⁵ Simms sternly reprimanded George Sand for her immorality and her masculinity.³⁶ He scorned Eugene Sue's "flat and commonplace" work.³⁷ He ridiculed Lamartine for his debased sentimentality.³⁸ Simms seldom commented on Spanish and German literature, though Cervantes³⁹ and Goethe⁴⁰ were among his favorite writers. He lavished faint praise on Sweden's popular female novelists, Frederika Bremer⁴¹ and Emily Carlen.⁴²

²³ September, 1850, 248-249.

²⁴ January, 1854, 266.

²⁵ September, 1850, 23; see also April, 1853, 537.

²⁶ July, 1849, 484-526.

²⁷ September, 1850, 256-257.

²⁸ November, 1850, 535.

²⁹ April, 1850, 263; July, 1850, 528.

³⁰ September, 1850, 257-258.

³¹ July, 1851, 243-245; April, 1853, 543; January, 1854, 254-255; July, 1854, 243.

³² April, 253; July, 1850, 509.

³³ January, 1854, 255-256.

³⁴ April, 1853, 533-534; July, 1853, 265.

³⁵ January, 1852, 263.

³⁶ July, 1850, 369; April, 1851, 567.

³⁷ October, 1849, 253-254.

³⁸ January, 1852, 241-242; see also July, 1850, 355-369; September, 1850, 254-255; November, 1850, 539-540.

³⁹ July, 1853, 265-266; October, 1853, 539.

⁴⁰ July, 1851, 248.

⁴¹ October, 1849, 261-262; July, 1850, 506-507; January, 1854, 271.

⁴² July, 1852, 269; July, 1853, 271; January, 1854, 253-254, 270; July, 1854, 259, 272.

American literature was naturally a subject of keen interest to Simms. New England was not his favorite section of the nation, and his literary criticism reflected this antipathy. "It is not often," he sneered, "that we receive any original literature from New England."⁴³ He discovered the "half-witted" Emerson's "chief excellence" in "mystifying the simple" and "disguising commonplaces in allegory."⁴⁴ He belittled Longfellow's "slender staple" of dull action and sparse ideas.⁴⁵ He did respect Hawthorne for his skill in telling a pleasant story,⁴⁶ his indoctrination of Christian morality,⁴⁷ and his "truthful" analysis of the human heart, especially in *The House of the Seven Gables*.⁴⁸

New York's famous authors did not overawe Simms. He greeted new editions of Cooper's novels with the mildest of enthusiasm,⁴⁹ but he admitted that Cooper's "loose and defective" works were worth "all the pretentious literature of all New England."⁵⁰ Simms did not fully appreciate Herman Melville. He described *Omoo* and *Typee* as "pleasant" but denounced the antislavery propaganda in *Mardi*⁵¹ and *White Jacket*.⁵² He found *Redburn* "rather cold" and "monotonous."⁵³ He ridiculed *Moby Dick* as "sad stuff, dull and dreary," and called for a "writ *de lunatico*" against both Melville and his mad characters.⁵⁴ *Pierre* convinced Simms that Melville had "gone 'clean daft'" and should not be trusted with pen and ink until "the present fit" had "worn off."⁵⁵

The Midwest's Harriet Beecher Stowe attracted Simms' attention. Surprisingly, he considered Mrs. Stowe a write of "rare ability"⁵⁶ and "passionate power."⁵⁷ He regarded *Uncle Tom's Cabin* as "a story of great and striking, though coarse, attraction,"⁵⁸ but on the subject of slavery Mrs. Stowe lied "like a dragoon," though she lied interestingly.⁵⁹

⁴³ April, 1849, 260.

⁴⁴ October, 1849, 240.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 245-246; see also September, 1850, 255-256.

⁴⁶ April, 1851, 571.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 571; January, 1852, 247; January, 1854, 256.

⁴⁸ July, 1851, 265-266; see also October, 1852, 543.

⁴⁹ October 1849, 269-270; April, 1851, 560, 571; July, 1851, 270.

⁵⁰ October, 1849, 240.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 260-261.

⁵² July, 1850, 514-520.

⁵³ April, 1850, 259-260.

⁵⁴ January, 1852, 262.

⁵⁵ October, 1852, 532.

⁵⁶ January, 1854, 235-236.

⁵⁷ July, 1854, 255.

⁵⁸ January, 1854, 235-236.

⁵⁹ April, 1853, 523.

Simms wanted to boost Southern literature, but he could not find much worthy of boosting. He explained that the literary poverty of the South resulted from concentration on agriculture and infatuation with politics.⁶⁰ He lamented that Southerners "breakfast on politics, lunch with party, dine with the corporation, sup with the wire-pullers, and sleep with bad bed fellows."⁶¹ Reluctantly Simms admitted that the numerous Southern replies to *Uncle Tom's Cabin* were feeble.⁶² He did laugh at the humor of Johnson J. Hooper⁶³ and Joseph G. Baldwin,⁶⁴ but he modestly confessed that the South's only great author was John Pendleton Kennedy.⁶⁵

An historian himself, Simms devoted much thought to history. He defined history as "philosophy teaching by example."⁶⁶ He knew that the writing of history demands "art, system, arrangement, grouping, great discrimination in the adoption of statements, the severe judgment of the critic, a close, calm weighing of testimony, and conclusions drawn and condensed from the evidence of hosts of conflicting witnesses."⁶⁷ He maintained that history should not be a merely factual chronicle⁶⁸ but should be a penetrating analysis of the characteristics, tastes, passions, mental powers, moral standards, and future destinies of a people.⁶⁹ He deplored the desire of the average historian to walk through the past on "enormous stilts," concentrating on kings and wars, on "the big and the portentous," on "the stately and the grand," while ignoring the "modest loveliness" of the "humble things of earth" and overlooking the "unobtrusive virtues" of the "struggling myriads of human beings."⁷⁰

Simms seldom wrote about European history but often dealt with the American past. He deserves to be listed among the forerunners of Frederick Jackson Turner, for he thus emphasized the role of the frontier in American history:

⁶⁰ October, 1851, 319-320; April, 1852, 511-513; April, 1853, 520.

⁶¹ April, 1853, 520.

⁶² January, 1853, 233; April, 1853, 523; July, 1853, 268; October, 1853, 539-540, 543; January, 1854, 255; July, 1854, 255.

⁶³ July, 1851, 272.

⁶⁴ April, 1854, 555.

⁶⁵ April, 1850, 192-236; April, 1852, 530; July, 1854, 269.

⁶⁶ September, 1850, 195.

⁶⁷ January, 1852, 192.

⁶⁸ October, 1852, 524-525.

⁶⁹ January, 1852, 193.

⁷⁰ April, 1852, 508.

A brave pioneer leads the way and plants his cabin by the sea-shore or in the depths of some great wilderness. He guards it with vigilance against the roving warrior; he bars its doors nightly against the prowling wolf; he dresses the soil about his doors, and, when the wilderness blossoms like the rose, under his laboring hands, he brings love and beauty to tend and hallow his homestead. Anon, he summons his kindred, and they come and plant themselves beside him. When assured of their security, and confident in their growing numbers, they make further explorations; and the hamlet grows, day by day, and adventure gradually brings in trade; and Civilization, increasing in resources, calls to her assistance the higher services of art, until wealth and taste have made their dwelling places at once charming and compensative. . . . ours is a curious history of a perpetual colonization—new shores, new forests, opening daily—new foes and necessities encountered;—fresh discoveries in hourly developments, and fresh accessions of strength to the whole, resulting from the continual multiplication of the parts;—a history of incessant transition, to which we owe the constant development of the picturesque and salient; the due consequence of the hourly recurring conflict between art and nature, civilization and the savage!⁷¹

Simms offered some interesting interpretations of the American Revolution. He discovered the fundamental cause of the Revolution in the highly developed sense of independence on the part of wealthy, educated, aristocratic Americans.⁷² He maintained that the French Alliance of 1778 resulted from the selfishness of the Catholic French monarchy⁷³ and resulted in the loss of interest by Puritan New England in pursuing the war against Protestant England.⁷⁴ He branded the Conway Cabal the "dirty" work of "malignant" Conway and incompetent Gates.⁷⁵ He attributed the ultimate British defeat to American "tenacity."⁷⁶

Keenly interested in the history of the Southern states, Simms contributed long reviews of William James Rivers'

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 509.

⁷² July, 1850, 328-329.

⁷³ July, 1850, 505.

⁷⁴ July, 1852, 159.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 148, 171, 193.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 159.

Topics in the History of South Carolina,⁷⁷ Albert J. Pickett's *History of Alabama*,⁷⁸ and J. G. M. Ramsey's *The Annals of Tennessee*.⁷⁹ He praised Rivers for research, realism, ingenuity, and style;⁸⁰ he criticized Pickett for compiling a dull chronicle of facts;⁸¹ he patronized Ramsey for occasionally achieving "the dignity of history."⁸² In a short "Critical Notice" Simms hurriedly placed his stamp of approval on Charles Gayarré's *Louisiana: Its History as a French Colony*.⁸³

Simms was a fiery advocate of Southern nationalism. For him, "the only patriotism" was the defense of "the South, the whole South, and the South in peril."⁸⁴ He insisted that Southerners "are a people, a nation, with arms in our hands, and in sufficient numbers to compel the respect of other nations."⁸⁵

Simms realized that a successful Southern nation must have a balanced economy. Though he paid proper homage to agrarianism⁸⁶ and condemned cities as "the mere sinks and sewers of civilization,"⁸⁷ he urged the full development of all Southern resources⁸⁸ through diversification of agriculture,⁸⁹ expansion of manufacturing,⁹⁰ construction of railroads,⁹¹ promotion of direct trade with Europe,⁹² and prohibition of protective tariffs.⁹³

Simms appreciated the importance of education in the development of Southern nationalism. He opposed the enrollment of Southerners in Northern schools.⁹⁴ He argued that only books written by Southern scholars and published by Southern presses could vindicate Southern principles and voice Southern grievances.⁹⁵ He encouraged Southern

⁷⁷ September, 1850, 66-84.

⁷⁸ January, 1852, 182-209.

⁷⁹ October, 1853, 337-368.

⁸⁰ September, 1850, 72, 82.

⁸¹ January, 1852, 189, 191-192, 196.

⁸² October, 1853, 368.

⁸³ January, 1853, 248-249.

⁸⁴ October, 1851, 334.

⁸⁵ January, 1853, 239.

⁸⁶ October, 1853, 540.

⁸⁷ September, 1850, 197.

⁸⁸ October, 1849, 266; September, 1850, 263.

⁸⁹ September, 1850, 263; July, 1851, 253-254.

⁹⁰ October, 1849, 266, 271; April, 1850, 251-252, 270; July, 1851, 263; October, 1851, 334, 348-349.

⁹¹ September, 1850, 258.

⁹² January, 1851, 283; January, 1852, 271.

⁹³ January, 1853, 248.

⁹⁴ July, 1851, 269.

⁹⁵ January, 1852, 248; October, 1852, 530.

state legislatures to adopt history textbooks prepared by Southern historians⁹⁶ and to establish law schools dedicated to Southern interests.⁹⁷ A conservative in education, Simms advised Southern schools to place equal emphasis on social aims and individual differences,⁹⁸ to eliminate utilitarianism,⁹⁹ to stress Latin and Greek,¹⁰⁰ and to apply the rod when necessary.¹⁰¹ Knowing that there is "no royal road" to learning, he warned that education requires "painstaking, unwearied application, care, anxiety, constant watchfulness, and a pursuit of the object for its own sake."¹⁰² Simms expressed deep respect for "the true student" who guards the treasures of the past, cherishes "Faith and Veneration," promotes the cause of progress, renounces fame and fortune and even pleasure, and lives by the "light and warmth" of "the unextinguished torch of learning."¹⁰³

Simms feared the centralization of political power and championed the doctrine of state rights.¹⁰⁴ He compared the federal government to "a huge mammoth cow, at whose dugs every calf of party must have a certain privilege to suck, and to suck ad libitum."¹⁰⁵ He opposed the suggested establishment of a federal Department of Agriculture and a national Agricultural Academy.¹⁰⁶ Predictably, he often quoted Southern Scripture according to St. John C. Calhoun.¹⁰⁷

Simms accused the federal government of tyrannical injustice to the South.¹⁰⁸ He complained that the South bore the brunt of federal taxation while the North could "feed and fatten free of charge" in the "pleasant pasturage" of the Union.¹⁰⁹ Simms hoped that the Nashville Convention would advance Southern unity,¹¹⁰ and he denounced the Compromise of 1850.¹¹¹ Early in 1851 he charged that, for

⁹⁶ January, 1852, 182-183, 187.

⁹⁷ July, 1850, 530; July, 1854, 259-260.

⁹⁸ October, 1851, 345.

⁹⁹ July, 1853, 198-199.

¹⁰⁰ January, 1851, 263.

¹⁰¹ October, 1851, 347-348.

¹⁰² January, 1853, 267.

¹⁰³ July, 1853, 188-214.

¹⁰⁴ April, 1849, 164-165; September, 1850, 253-254.

¹⁰⁵ April, 1851, 556.

¹⁰⁶ January, 1853, 270.

¹⁰⁷ September, 1850, 269; April, 1851, 569; July, 1851, 108-109, 113; October, 1851, pp. 324, 542; July, 1852, p. 277.

¹⁰⁸ April, 1850, 228-230.

¹⁰⁹ September, 1850, 201.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 191-232.

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 201.

the South, the Union had meant only loss of rights, property, and liberty.¹¹² In the spring of 1851 he trumpeted that the South must either secede from the Union or suffer utter destruction within the Union,¹¹³ and by the fall of 1851 he predicted that the "robbed and cheated" South would enjoy its "day of retribution."¹¹⁴ The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 did not satisfy him.¹¹⁵

Buttressing his Southern nationalism by advocacy of the pro-slavery argument, Simms reiterated that slavery needed no apology but was innately right.¹¹⁶ He dismissed the alleged abuses of slavery as simply the evils incident to "humanity in society everywhere."¹¹⁷ He claimed that slavery had saved the inferior Negro race from extinction through disease, famine, and war and had given the Negroes subsistence, security, and Christianity.¹¹⁸ He pointed to the horrible consequences of emancipation in the British West Indies as proof of the advantages of slavery.¹¹⁹

His Southern nationalism impelled Simms to a vicious counterattack on the North. He castigated the North for its "daily labor" of "neighborly" defamation of Southern character.¹²⁰ He sneered that the "children of the Mayflower" (*sic*) had launched a "thousand ships" to capture the African slave trade from the Dutch.¹²¹ He accused the philanthropic North of brutal mistreatment of its poor working class.¹²² He recommended the passage of state censorship laws to prohibit the circulation of abolitionist literature in the South, not because of fear but because even a harmless "toad" should not be allowed "to foul one's carpet."¹²³ He snarled that the abolitionists were "flinging Christ overboard,"¹²⁴ and compared them to Pontius Pilate who had asked for the truth and had then turned away from the answer.¹²⁵ He thundered that abolitionism was "a

¹¹² January, 1851, 290.

¹¹³ April, 1851, 536.

¹¹⁴ October, 1851, 342.

¹¹⁵ July, 1854, 260.

¹¹⁶ July, 1852, 257; January, 1853, 238-239; April, 1854, 541-542.

¹¹⁷ October, 1852, 526-527.

¹¹⁸ September, 1850, 204; January, 1852, 244-245.

¹¹⁹ October, 1851, 343.

¹²⁰ September, 1850, 24.

¹²¹ April, 1849, 266.

¹²² January, 1854, 272.

¹²³ October, 1849, 246.

¹²⁴ January, 1854, 191.

¹²⁵ January, 1852, 210.

lying in the face of God's books, God's written laws, God's own acts."¹²⁶

Simms regretted that the North did not limit its reform mania to abolitionism. He dismissed the peace movement as unrealistic.¹²⁷ He needled the suffragettes for their lack of femininity.¹²⁸ He scoffed at the prohibition crusade as destructive of poetic inspiration.¹²⁹ He even smeared the North with communism.¹³⁰ All in all, the North was a hopelessly mad and fanatical section, deluded with vague, vicious, and incendiary doctrines and plagued with mobs, riots and daily murders.¹³¹

Perhaps the most significant clue to Simms' conservative thought was his admiration for Edmund Burke. He hailed Burke as "the great man, *par excellence*, of his time."¹³² Like Burke, Simms distrusted the common man and feared the irresponsible majority.¹³³ Like Burke, he detested socialism and upheld the institution of private property.¹³⁴ Like Burke, he warned against abstract theory¹³⁵ and "rash experiments" by government.¹³⁶ Like Burke, he cherished experience,¹³⁷ prescription,¹³⁸ veneration,¹³⁹ and respect for the sacred things of the past.¹⁴⁰ Like Burke, Simms believed that true conservatism always possesses the foresight and courage¹⁴¹ essential to "natural and gradual" progress¹⁴² based on law, honor, justice, and truth.¹⁴³

In summary, Editor Simms of the *Southern Quarterly Review* was a Protestant Christian, with only the educated layman's interest in philosophy and science; a pungent lit-

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 245.

¹²⁷ April, 1850, 260-261, 266; July, 1853, 283-284.

¹²⁸ January, 1853, 256-257.

¹²⁹ July, 1853, 273-274; October, 1854, 530.

¹³⁰ April, 1850, 249; September, 1850, 29; see also April, 1849, 139-141; January, 1852, 247.

¹³¹ October, 1849, 241; April, 1850, 197; September, 1850, 197-198; January, 1852, 247; October, 1852, 537.

¹³² April, 1854, 538-539.

¹³³ April, 1849, 131-132; April, 1850, 253; July, 1850, 317, 331; November, 1850, 522; July, 1851, 241; April, 1853, 523; January, 1854, 188.

¹³⁴ April, 1849, 141.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 160.

¹³⁶ *Ibid.*, 121.

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 150, 162; September, 1850, 192, 197, 208.

¹³⁸ April, 1849, 157, 159.

¹³⁹ April, 1850, 238; see also September, 1850, 192.

¹⁴⁰ April, 1850, 238, 246.

¹⁴¹ April, 1849, 121.

¹⁴² April, 1850, 245.

¹⁴³ January, 1854, 221.

erary critic, with the professional author's colorful style and independent judgment; a capable historian, with more than the fond amateur's insatiable curiosity and love of the past; a Southern nationalist, with the zealous patriot's ardor in defending his own and in condemning the enemy; and underlying all of this, a Burkean conservative.

THE UP-COUNTRY ACADEMIES OF MOSES WADDEL

By HUGH C. BAILEY

It is probably true that no single individual exerted a more lasting cultural influence on the South Carolina and Georgia up-country than Moses Waddel, a teacher-parson who in 1801 opened an academy in Vienna, South Carolina. Waddel was born July 29, 1770, in Rowan County, North Carolina, the son of Scotch-Irish immigrants. In 1788 he moved with his parents to Green County, Georgia. As a young man he attended Hampton-Sydney College where he was graduated in 1792. Two months before graduation, he presented himself to the Presbytery of Hanover, in Campbell County, Virginia, and was confirmed as a candidate for the ministry. After a few months, he came to visit Thomas Legare, an elder in the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina, and in April, 1794, accepted a "half-time call of Carmel church" in Georgia, and full-time service in June.

Not long after this, perhaps in 1794, the need of the people for education led Waddel to establish a school near Appling in Columbus County, Georgia. While here he taught William H. Crawford, who, though he rose to the pinnacle of political achievement, "never . . . attended any other institution of learning." John C. Calhoun also came under his tutelage at approximately the same time.

It appears in 1795 that Waddel, in his capacity as a minister, visited the "Calhoun Settlement" in Abbeville District, South Carolina. He was a guest in Patrick Calhoun's home where he met both John C., who shortly thereafter became his student, and his sister, Catherine. The next year Moses and Catherine were married. Unfortunately, the young bride died within a few months' time. Waddel was grief-stricken and for some time found comfort in devoting himself exclusively to the ministry. By the time of the opening of the Vienna Academy, his grief had been interred, and he had the aid and comfort of a new wife, Eliza Pleasants Waddel, in his labors.

From Vienna Waddel's fame spread throughout the up-country and to the coast. It became even greater when he moved in 1804 to Willington, another town in Abbeville

District.¹ From the accounts available of life at the renowned Willington Academy, we may gain an impression of Waddel as a teacher and counselor.

The student body of some one-hundred-fifty boys boarded with "the neighbors" at a distance of a few hundred yards to three miles from the academy. Though servants could be hired to perform such tasks as obtaining firewood, the students usually did such chores themselves. Waddel often journeyed to these boarding-houses in the evening, not infrequently *incognito*; he would then "recount his observations the next day to the whole school, commending such youths as he found well employed, and censuring such as he found ill employed."² A student reported that: "At sunrise Dr. Waddel would blow his horn and presently someone in each of the boarding houses would answer. Soon, then, the boys would hustle off to prayers."³

The academy itself was a building composed to two large rooms situated at the head of a street on which were located ten or twelve student-constructed buildings where the pupils could withdraw in wet or cold weather to prepare their lessons. Monitors were always near to aid the scholars and to see that, except for "play-time", no noise disturbed the labors of the day. Needless to say there was "no din . . . in study hours."⁴

Regularly Waddel, a gentleman "about five feet nine inches in height, of stout muscular frame, and a little inclined to corpulancy," would call various groups of his carefully graded scholars together to recite their lessons, which were primarily in the classics. "Good boys felt at perfect ease in his presence, and even bad ones could, and did, approach him with the utmost freedom." A partial explanation for this lay in the fact that he "never whipt in a passion—indeed, he seemed to be in his most pleasant moods when he administered correction, and hence, a stranger to him would naturally suppose that he took pleasure in flog-

¹ John N. Waddel, *Memorials of Academic Life being an Historical Sketch of the Waddel Family, Identified through three generations with the history of the higher education in the South and Southwest* (Richmond, 1891), 1-44; Margaret L. Coit, "Moses Waddel: A Light in the Wilderness," *The Georgia Review*, V (January, 1951), 34-37; Ellis M. Coulter, "The Ante-Bellum Academy Movement in Georgia," *The Georgia Historical Quarterly*, V (December, 1921), 11-42.

² Augustus B. Longstreet, *Master William Mitten: or A Youth of Brilliant Talents, Who Was Ruined by Bad Luck* (Macon, 1864), 72.

³ John F. Jameson, (ed.), *The Correspondence of John C. Calhoun*, (Washington, 1900), 79.

⁴ Longstreet, *op. cit.*, 66.

ging." But Waddel rarely administered corporal punishment and never for the failure to prepare lessons.

His government was one of *touching* 'moral suasion'; but he administered it in a new way. . . . To be 'turned off' as it was called—that is, to have to get a lesson over a second time, was considered such a disgrace by the students, that if this did not cure the fault, whipping, he well knew, would not.⁵

"His method of instruction permitted a wide variety of individuality on the part of the students."⁶ Each boy was encouraged, for example, to read as much Virgil, Cicero, Xenophon or Horace as he could; 150 lines were considered small indeed. Many did much more. The schools' record was set a few years after the removal to Willington when George McDuffie prepared for one recitation 1,212 lines of Virgil.⁷

In addition to Waddel's constant scrutiny, annual examinations and exhibitions were held in the spring of the year. "These exercises continued for several days, and they were attended by multitudes. . . ." The order of events was as follows: First all classes were examined, "invariably by the visitors, except when they declined the task, and this rarely occurred." This was followed by orations of the scholars for which prizes were awarded. Lastly came the "performance of one or two dramatic pieces, usually a comedy and a farce." (Later the reading of compositions was substituted for the plays.)

As the eve of examinations drew on, "the night shut in and the woods were vocal in all directions with rehearsals of speeches and parts of plays." The inns spread mattresses on the floor to accommodate their guests whose chatter until late in the night eventually gave way to silence broken only occasionally by "the bubbling cry of some strong snorer 'in his agony.'"

"The next morning exhibited a complete metamorphosis of the students." It was now easy "to distinguish the sons of the Patricians from those of the Plebs, though *turkey-red* and *indigo-blue* predominated largely over nankeen and

⁵ *Ibid.*, 72.

⁶ John D. Wade, *Augustus Baldwin Longstreet, A Study of the Development of Culture in the South* (New York, 1924), 25.

⁷ Charles M. Wiltse, *John C. Calhoun, Nationalist, 1782-1828* (New York, 1944), 28.

ingham still.”⁸ From seven till nine people “of all ranks, ages, sexes, and sizes, might be seen winding their way to the school house, or rather the area in front of it—for the examination was conducted under the stately oaks on the campus.” Amid this scene of natural grandeur the crowd reveled in the admirable performance of most of the scholars and were not infrequently amused by the malperformance of others.

A rough plank stage was erected for the judges. For many years these included William H. Crawford, John C. Calhoun, and William Wyatt Bibb, the first two of whom were former students of Waddel. These gentlemen chose the scholars to be awarded prizes while often hundreds of interested relatives and friends looked on. Everyone except an occasional scholar seemed to enjoy himself immensely, even though log seats were available only for the ladies and bush-arbors furnished the only shelter.⁹

Though some phases of life at Waddel’s academies were crude, their record is one of the most remarkable in the annals of American education. Their pupils included such men as Calhoun, Crawford, A. B. Longstreet, Hugh S. Legare, George McDuffie, and James Petigru—the foremost intellectual and political leaders of Georgia and South Carolina. At one time Governor George Mathews of Georgia had three or four grandsons in residence at the Willington Academy; Senator W. W. Bibb had two brothers-in-law, and Senator Early, Judge Charles Tait, Congressman David Meriwether, and Editor William J. Hobby (of the *Augusta Herald*) had sons there.¹⁰

Its graduates achieved recognition in the leading universities of the North. Calhoun was only the first of many. Samuel Stanhope Smith, President of Nassau-Hall (Princeton), repeatedly said that he received “no scholars from any section of the United States who stand a better examination than the pupils of Dr. Waddel.”¹¹

Truly Moses Waddel was a rare phenomena on the southern frontier. Due to his genius, “the glowing periods of Cicero” were “read and admired,” the “melody and majesty of Homer” delighted the ear and charmed the understand-

⁸ Longstreet, *op. cit.*, 123-124.

⁹ *Ibid.*, 124-125.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 85.

¹¹ *The History of South-Carolina* (2 vols., Charleston, 1809), II, 294.

ing "in the very spot which sixty years ago resounded with the war-cry and the horried yelling of savage Indians."¹²

Years after his period of training under Waddel, Calhoun wrote that the famous pedagogue

may be justly considered as the father of classical education in the upper country of South Carolina and Georgia. His excellence in that character depended not so much on extensive or profound learning as a felicitious combination of qualities for the government of boys and communicating to them what he knew. He was particularly successful in exciting emulation amongst them, and of obtaining the good will of all except the worthless.¹³

Calhoun felt that because of his great services, Waddel should be long remembered as "a benefactor of his country."

It was in the school of this celebrated educator that John Williams Walker, the man who was to become the first United States Senator from Alabama and one of the state's first great leaders, enrolled in 1803. The academy's location at Vienna, immediately across the Savannah River from Petersburg, Georgia, made it possible for Walker to remain in the latter place and, while he studied, attempt to carry on his deceased brother's business affairs.

Shortly after the young Georgian's entrance, on July 4, 1803, the famous academy master held an exhibition at the school, but, due to the negligence of the people of Petersburg, no orations were delivered in the town.¹⁴

After this the scholars "distributed themselves in various parts of the country," and each followed a separate course for the next few months. "Some have entered themselves to 'Paul,'" wrote Walker, "others to 'Apollos'; some have retired to their homes to take their pleasure for the ensuing two months in idleness." "'Judge Walker' had a few applications to know if his 'honor' would *condescend* to take a few [students] under his direction." He "generally" declined, even though the pressure was great to obtain some of Waddel's students as tutors. A Mr. Watkins was so insistent that Walker was forced to hear his son recite, and

¹² *Ibid.*, II, 370-371.

¹³ Cited in William M. Meigs, *The Life of John Caldwell Calhoun* (2 vols., New York, 1917), I, 63.

¹⁴ John W. Walker to Larkin Newby, June 30, 1803, in Larkin Newby Papers, Duke University.

Mrs. LeRoy Pope prevailed upon him to take the irrepresible Willis Pope for whatever taming and teaching could be done for him.

J. B. Posey also came to Petersburg and boarded about one-half mile from the Walker home in order to read *Cicero's Orations* under the amateur pedagogue. With candor, the new teacher admitted that he did not instruct these persons in a hope of obtaining "lucre" but "because," as he phrased it, "I wish to brighten my Knowledge in the Latin, and because I esteem them, and their parents."¹⁵

Waddel returned from Virginia in the fall of 1803 and again opened his school. Walker did not resume his formal studies at the very first of the term due to the pressure of business. Meanwhile, he heard that the school was "quite short in numbers, there not being more than 12" students. He did not think that this would long be the case, but he doubted that the enrollment would ever be as large as it had formerly been. He could not foresee that by 1819 the academy at Willington would have 180 pupils.

Prophetically, a rumor was circulating in 1803 that Waddel had been induced to settle in Athens, Georgia, as a language teacher. Walker felt that should Waddel go to Franklin College, he would accompany him. Under the direction of President Josiah Meigs, he could study astronomy, natural and moral philosophy and geography, and he could continue the study of Greek and Latin under Waddel.

Waddel did not disband his academy, however, and Walker continued the study of the classics and participation in the other activities of the school at Vienna. Notable among the latter was the exhibition in the late spring of 1804. In the five hours of its duration two plays were performed and orations were given. The productions were "The Drummer, or the Haunted House," and "She Stoops to Conquer, or the Mistakes of a Night." Two men portrayed female characters in both plays. Walker felt the audience was pleased, but he realized that they would expect more than they received, but "happily for us," he wrote, "the people in the backwoods, who generally constitute our audience on these occasions are not very critical judges of dramatic exhibitions, or displays of oratorical powers."

In oratory, a certain Shields spoke on the commemoration of Columbus. A. M. Posey gave a discourse on the ac-

¹⁵ *Id. to id.*, July 22, 1803, *ibid.*

quisition of Louisiana. Walker spoke on the career of George Washington. "The people could feel the subject if not the eloquence of the orator," he held. He succeeded as well as he had any right to hope and felt that he had improved "much in Oratory" in the past few years.¹⁶

Immediately after this event, Waddel began to move his school to his plantation, "5 or 6 miles distant." "We are all in the *vocatives*" on account of this, Walker wrote, but he, for one, would follow the master wherever he might go, though he feared that he would be "surfeited with the 'sweets of rural life.'" ¹⁷

In this latter respect Walker reflected his regard for Waddel's learning and his ability as a teacher, as he did on many occasions. He failed to demonstrate, however, the love toward him which he held for many of his friends. In Walker's eyes, Waddel seems to have been a rather cold man. When he conducted the funeral of a Mr. Tatom, Walker's dear friend, Waddel was much affected as he delivered the final oration at the grave, saying that he had never been so shocked before at the death of someone who was not a relative. "Mr. Waddel here discovered a warmth of affection of which I scarcely thought him capable," Walker wrote.¹⁸

Walker's ability in later years to compete so handsomely with other students from throughout the country was in itself a tribute to Waddel. He graduated from Princeton eighteen months after his matriculation. As territorial judge and speaker of the territorial house, as president of the state constitutional convention and United States Senator, he won acclaim as "Alabama's Pioneer Statesman."¹⁹

Great as Waddel's influence was through his academies, his contribution to Southern education was not limited to them. In 1819 he accepted the presidency of the all but defunct University of Georgia which at that time had only six students. The move from Willington to Athens was a momentous step for Waddel to take, but the outcome was a happy one. In the ten years of his presidency university lands were sold, buildings were erected, the faculty was increased from three to eleven members and the student

¹⁶ *Id. to id.*, August 12, October 6, 1803, May 10, 25, 1804, *ibid.*

¹⁷ *Id. to id.*, May 25, 1804, *ibid.*

¹⁸ *Id. to id.*, April, n.d., 1804, *ibid.*

¹⁹ See the author's, "John W. Walker and the 'Georgia Machine' in Early Alabama Politics," *The Alabama Review*, VIII (July, 1955), 179-195.

body grew accordingly. Ill health forced Waddel's retirement in 1829 and restricted his activities for the decade of his life which remained. Most of this time was spent on his estate near Willington.²⁰

The author believes Waddel's most productive period came when he headed the academies at Vienna and Willington, as is attested by the careers of so many of his students. As James Otis Willis has pointed out, Waddel was a splendid teacher in an area where there were few teachers of even average ability. From the South Carolina and Georgia low-country came the sons of the first citizens of both states who were entrusted to his care. Moreover, his fellow Presbyterian ministers of the region constantly served as a publicity bureau to recruit the best material in their congregations for Waddel's academies.²¹ Once in his care, Waddel's belief in the zealous pursuit of learning and his firm grounding in the classics usually produced results if the students had any aptitude.

Waddel's sense of the dramatic, his ability to alternately rebuke and praise suggest that he was a keen student of human nature and was certainly in advance of his day in the use of pedagogical psychology. Considering these facts one should not be surprised that before his death Waddel could "with an honest pride . . . enumerate among his pupils many of the most celebrated jurists and statesmen of the South."²²

²⁰ Waddel, *op. cit.*, 63; Ellis M. Coulter, "Franklin College as a Name for the University of Georgia," *The Georgia Historical Quarterly*, XXXIV (September, 1950), 189-194.

²¹ James Otis Willis, "Moses Waddel and His Willington Academy," Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of South Carolina, 1938, 48-54.

²² James A. Pickett, *History of Alabama and Incedentially of Georgia and Mississippi . . . from the Earliest Period* (2 vols., Charleston, 1851), II, 402.

LIST OF MEMBERS, 1959

- Charles Anger, The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.
Thomas B. Alexander, Box 3264, University, Alabama
Winston Babb, Furman University, Greenville, S. C.
Mary N. Baker, Box 789, Greenwood, S. C.
B. D. Barger, 1620 College Street, Columbia, S. C.
R. W. Barnwell, Jr., 201 Oakview Square, Warner Robins,
Georgia
Mrs. R. W. Barnwell, Jr., 201 Oakview Square, Warner
Robins, Georgia
Mildred C. Beckwith, Box 83, Winthrop College, Rock Hill,
S. C.
Eugene H. Blake, 221-B West Durst Avenue, Greenwood,
S. C.
C. W. Bolen, Box 1257, Clemson, S. C.
Ruth Boyd, 132 Capers Street, Greenville, S. C.
L. F. Brewster, Box 122, East Carolina College, Green-
ville, N. C.
Marshall Brown, President, Presbyterian College, Clinton,
S. C.
W. H. Callcott, University of South Carolina, Columbia,
S. C.
Charles H. Carlisle, Box 264, Due West, S. C.
Louisa B. Carlisle, 151 N. Fairview Ave., Spartanburg,
S. C.
A. J. Carlson, Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C.
C. H. Carpenter, Clemson College, Clemson, S. C.
C. E. Cauthen, Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C.
Arney R. Childs, 732 Pickens Street, Columbia, S. C.
R. H. Chowen, University of South Carolina, Columbia,
S. C.
George W. Clarke, Presbyterian College, Clinton, S. C.
David W. Cole, Pfeiffer College, Misenheimer, N. C.
Charles W. Coolidge, University of South Carolina, Co-
lumbia, S. C.
Harriet Hefner Cook, Box 205, Clemson, S. C.
Robert Cooper, College of Charleston, Charleston, S. C.
J. Isaac Copeland, Library, Peabody College, Nashville 5,
Tenn.
N. H. Crowell, 1710 College Street, Newberry, S. C.
E. T. Crowson, Winthrop College, Rock Hill, S. C.
Lawrence Curry, University of South Carolina, Columbia,
S. C. /student/

- Lucia Daniel, 4G Cornell Arms, Columbia, S. C.
Miss Hannah Lou Dargan, 18 Pleasant Ridge Avenue,
Greenville, S. C.
Elizabeth H. Davidson, Coker College, Hartsville, S. C.
Arthur DeRosier, Converse College, Spartanburg, S. C.
W. E. Douglas, University of South Carolina, Columbia,
S. C. /student/
A. L. Duckett, Box 151, Winthrop College, Rock Hill, S. C.
J. J. Duffy, Jr., University of South Carolina, Columbia,
S. C. /student/
J. H. Easterby, South Carolina Archives Department,
Columbia, S. C.
Mrs. Charles Eastman, 4805 Barber St., Columbia, S. C.
John C. Ellen, Jr., P. O. Box 301, East Carolina College,
Greenville, N. C.
Carl L. Epting, Clemson College, Clemson, S. C.
Alvin A. Fahrner, Coker College, Hartsville, S. C.
C. M. Ferrell, University of South Carolina, Columbia, S. C.
L. H. Fortunato, The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.
Helen Brice Galloway, Due West, S. C.
D. H. Gilpatrick, 407 Bennett Street, Greenville, S. C.
John G. Gourlay, Clemson College, Clemson, S. C.
Cornelia A. Graham, Clemson College, Clemson, S. C.
A. P. Gratiot, Limestone College, Gaffney, S. C.
Ruth S. Green, 1502 Hampton Street, Columbia, S. C.
Ann King Gregorie, Mt. Pleasant
Charles R. Halstead, Converse College, Spartanburg, S. C.
Harry L. Harvin, Jr., Columbia College, Columbia, S. C.
W. Edwin Hemphill, S. C. Archives Dept., Columbia, S. C.
Mary B. Heyward, The Habitat, Rion, S. C.
Daniel W. Hollis, Dept. of History, University of South
Carolina, Columbia, S. C.
E. L. Inabinet, University of South Carolina, Columbia,
S. C.
Katherine M. Jones, 111 Perry Ave., Greenville, S. C.
Lewis P. Jones, Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C.
Newton B. Jones, Box 142, Clinton, S. C.
Lillian Kibler, Converse College, Spartanburg, S. C.
Robert S. Lambert, Clemson College, Clemson, S. C.
Margaret Lancaster, 705 Veterans Road, Columbia, S. C.
E. M. Lander, Jr., Clemson College, Clemson, S. C.
E. Lawrence Lee, The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.
J. Mauldin Lesesne, Erskine College, Due West, S. C.

- S. Frank Logan, Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C.
 Neill W. Macaulay, 1226 Pickens Street, Columbia, S. C.
 W. L. McDowell, South Carolina Archives Department,
 Columbia, S. C.
 David McElroy, P. O. Box 2394, University, Alabama
 Charles Martin, The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.
 Mary Elizabeth Massey, Box 155, Winthrop College, Rock
 Hill, S. C.
 C. A. Mays, Box 826, Greenwood, S. C.
 Cynthia Moseley, Converse College, Spartanburg, S. C.
 Dorian Moorhead, Box 11B, Cornell Arms, Columbia, S. C.
 Robert D. Ochs, University of South Carolina, S. C.
 Mrs. A. D. Oliphant, 107 James Street, Greenville, S. C.
 William H. Patterson, 115 DeLiesseline Road, Cayce, S. C.
 Mrs. J. T. Pearlstine, Box 13, St. Matthews, S. C.
 Hanna Pearlstine, Columbia High School, 1323 Washing-
 ton St., Columbia, S. C.
 Edward H. Phillips, The Citadel, Charleston, S. C.
 Bernard L. Poole, Erskine College, Due West, S. C.
 S. L. Prince, 1316B W. Boulevard, Anderson, S. C.
 Mary B. Prior, S. C. Historical Society, Fireproof Bldg.,
 Charleston, S. C.
 Elmer Puryear, College of Charleston, Charleston, S. C.
 May S. Ringold, 4B N. Palmetto, Clemson, S. C.
 Frank W. Ryan, Jr., Dept. of Social Science, U. of N. C.,
 Chapel Hill, N. C.
 Albert N. Sanders, Furman University, Greenville, S. C.
 Bates L. Scoggins, Wofford College, Spartanburg, S. C.
 Henry R. Sims, Winthrop College, Rock Hill, S. C.
 South Carolina Historical Society, Fireproof Bldg.,
 Charleston, S. C.
 Richard G. Stone, St. Marv's Junior College, Raleigh, N. C.
 Samuel G. Stoney, 129½ Tradd Street, Charleston, S. C.
 Flora B. Surles, Mt. Pleasant, S. C.
 John S. Taylor, 708 Insurance Bldg., Greenville, S. C.
 Harvey S. Toal, 7 Carroll Court, W. Columbia, S. C.
 J. M. Thompson, University of South Carolina, Columbia,
 S. C. /student/
 Mrs. Horace L. Tilghman, Sr., Marion, S. C.
 Marjorie Spelts Tollison, Old Carrolton Club Road, Lex-
 ington, S. C.
 Robert Tucker, 312 University Ridge, Greenville, S. C.
 Jack E. Tuttle, Clemson College, Clemson, S. C.

Mrs. Charles H. Van Patten, 1503 Prescott Ave., Columbia,
S. C.

Mrs. J. D. Vann, Jr., 118 West Faris Road, Greenville, S. C.

Henry Von Hasseln, 1102 West Whitner St., Anderson,
S. C.

Wylma Waites, South Carolina Archives Dept., Columbia,
S. C.

Lowry Ware, Erskine College, Due West, S. C.

R. H. Wienefeld, Box 100, University of South Carolina,
Columbia, S. C.

Hazel C. Wilkin, 100 Bull Street, Charleston, S. C.

Jack K. Williams, Clemson College, Clemson, S. C.

Gus G. Williamson, Dept. of History, U. of North Carolina,
Chapel Hill, N. C.

J. Harold Wolfe, Winthrop College, Rock Hill, S. C.

Robert H. Woody, 2734 Circle Drive, Durham, N. C.

Edward L. Wright, 2907 Forest Drive, Columbia, S. C.

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE LIBRARY



0 01 01 0020888 2

S.C. 975.7

Copy 3

South Carolina Historical
Association.

The proceedings of the South
Carolina Historical / 1959

S.C. 975.7

Copy 3

South Carolina Historical
Association.

The proceedings of the South
Carolina Historical / 1959

S. C. STATE LIBRARY

