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Preface

In my more than thirty years at the Department of Archives and History I often used the analogy that the department was like the cobbler whose children had no shoes. It wasn’t that we didn’t have the agency’s own records of permanent value, but they were unarranged or poorly arranged, and formal histories of the department were limited to brief overviews. With the publication of The Palmetto State’s Memory, this situation is at least partially rectified.

The early history of the department is closely entwined with the political history of South Carolina. For many years it is largely the story of one man, Alexander Samuel Salley, Jr. When I came to South Carolina, the long fight to force him to retire was whispered about at the same time that the staff still almost reverentially referred to him as “Mr. Salley.” The battle between Salley and his opponents is an epic story that almost seems unreal in 2009, and Salley’s successor, J. Harold Easterby, comes across as a heroic figure.

A number of staff members and former staff members have long been interested in the agency’s history. My debt to them is much greater than the references to their work in my footnotes might indicate. My colleagues at the South Caroliniana Library at the University of South Carolina and at other South Carolina repositories have also been extremely helpful. Tom Simmons, a faithful volunteer worker here at the department, painstakingly arranged most of the department’s early records. Tom, I promise I won’t find any more Salley papers for you to interfile!

Limitations on my time and the difficulty of being objective about scenes in which one was a participant have forced this book to stop in 1960. The Epilogue briefly summarizes the department’s more recent past. The bibliography of the department’s documentary and monographic publications at the end of this book, however, comes forward to the present. Records management and historic preservation manuals, handbooks, technical leaflets, and similar materials have not been included. Mounting of a PDF version of this history on our website will at least partially substitute for the lack of an index.

As I write this preface the agency’s fifth director, Rodger E. Stroup, has just retired and a search is on for his replacement. I thank Rodger not only for being supportive of this history but also for many years of friendship as we have labored in the vineyards of this state’s history.

CHARLES H. LESSER
March 2009

FOLLOWING PAGE: The grillwork over the main entrance to the Archives Building constructed in 1959.
SOUTH CAROLINA ARCHIVES
The Palmetto State’s Memory

Part I: The Salley Years

Beginnings

On March 29, 1905, in the Supreme Court room in the State House, the Historical Commission of South Carolina elected a full-time secretary. The General Assembly had passed a law a little more than a month earlier reorganizing the commission, a moribund collecting organization with no staff whose holdings were deposited with the secretary of state. The reorganized commission and its new secretary were to take charge of the state’s archival records. After a competitive examination, the commission hired Alexander Samuel Salley, Jr. Salley, then thirty-three, had run the South Carolina Historical Society in Charleston for nearly six years. As he put it in his application, “I am the only person in South Carolina who has adopted scientific historical research as a profession and who makes a livelihood exclusively thereby. I want to work up those records,” he added. “I expect to make practical studies among them the remainder of my life, and I would like to build my monument out of them.”

For the next forty-four years Salley built his “monument” until he was forced to retire against his will at age 78 in 1949. In 1939 he summed up, “I have been practically this department since its inception, April 1, 1905. For nineteen years I had no assistants, for fifteen more a stenographer and for the last three years one other assistant.”

The South Carolina Department of Archives and History has had only five directors since these modest beginnings in 1905. Starting in but two rooms in the State House, it is now housed in its own modern building, built eleven years ago at a cost of twenty and a half million dollars. Despite draconian budget cuts in recent years, it is possessed of one of the best sets of colonial, state, and local government records in the nation and is doing exciting things with remote electronic access. Records management and historic preservation programs were added to the department’s archival responsibilities in the 1960s. The department is much changed. But like all institutions, it is the product of its history. And like other institutions, there is a pre-history.

South Carolina’s concern for preserving its government records dates back to the very beginning of the colony in 1670. Joseph Dalton, the first secretary of the province, worked hard to get “an orderly method” to record keeping in the fledgling settlement. The colony and state often exhibited extraordinary attention to the preservation of its records. After the December

---

1 A.S. Salley, Jr., March 6, 1905, to the Chairman and Members of the State Historical Commission, Applications and Examination for the Position of Secretary, Series S108180, South Carolina Dept. of Archives and History; Wylma Anne Wates, “In the Beginning: South Carolina Hires Its First Archivist,” South Carolina Historical Magazine, 80 (1979): 186-91.

2 A.S. Salley, Jr., Sept. 18, 1939, to William D. McCain, Director, Mississippi Dept. of Archives and History, Correspondence of the Secretary of the Historical Commission, 1894-1949, Series S108066, S.C. Archives.

1719 revolt against the government of the Lords Proprietors who owned the colony, the custody of the records was in dispute. In passing a law to get the records, the revolutionaries declared, “Nothing is more necessary for the Well Being of a Colony than the Preservation of the Publick Records.”

After the great hurricane of September 15, 1752, George Hunter, the surveyor general and inspector and controller of quit rents, sent wet records to bakers’ ovens, “Sunning & Airing them when Weather woud permit.”

The state went to considerable trouble in the early 1820s to erect a fireproof building in Charleston to house state and district records. An alley was widened so that the building, designed by native-born architect Robert Mills, would be surrounded on all sides by streets or parkland. South Carolina’s current State House has its origins in 1851 with the beginning of construction of a fireproof building for state offices in Columbia.

In 1865 valiant efforts by State Auditor James Tupper, Secretary of State William R. Huntt, and other officials succeeded in getting most of the state’s records out of Columbia by train before the February 17 fire.

In 1865 valiant efforts by State Auditor James Tupper, Secretary of State William R. Huntt, and other officials succeeded in getting most of the state’s records out of Columbia by train before the February 17 fire. Alexander Salley could report in 1927 that despite “the mutations of time and the destructions of two invading armies, of cyclones, earthquakes and fires,” South Carolina had “a magnificent accumulation of records.” In an article published in the North Carolina Historical Review in that year, he recounted a lengthy catalogue of the colony and state’s efforts to preserve those records.

Obtaining copies of colonial records from England and publishing the state’s records had also long been a concern. In 1829 the state commissioned Henry N. Cruger to examine records in London that would aid in “filling up the chasms in our Records.” In 1849 another effort to determine what records survived in state custody and then to “visit London, Paris and Madrid” to “select and transcribe” records relating to “the early history of our State” led to a proto-archival effort. John Sitgreaves Green, Agent for Colonial and Revolutionary Records, rescued many of the most important early records in Columbia and Charleston between 1850 and 1853, but the office was discontinued and again no European copying was done.

A renewed effort in the 1890s to obtain copies from England and to publish the colonial records eventually led to the 1905 establishment of the Historical Commission as the state’s archival repository. The South Carolina Historical Society, founded in Charleston in 1855, took the lead. In 1891 a distinguished group of gentlemen from throughout the state headed by former Charleston mayor William Ashmead Courtenay gave the Historical Society the ten fat volumes of the recently published The Colonial Records of

---

5 Terry W. Lipscomb and R. Nicholas Olsberg, editors, The Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, November 14, 1751-October 7, 1752 (Columbia: Published for the South Carolina Department of Archives and History by the University of South Carolina Press, 1977), p. 407.
North Carolina. A businessman with a passion for history, Courtenay had initiated the publication of City of Charleston Year Books, which, in addition to the reports of city officers, printed extensive historical materials as appendices. In 1883 Mayor Courtenay also obtained transcripts of the rich documentation for the founding of the colony contained in the Shaftesbury Papers. Spurred on by the North Carolina publication, the Historical Society named a five-man committee chaired by Courtenay. The committee decided that obtaining transcripts of colonial records from England had to precede a publication effort and mounted a statewide petition drive for legislative funding. In December 1891, the General Assembly established the Public Record Commission of the State of South Carolina to obtain the transcripts. By 1895 the Public Record Commission had fulfilled its mandate and, as provided in its enabling legislation, turned the transcripts over to the secretary of state.12

The impetus for further records work would again come from Charleston and the South Carolina Historical Society. In 1887 Alexander Samuel Salley, Jr., son of a prominent Orangeburg family, had moved to Charleston to attend The Citadel. Except for an unhappy brief period in 1892 when he worked on the engineering staff for the Columbian Exposition in Chicago and five months in late 1895 and early 1896 when he was in Washington as clerk to Congressman William Elliot, Salley would remain in Charleston until 1905. Salley moved in the best Charleston social circles and became a member of the elite St. Cecilia Society. In 1892 he began to study law and served as a lawyer's clerk to Joseph W. Barnwell for two years before joining the staff of The News and Courier briefly in 1896 and 1897. In 1898 he published a history of his native Orangeburg County. Salley's acquaintance with the State House and its masses of disordered records began as he reported on the state Senate for the Charleston newspaper in 1899. That same year he was admitted to the bar, but history rather than the law was to be his calling.13

In 1899 the South Carolina Historical Society was a small gentlemen's club with but 60 members and no paid staff. At a May meeting the first women were admitted, and in October the very nature of the society changed. Joseph Walker Barnwell, a prominent Charleston lawyer, political figure, and supporter of cultural organizations, was vice president of the society and at the center of the reorganization. At the October 20 meeting, Alexander Salley was present by invitation. Elected to membership, a motion by Barnwell also made Salley secretary, treasurer, and librarian at a salary of $25 per month. Barnwell also moved that a publications committee be authorized to publish "a quarterly magazine of history." With Salley as editor, the first issue of The South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine appeared

---


13 Alexander Samuel Salley sketch in The History of South Carolina; Biographical Volume (New York: The American Historical Society, Inc., 1935), p. 611, and Salley, Jan. 13, 1949, to Mrs. Irene Gaillard Smith, South Carolina Historical Society. I am indebted to the society's former archivist, Nicholas Butler, now special collections manager at the Charleston County Public Library, for a copy of this letter. The letter is a revealing autobiographical account written because Mrs. Smith was giving a paper about Salley. Salley doubtless also wrote the 1935 boastful sketch; he noted in the letter that there was "always some blunder" in the printing of sketches of himself that he contributed. The History of Orangeburg County, South Carolina From its First Settlement to the Close of the Revolutionary War (Orangeburg, S.C.: R. Lewis Berry, Printer, 1898). See also the laudatory account for the 40th anniversary of the commission in The State (Columbia), April 1, 1945.
In 1894, as its work in obtaining transcripts of colonial records from London was nearing completion, the Public Record Commission recommended the creation of a permanent Historical Commission. “While the record of Colonial days is most valuable,” they noted, “no less so would be that of the succeeding periods of South Carolina’s history.” The Historical Commission, they suggested, should “collect, from whatever source attainable, all material bearing upon the history of the State and her people.” The General Assembly agreed, providing a six-member commission with “the Secretary of State, ex officio, as Chairman, and five other citizens of the State, to be appointed by the Governor, and to serve without compensation.” Their collections were to be “deposited in the office of the Secretary of State.” Before 1905 the commission met only five times. At one of two meetings in 1897 it authorized “estimates of cost of publication of the Public Records,” and in a printed report for the year 1898 it advocated work on a large unsorted cache of records in a third-floor room of the State House. Nothing came of either motion. The 1902 Code of Laws left out all mention of the existence of the commission.

Although the Historical Commission in a number of years did not even meet, there were other signs of renewed concern for the state’s public records. In 1889 a joint resolution...
authorized the secretary of state to hire “a skillful person at a salary not exceeding one hundred dollars a month” to index “all records in his office.” In the next few years first Col. William Wallace and then L.M. Ragin worked to improve indexes to the grant and plat books and the volumes of Miscellaneous Records. In 1902 the General Assembly gave the secretary of state authority “to take charge of any papers or documents of a purely historical nature in any of the offices of the State House,” to “set apart a room or rooms in the State House in which he shall place all such papers or documents,” and to hire “a competent man” to arrange, catalog, and index these records at a salary of seventy-five dollars per month. Fitz Hugh McMaster, business manager of The Evening Post and a member of the Charleston delegation to the House of Representatives, had gotten this act passed. McMaster circulated a petition that was signed by a majority of the members of the legislature asking the secretary of state to appoint his friend A.S. Salley, Jr., to the post. Instead, the secretary appointed R.M. McCown, whom McMaster later called a “political henchman.”

In Charleston “Aleck” or “Alex” Salley, as he was known to his friends, continued to run the Historical Society. In a 1916 newspaper plea for support for the Historical Society, he reported that he had for “six winters . . . worked in the room of the society in the old building of the Charleston library, without fire in order to save the scanty funds of the Society.” Salley also did “historical and genealogical research work and newspaper and magazine work,” and sold old newspapers and books to make enough to support himself. He was active in the Sons of Confederate Veterans. In 1902 he briefly ran a bookshop called The Curio in partnership with Yates Snowden, who later became professor of history at the University of South Carolina. In August 1904 Salley lost by a large margin in the Democratic primary for a Charleston seat in the House of Representatives.

For a year from late 1903 through much of 1904, Salley contributed a weekly “Historical Department” to the Sunday News, publishing abstracts of early probate records, death notices in the Gazette, ship registries from the 1730s, and other materials. For Salley “scientific” history centered on publishing accurate historical texts, but these texts apparently appealed to few of the newspaper’s readers. When the paper asked him to substitute “historical sketches in narrative style with incidents and reminiscences,” he refused. As he angrily wrote his friend Snowden, he would not have had for “six winters . . . worked in the room of the society in the old building of the Charleston library, without fire in order to save the scanty funds of the Society.” Salley also did “historical and genealogical research work and newspaper and magazine work,” and sold old newspapers and books to make enough to support himself. He was active in the Sons of Confederate Veterans. In 1902 he briefly ran a bookshop called The Curio in partnership with Yates Snowden, who later became professor of history at the University of South Carolina. In August 1904 Salley lost by a large margin in the Democratic primary for a Charleston seat in the House of Representatives.

For a year from late 1903 through much of 1904, Salley contributed a weekly “Historical Department” to the Sunday News, publishing abstracts of early probate records, death notices in the Gazette, ship registries from the 1730s, and other materials. For Salley “scientific” history centered on publishing accurate historical texts, but these texts apparently appealed to few of the newspaper’s readers. When the paper asked him to substitute “historical sketches in narrative style with incidents and reminiscences,” he refused. As he angrily wrote his friend Snowden, he would not

---

19 Joint Resolution No. 179, Statutes at Large, 20:294. Reports of the indexing clerks can be found in the secretary of state’s reports in Reports and Resolutions for 1892 (Vol. 2, p. 193), 1893 (Vol. 2, p. 31), 1894 (Vol. 1, pp. 256-57), 1896 (Vol. 1, p. 5), and 1897 (p. 741).

20 Act No. 66, Statutes at Large, 23:1155-56.


22 The State (Columbia), Dec. 29, 1916, p. 3; “Salley, Alex S.” folder, Box 15, Yates Snowden Collection, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina. The library also has three volumes of records of the bookstore. The newspaper article pays tribute to Mabel L. Webber, his successor at the Historical Society, even though her father fought in the Union Army and she was a woman!

23 News and Courier, September 1, 1904, p. 5.

24 Sunday News, October 18, 1903 through November 20, 1904. The “Historical Department” was often on page 9. W.W. Ball to Salley, November 22, 1904, Folder 90, Alexander Salley Papers, Caroliniana Library. Salley also wrote a lengthy history of the Courier for the centennial edition that appeared as part two of the News and Courier for April 20, 1904. Salley was paid for these contributions.
“descend to the Ben Perry style of rot.” But before his newspaper column ended, Salley also used it to advocate a separate archives department. The late nineteenth century had seen the beginnings of the professionalization of history. Patrician historians began to give way to academics with doctorates, but at first both cooperated in establishing national and regional historical organizations and in advocating archival institutions. In 1904 Yates Snowden went off to Columbia University for graduate study but did not complete a Ph.D. Herbert Baxter Adams’s graduate students at Johns Hopkins University were key figures in the spread throughout the South of the German seminar approach and the emphasis on primary sources. That influence, however, had not reached The Citadel by the time Salley was there. His instructors were either former Confederate officers or themselves Citadel graduates. Salley did not sit at the master’s feet in Baltimore, indeed had no graduate training at all. Nonetheless, he began to interact with professionally trained “scientific historians” during his time in Washington as private secretary to Congressman William Elliot in late 1895 and 1896.

The Southern History Association was established in April 1896 by Southerners who were in Washington during the Democratic interlude that ended at the conclusion of the second term of President Grover Cleveland in 1897. Among Herbert Baxter Adams’s students was a South Carolinian, Colyer Meriwether (Ph.D., Hopkins, 1893). Meriwether was one of the most active founders and permanent secretary of the Southern History Association. Ironically, he was also an older cousin of Robert L. Meriwether, who would later become Salley’s nemesis. The association and its periodical publication lasted only until 1907. Its membership included both professionally trained historians like Meriwether and Woodrow Wilson and former Confederate Generals like M.C. Butler and Wade Hampton. Alexander Salley and Colyer Meriwether knew each other through Washington’s South Carolina Society. Meriwether saw to it that Salley was one of the original members of the Southern History Association and solicited his help in gaining others for the organization.

Salley had been collecting the works of the South Carolina author William Gilmore Simms. His first scholarly publication, a Simms bibliography, appeared in 1897 in the first volume of *Publications of the Southern History Association*. Thomas M. Owen of Alabama was also one of the founders of the association. Owen, who like Salley had been trained in the law, was then living in Washington while working for the Post Office Department and became the association’s

---

25 Salley to Snowden, November 30, 1904, Salley folder, Box 15, Snowden Collection. Former governor Benjamin Franklin Perry’s newspaper pieces were published in book form as *Reminiscences of Public Men*.


first treasurer. Salley and Owen also became acquainted in Washington. After Owen became the first director of the Alabama Department of Archives and History in 1901, the *Publications of the Southern History Association* ardently pushed for other southern states to follow Alabama's example.  

Like the Southern History Association, the United Sons of Confederate Veterans became a vigorous advocate of the establishment of state archives. Founded in 1895, this organization appointed a Historical Committee in 1898. Salley was back in Charleston in 1899 when the annual reunion was held there and the Historical Committee proclaimed, “The establishment of truth is never wrong.” Both the Southern History Association and the committee of the United Sons linked the passion for original sources of the new “scientific historians” with the defense of the Confederate Lost Cause. Thomas Owen became chairman of the Historical Committee of the United Sons of Confederate Veterans in 1903 and commander-in-chief of the organization in 1905. More active in the promotion of archival efforts than its parent United Confederate Veterans and related women’s organizations, the United Sons added their voice to the choir calling for preservation of original sources.

In November 1903 Salley’s “Historical Department,” in addition to the usual abstracts, sermonized on “The Value of Records.” “There are very few states in the Union richer in records than South Carolina,” Salley argued, “and very few States have made less effort to put their records in shape for students.” Through the years Salley would be famous for tirades against myths and errors. As he put it here, “if almost everything that is written is filled with errors, it is questionable whether it would not be better to write nothing.” The solution, he argued, “is to put our original records in print, properly shaped.” Salley was the South Carolina adjunct member of the Public Archives Commission of the American Historical Association. The advocacy of that commission and other organizations for proper care of records bore first fruit with the establishment of the Alabama Department of Archives and History in 1901. In December 1903 “The Historical Department” contrasted the South Carolina situation with the Alabama department and its first director Thomas Owen. Salley reported, “Thousands of papers in the State House at Columbia are going to ruin and decay because this State employs no Owen to calendar and index them.” The state should “establish a decent State library, transfer its historical records thereto and employ a competent man to arrange, calendar and index them.”

In January 1904 Salley, under the heading “Legislation Wanted,” argued that the state should appropriate about fifteen hundred dollars for the Historical Commission, “authorize them to employ a clerk, or State Archivist, give the Commission quarters and turn over to it all of that magnificent mass of records that are indiscriminately distributed throughout the State House.” He then printed the full text of the

---
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Alabama act establishing their department. In the next week's column, Salley published a letter from Owen advocating the establishment of a South Carolina department similar to Alabama's rather than amending the Historical Commission.

In October 1904 Salley began a short-lived series for the Columbia newspaper The State that aimed to publish lists of the officers of the South Carolina districts from 1798 to 1868. This business reminded Fitz Hugh McMaster, who was now with that newspaper, that he had “intended writing you for some time about the historical matter in the State House.” McMaster thought the “DDDDDDDDDD --- st dunderheads in the world have been working on this” under the secretary of state and believed the only solution was to have the Historical Society “take charge of the work.” He proposed that Salley get Charleston representative Hugh Sinkler to write a bill and that Salley fabricate an exchange of letters in The State, but this part of the effort came to naught.

Another member of the South Carolina Historical Society brought the campaign to a successful conclusion. Henry Augustus Middleton Smith, antiquarian scholar, lawyer, and low-country aristocrat of the first order, had joined Joseph Walker Barnwell and Alexander Salley in transforming the South Carolina Historical Society in 1899. In 1904 Governor Duncan Clinch Heyward appointed Smith to the inactive Historical Commission. When the commission finally met on January 4, 1905, Smith came armed with a draft bill giving the commission the care and custody of all the official archives of the State not now in current use; the collection of materials bearing upon the history of the State, and of the Counties and territory included therein from the earliest times; the collection of all documents or transcripts of documents and of material relating to the history of South Carolina and of all its territory and inhabitants; and particularly of procuring data concerning South Carolina Soldiers in the War of the Revolution and the War Between the States.

The commission adopted Smith's draft with minor changes and in their printed report to the General Assembly called attention “with all urgency possible” to the “present state of affairs with regard to the historical material of State of South Carolina.”

Senator John Quitman Marshall, a lawyer and former secretary of state who represented Richland County, introduced the bill on January 11. Thirteen days later Senator William James Johnson, a Fairfield County follower of “Pitchfork Ben” Tillman, proposed an amendment providing that the secretary of state's existing historical clerk be given all the duties under the redefined commission instead of a new secretary. Although this was defeated by a vote of 25 to 12, Senator Coleman L. Blease succeeded in getting the salary reduced from $1,200 to $1,000. This would not be the last time that the Historical Commission would have problems with Blease, a demagogic champion of the mill hands.

On February 20, 1905, Governor Heyward signed the act revamping the Historical Commission into law. In its report to the legislature, the commission had noted that in “many of the States there are separate fire-proof buildings known as Halls of Record,” but, given the

---

35 F.H. McMaster to Salley, October 11 and 14, 1904, folders 88 and 89, Salley Papers, Caroliniana Library. Only Abbeville and Anderson districts appeared, October 16, p. 20 and October 23, p. 28.
state's financial condition, they felt this was more than the state “could undertake.” Instead, as they suggested, the act provided that the said Historical Commission shall be located at the State Capitol, in the city of Columbia, in separate apartments in such Capitol, to be designated and set aside for its use by the Secretary of State, of which apartments the said Commission shall have exclusive charge and control.

The secretary of state continued to be ex-officio chairman of the commission. The appointment of the five other members by the governor was regularized with staggered, renewable, ten-year terms. The commission was to select the secretary, “who shall not be a member of the Commission, and who shall hold office at the pleasure of said Commission.”38 When he was forced to retire in 1949, Salley would claim that he had “procured the reorganization of the defunct Historical Commission.”39 Given his high opinion of himself and the circumstances in 1949, this inflated claim may not be surprising. In 1909 he more accurately reported having “had something to do with the movement to establish this department.”40 The challenge in 1905 was to insure his appointment as secretary.

McMaster wrote Salley on March 1 that he took “for granted that the Historical Commission knows its business and will do the right thing, which is the election of yourself as secretary.” It took a little maneuvering. The reorganized commission met on March 11, drew lots to stagger their terms, and on motion of Henry A.M. Smith ordered advertisement of the position in The State and the News and Courier. The deadline for applications was set for March 28 with the “examination by the Commission to test capacity and fitness” scheduled for the next day. August Kohn, a wealthy Columbia businessman, newspaperman, and book collector, wrote his friend Salley on March 12 to tell him he had the votes of three members of the commission: Smith, William Ashmead Courtenay, and John Bomar Cleveland, a leading Spartanburg banker and mill owner. He also relayed the information that Courtenay, the former Charleston mayor who was now a Newry mill owner, would write another member of the commission, former secretary of state and Clarendon County planter James E. Tindall. Courtenay had “every reason to believe that Mr. Tindall will vote for you and that will settle the matter.”41

What McMaster would call the “subterfuge” of an examination may have been caused by the candidacy of Mrs. Sarah Aldrich Richardson, the state regent of the Daughters of the American Revolution. Mrs. Richardson had appeared at the March 11 meeting with a delegation from

---


38 Statutes at Large, 24:906-10.

39 Salley to Mrs. Irene G. Smith, Jan. 13, 1949, South Carolina Historical Society.

40 Salley to Mrs. C.R. Foster, March 25, 1909, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. The letter also refers to “those of us who were behind the movement” and to Smith’s having written the bill.

41 McMaster to Salley, March 1, 1905, folder 94 and Guss [August Kohn] to Salley, March 12, 1905, folder 95, Salley Papers, Caroliniana Library; Minutes of the Historical Commission, March 11, 1905. Kohn, a couple years older than Salley, was also from an Orangeburg family; August Kohn sketch in Snowden, History of South Carolina, Vol. V, pp. 224-26. See also Helen Kohn Hennig, August Kohn, Versatile South Carolinian (Columbia, S.C.: The Vogue Press, 1949).
her organization. The men of the commission stood throughout their reading “of papers signed by legislators and others strongly endorsing the application.” August Kohn reported that Courtenay thought Secretary of State Jesse T. Gantt “is for Mrs S.A.R.,” but Kohn thought Gantt would not press the issue.

McMaster’s prediction that Mrs. Richardson would “decline indignantly to stand the exam” proved right, but six applicants in addition to Salley appeared on the 29th. Two of them would seem to have been strong candidates. George McCutcheon was instructor in history and political science at South Carolina College. John C. Garlington, a former editor of the Spartanburg Herald and author of Men of the Time, in a private venture was preparing Confederate rolls for publication in an office on the third floor of the State House. Commissioner Cleveland was unable to be present. Garlington and McCutcheon did each receive one vote, but Salley got the other three and was duly elected.42 Aleck Salley’s work with the state’s records could now begin.

Confederate and Revolutionary War Records and Documentary Editing in the Salley Years

A room on the ground floor of the State House next to the secretary of state’s office would be the commission’s headquarters for three decades. With their massive masonry walls, these rooms were believed to be fireproof, but a fire in the secretary of state’s office in September 1904 had graphically demonstrated the danger of wooden cases to hold records. That fire may have helped the movement to establish a separate archival agency but fortunately it did little irreparable damage. The secretary of state then had three rooms, and the fire was confined to the one used by the engrossing clerks who recorded and issued charters and commissions. Some volumes were badly singed and a large quantity of paper was destroyed, but no records were utterly lost.43

This same room was now assigned to the Historical Commission along with a room for additional storage on the third floor above the senate committee rooms. The secretary of state confined his operations to his office and the one for the land agent, who would continue to have custody of the state’s spectacularly rich grant and plat books. The secretary of state had earlier unsuccessfully asked the legislature for fireproof cases, but the General Assembly was now willing to appropriate $2,500 for metal fixtures for the Historical Commission. By November 1905 the room was fitted out with a desk and table and the lower ranks of steel cases and shelves obtained from the Art Metal Construction Company of Jamestown, New York. A further appropriation of $2,500 in 1906 provided additional cases for the room and started the metal pigeonhole cases for the room on the third floor.

The rules that the commission adopted on the day that they elected Alexander Salley required him to be present and the office open to the public from 9 a.m. to 2 p.m. and from 4 to 5 p.m. Thus they observed the mid-day dinner that would continue to be the fashion for professionals in Columbia for many years. In the first annual report of the reorganized commission Salley listed in detail the Council Journals, Commons

42 McMaster to Salley, March 14, 1905, folder 95, Salley Papers, Caroliniana Library; Wates, “In the Beginning: South Carolina Hires its First Archivist.” Thomas E. Richardson, a Sumter County rare book and real estate man, became very angry at Henry A.M. Smith because he was not given the opportunity to read a historical paper on the 29th as he claimed Smith promised him; Richardson to Smith, May 6, 1905, Letterpress Copy Book, November 1904-October 1906, Thomas Eveleigh Richardson Collection, Caroliniana Library. Salley’s answers to the examination were printed in The State (Columbia), March 31, 1905, p. 6.
43 The State, September 19, 1904, p. 8, col. 1, and Sept. 20, 1904, p. 8, col. 3.
House Journals, Privy Council Journals, Senate and House Journals, British Public Record Office Transcripts, Miscellaneous Records of the Secretary of State, Mortgages, Bills of Sale, Memorial Books, Indian Books, Stub-books of Indents Issued in Payment of Revolutionary War Services, and Marriage Settlements in his custody. He ended his list with a “great mass of miscellaneous papers of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government as yet unarranged and unclassified.”

Arrangement, indexing, and publication work in the early years concentrated on records of the American Revolution, rolls of the state’s Confederate soldiers, and legislative journals. In the third report Salley noted that the “most sought for records are the individual records of soldiers of the Revolution.” The commission argued in the

---

44 Report of the Historical Commission of South Carolina to the General Assembly of South Carolina at the Regular Session of 1906 (Columbia: Gonzales and Bryan, State Printers, 1905-1906). The reports were issued both as separates and, with different pagination, as part of the Reports and Resolutions. For the Salley era I have used his bound and annotated copies of the separates in series S108001, S.C. Archives. The department still has the desk, table, and two of the record cases.
same report that printing “a roll of the officers, soldiers and sailors who served the State during the War between the Confederate States and the United States” was “one of the highest duties devolving upon the Commission and the State.”

As early as 1862, the state of South Carolina authorized publishing a roll of its Confederate dead. Since 1882 it had intermittently been laboring on the more ambitious task of compiling and publishing rolls of all the men who had served in the war. Since the state possessed few actual muster and pay rolls, the latter project involved circulating draft rolls among veterans and asking them to add and confirm names and data from memory. In 1899 the best corrected “memory rolls” were bound in five large volumes. The adjutant general turned the Confederate rolls over to Salley soon after he took office, and he promptly began “the work of indexing them by the card index system.”

Special appropriations in 1908 and 1910 allowed Salley to hire temporary staff to speed the indexing work. Over 50,000 cards had been created by 1911, even though that did not quite finish the work.

On the basis of the memory rolls, in 1908 Salley printed a *Tentative Roster of the Third Regiment, South Carolina Troops in Confederate Service, Confederate States Provisional Army*. The volume was addressed “To the survivors of the 3rd Regiment” for “corrections and additions.” But “scientific” historian that he was, Salley was uneasy about information based on memory and the clerical and printer’s errors that had doubtless crept in. By 1912 he was arranging, at the suggestion of the historian J. Franklin Jameson, to have the original captured Confederate muster rolls, pay rolls, and returns in the War Department photostated. Salley had originally planned to have these rolls copied by hand and admitted to Jameson that “it was stupid of me not to think” of photostats. He added that he was “familiar with almost every family name in this state and when I see a name I will be able to say what it is no matter how eccentric the handwriting.” As he expected, comparison showed the earlier information “to be exceedingly incomplete, inaccurate and erroneous.”

Special appropriations from the 1912 through 1918 legislatures allowed Salley to acquire photostats of not only the Confederate rolls but also the muster rolls of South Carolina troops in Continental service during the American Revolution. The acquisition of these photostats of federal records is

---

45 *Report of the Historical Commission of South Carolina to the General Assembly of South Carolina at the Regular Session of 1908* (Columbia: Gonzales and Bryan, State Printers, 1907-1908), pp. 6, 4.


48 (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Co., 1908), note to the survivors at the front of the volume.

49 Salley, April 25, 1912, to Dr. J.F. Jameson, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.


51 The annual reports in these years give minute details of every receipt and expenditure down to the purchase of stamps and soap. The photostats of the Revolutionary War rolls have subsequently been replaced by microfilm; only those not fully legible on the film were retained.
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the lineal ancestor of the department's purchase of more than 5,000 reels of microfilmed records from the National Archives, mostly in the 1960s and 1970s. Much of this microfilm also documents the American Revolution and the Civil War.

Initially Salley made quick progress in publishing Confederate rolls based on the photostats. A fat volume of 783 pages covering the three different First Infantry regiments appeared in 1913, and a second substantial volume for the Second, Third, and Fourth infantry regiments was completed in 1919. But then progress slowed and ground to a halt. A third volume of less than half the size of the first and covering only the Fifth Infantry appeared in 1930. In 1910 the commission had lamented the comparison with "the large volumes of records of Confederate soldiers from other States, which have been printed by those States," and in 1930 they were faced with "demands made by the commander of the United Confederate Veterans of South Carolina that the Commission proceed faster with the work of compiling and printing the records of the Confederate soldiers from South Carolina." The threat of the legislature taking the Confederate work out of the Historical Commission would lead to a highly critical 1931 commission report on the progress of the secretary's work.\(^{53}\)

Work with Revolutionary War records involved arrangement as well as indexing and publication. In its 1898 report the then inactive Historical Commission had called attention to the "plunder room" on the third floor of the statehouse with its "mass of papers apparently several feet deep all over the floor, in almost inextricable confusion." Salley later recounted that before the practice was discovered and stopped in the early 1890s porters had visited the room to gather baskets of papers to use as kindling in the office coal grates. In 1903 Secretary of State Gantt reported in The State that the 25 by 40 foot room was "piled 10 feet high" before old furniture, unbound copies of the 1880 statutes, and other trash were removed. Among the papers in the room were great masses of loose legislative papers and a "large number of accounts of individual militiamen, with number of days served by each, and accounts of those who fed the militia."\(^{54}\)

In the brief period under the 1902 act when the secretary of state had responsibility for the state's archives, his historical clerk worked to find the Revolutionary War militia records and began to arrange them in blank books.\(^{55}\) Based on the work of the Historical Commission, Salley reported delivery of the completed volumes on May 12, 1919. Only 200 copies were printed. Report of the Historical Commission of South Carolina to the General Assembly of South Carolina At the Regular Session of 1920 (Columbia: Gonzales and Bryan, State Printers, 1920), p. 4.

\(^{52}\) The title page of Vol. II contains the misleading date of 1914. Printing of the volume began in that year and was continued in sections until the whole was finally indexed and bound. Salley reported delivery of the completed volumes on May 12, 1919. Only 200 copies were printed. Report of the Historical Commission of South Carolina to the General Assembly of South Carolina at the Regular Session of 1920 (Columbia: Gonzales and Bryan, State Printers, 1920), p. 4.

\(^{53}\) Report of the Historical Commission of South Carolina to the General Assembly of South Carolina at the Regular Session of 1910 (Columbia: Gonzales and Bryan, State Printers, 1909-1910), p. 4; Minutes of the Historical Commission, December 13, 1930, p. 126, and memorandum from commission member Robert L. Meriwether inserted as the following page. The memorandum is not signed and is misdated in pencil but the University of South Carolina History Department letterhead clearly identifies the author. The "Major General Commanding" of the veterans, W.D. Craig of Chesterfield, wrote to all the commissioners suggesting they get estimates from private firms for completing the work. Ten years earlier he had complained to Salley of numerous unanswered letters; Craig to Salley, June 21, 1920, and October 17, 1930, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.

\(^{54}\) 1898 report, Reports and Resolutions . . . 1899, Vol. II, pp. 389-91; Salley to Jameson, April 11, 1908, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives; The State, Dec. 20, 1903, quoted in Judith M. Brimelow, Accounts Audited of Claims Growing Out of the Revolution in South Carolina (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1985), a pamphlet accompanying South Carolina Archives Microcopy Number 8, p. 8.

on this work, Salley's friend Fitz Hugh McMaster published compiled rolls of Revolutionary soldiers, first under the secretary of state's name and then under his own. These appeared in *The State* in many Sunday editions between January 1904 and June 1905. Thus McMaster had every reason to be knowledgeable in his condemnation of the “lack of progress” of the archival work under the secretary of state.\(^{56}\)

As soon as his furniture and cases were installed, Salley began to file “alphabetically-lexiographically” in packets, rather than in books, the “vouchers for the pay of soldiers and other claimants against the State for services and supplies furnished the State during the Revolution.” He filed three thousand in the first year alone and continued to report progress even though in the second year he reported that he “employed only a portion of his time” in this work. Records of the “other two hundred and thirty years” of the state’s history, he felt, also deserved his attention. In 1910 he received a special appropriation to hire temporary help to start a card file index to Revolutionary War records. That card file would eventually reference not only the file-holders in the series now known as *Accounts Audited of Claims Growing Out of the Revolution* but most of the names mentioned in the more than ten thousand files in that series. It indexed other Revolutionary War records as well.\(^{57}\)

Until it acquired photostats from the War Department, South Carolina had few Revolutionary War rolls. Salley edited and indexed the ones he could find and other miscellaneous manuscripts in one of his earliest publications for the commission, *Documents Relating to the History of South Carolina During the Revolutionary War*.\(^{58}\) Rather than attempt compiled rosters like he was doing for Confederate soldiers, Salley continued to edit and publish original records relating to the Revolution. The Revolutionary accounts were settled after the war by the issuance of interest-bearing certificates called principal indents. Most of the stubs of these indents, which bore a summary of the military service or supplies furnished during the war, survived in letter-designated books. Beginning with *Stub Entries to Indents Issued in Payment of Claims Against South Carolina Growing Out of the Revolution Books L-N* in 1910,\(^{59}\) Salley began to publish these books. Before he retired, he had published nine volumes in the series. The department published three further volumes in the mid-1950s in an unsuccessful attempt to complete the series.

Salley would prove to be an adept politician. In 1907 Yates Snowden, now a member of the Historical Commission, had informed the commission that the records of South Carolina’s Revolutionary Navy Board were in the New York State Library in Albany. Several attempts to get their return failed due to the opposition of the New York commissioner of education, who was in charge of the state library. In 1910 Salley enlisted the aid of New York Judge A.T. Clearwater, who was in Charleston to make the annual Huguenot Society address. Salley got the 1911 South Carolina legislature to pass a concurrent resolution asking the New York legislature for their return. He

---

\(^{56}\) McMaster to Cleveland, March 4, 1905, Applications and Examination for the Position of Secretary; Brimelow, *Accounts Audited*, p. 8.


\(^{58}\) (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1908). The volume can be found on microfilm in the Colonial Records of South Carolina series published by Research Publications, Inc. Most or all of these documents are now cataloged as part of the Robert W. Gibbes Collection of Revolutionary War Manuscripts, 1773-1820, but a number of them were not owned by Gibbes. A series description for the Gibbes Collection can be found through the On-line Records Index on the department’s homepage, http://scdah.sc.gov/.

\(^{59}\) (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1910).
also gathered other advocates in New York state, including State Historian Victor H. Paltsits and the vice president of the New York Association of Historical Societies, and got a bill introduced into the New York legislature. He then journeyed to Albany to testify before a legislative committee, arriving on the evening of March 28, 1911. Early the next morning New York lost many of its records in the disastrous New York State Library fire. It was assumed that the South Carolina navy records were also destroyed, and Salley returned to South Carolina. Fortunately the navy records were only very badly singed. An amended New York bill passed, and the records were returned to South Carolina.60 Until they were in hand, however, Salley had some anxious weeks. Commissioner of Education Dr. Andrew S. Draper came under attack for the loss of New York’s records. In private correspondence Salley called him “an old gray haired, wooden-legged Yankee veteran, with a villainous countenance” who might “make way with or mutilate our records after the legislature orders him to turn them over to us.”61

Salley published the *Journal of the Commissioners of the Navy of South Carolina, October 9, 1776–March 1, 1779*, in 1912 and followed with a slim volume of the same title for July 22, 1779–March 23, 1780 the next year. In his meticulous editing of the first of these volumes, for which both a rough and a more seriously damaged engrossed manuscript survived, Salley indicated which words came from the alternate copy and also used black type for words he had to take from that part of the journal that had been printed in Peter Force’s *American Archives*. Careful transcription work like this was typical of Salley’s documentary publications, but he did not attempt to put the Navy Clerk’s Pay Bill Book, 1778–1779, into print. Also rescued from the New York fire, this book’s records of patriot mariners, including slaves and free blacks, are still untapped.62

Salley’s other publications relating to the American Revolution included three slim volumes edited from manuscripts in other repositories and in private hands63 and an abortive beginning at printing the massive audited accounts. Salley included only about 100 files in each of the three volumes of *Accounts Audited of Revolutionary Claims Against South Carolina* that he published between 1935 and 1943. At that rate, it would have taken more than 100 little volumes, each with its separate index, to complete the more than 10,000 files in the series. The department published the Accounts Audited in a more practical microfilm format in the 1970s.64

---


61 Salley to Henry A.M. Smith, April 26, 1911, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.

62 Salley probably did not know of the complete transcripts of the journals in the Force Papers at the Library of Congress. Unfortunately the Force Papers have no transcript of the badly damaged Pay Bill Book. The volume is arranged by ship. Although the ship names at the top are illegible or burned off, most of the ships could be identified by searching for the names of captains and other officers in the journals and other sources.

63 *Captain Tollemache’s Journal of the Proceedings of H.M.S. Scorpion, June 21, 1775–September 18, 1775*, from a manuscript in the British Public Record office, and *Capt. William Hill’s Memoirs of the Revolution*, from an early copy in the Library of Congress of the lost original, were both published in 1919. *An Order Book of the Third Regiment, South Carolina Line, Continental Establishment, December 23, 1776–May 2, 1777*, was published in 1942 from a manuscript then in the hands of a state representative.

64 The filming on 165 reels was completed in fiscal year 1977–1978, but the accompanying booklet (see note 50 above) was not published until 1985. The printed volumes only reached Isaac Barnard in the alphabetical sequence.
Legislative journals were the most numerous documentary editions during Salley’s long tenure, but they mostly consisted of tiny separate volumes for individual legislative sessions. South Carolina did not contemporaneously print its journals until the 1830s. Retrospective printing of earlier journals had been considered as far back as 1819, but brought no results until Salley’s first publication for the Historical Commission in 1906, the *Journal of the General Assembly of South Carolina, March 26, 1776-April 11, 1776*. Salley published a few other journals of the Revolutionary era and Commons House journals for parts of 1734-1735 and 1765, but the bulk of his legislative documentary editions consisted of Commons House journals for the colony’s Proprietary Era. Salley published most of these journals from 1692-1708 in sixteen little volumes, but some surviving minutes for this period and all the journals from November 1708 through May 1734 remain unpublished. Salley also published almost all of the few surviving council journals for the Proprietary Era in two slim volumes issued in 1907.

The colony’s early years were a focus of Salley’s expertise and documentary efforts. In addition to legislative journals, he published the *Warrants for Lands in South Carolina, 1672-1711*, in three volumes; the *Commissions and Instructions from the Lords Proprietors of Carolina to Public Officials in South Carolina, 1685-1715*; the *Journal of the Commissioners of the Indian Trade of South Carolina, September 20, 1710-April 12, 1715*; the *Journal of Colonel John Herbert, Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the Province of South Carolina, October 17, 1727, to March 19, 1727/8*; the colony’s earliest record book, 1671-1675; and five volumes of indexed facsimile printings of the transcripts of *Records in the British Public Record Office Relating to South Carolina, 1663-1710*.

Salley published a few other early records not in the commission’s custody under their imprint. The largest of these was his 1919 volume *Minutes of St. Helena’s Parish, South Carolina, 1726-1812*. The commission also published compilations of death and marriage notices from early newspapers that Salley had started in his “Historical Department” column before he left Charleston. Salley continued to write for the newspapers throughout his career. In 1939 he told another state archivist that the *News and Courier* and *The State* had “published a great many historical articles by me in the past thirty-five years which have conducd to the popularity of this department.” He went on to note that he had usually been paid “at the space rates which help me to live and finance other historical work for which I have not had sufficient appropriations from the State.”

---

66 Lesser, *South Carolina Begins*, p. 185. The journals for Sept. 1735-July 17, 1736 are also unpublished. See also the guides to the Commons House journals by Charles E. Lee and Ruth S. Green in volume 68 (1967) of *The South Carolina Historical Magazine*.
67 Although Salley titled both the 1671-1680 and the 1692 volumes *Journal of the Grand Council*, the latter is really a journal of the Proprietors’ Council. An 1850s transcript of council proceedings Aug. 12-Oct. 3, 1717, also survives. See Lesser, *South Carolina Begins*, p. 173 and note 102.
68 The *Warrants for Lands* (1910-1915) were subsequently reprinted in one volume with a new introduction and a new consolidated index in A.S. Salley, Jr., and R. Nicholas Olsberg, editors, *Warrants for Lands in South Carolina, 1672-1711* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1973). See Lesser, *South Carolina Begins*, pp. 420-22, for discussion of *Records of the Secretary of the Province and the Register of the Province of South Carolina, 1671-1675*, and the documents on two leaves from the volume that were found after Salley published it. Salley’s publications for the commission can be found in the bibliography of the department’s publications in the appendix; for independent publications see the bibliography compiled by Mary C. Simms Oliphant cited in note 227.
69 Salley to William D. McCain, Sept. 18, 1939, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.
In 1909 J. Franklin Jameson, managing editor of the American Historical Review and entrepreneur of scientific history, recognized Salley as “specially competent” to edit “the chief original narratives respecting the Carolinas in their earliest period.” Jameson told Salley that he “would rather have you than anyone else” for the Carolina volume in the American Historical Association’s Original Narratives of Early American History series. For supplying introductions and annotations for texts chosen by Jameson, Salley would receive “an honorarium of one hundred dollars.”

Narratives of Early Carolina, 1650-1708, appeared in 1911 and has twice been reprinted.

For the first ten years Salley planned his work in close conjunction with Henry A.M. Smith. The secretary of state was ex-officio chairman of the commission, but Smith took the lead in its affairs and wrote its reports from the beginning in 1905 through 1915. Former mayor Courtenay was titular vice-chairman at first until he resigned from the commission because of age. Smith officially became vice-chairman in 1907 and at a special meeting on June 30, 1908, had his role confirmed. The commission named the vice-chairman and the secretary of state as an executive committee of the commission with the power “to take charge of the execution of its duties [and] to supervise and control all work of the Secretary.” Salley consulted, or at least informed, Smith on matters both large and small, but he was sensitive to criticism.

At its 1907 meeting the commission passed a resolution proposed by Fitz Hugh McMaster that “the Secretary devote all of his available time towards the preparation for publication of the records pertaining to lists of Revolutionary Soldiers from South Carolina.” Salley was deeply offended. He thought the resolution “virtually told me that I was not a competent judge of how the work should be done,” and “brought on a heart trouble that may be serious in its consequences.” Smith smoothed over the matter and broadened the goals in the printed annual report but candidly told Salley that he differed with him on several fronts. Smith thought “accumulation and the preservation of historical material . . . infinitely more valuable in the long run than its publication.” He believed the commission should publish only as much as was necessary “to keep us before the public eye.” Smith thought heroic efforts should go into getting records out of the State House basement, but Salley objected to the suggestion that the legislature be asked for additional help. Smith feared that Salley’s talk of the “added work” of teaching an assistant betrayed a “condition of mind” that all the work “can best be done by yourself.” Earlier that year Salley had complained of “nervous dispepsia,” and the effect of his work on his health would be a constant theme throughout the years.

---


72 Minutes of the Historical Commission, December 11, 1907, and June 30, 1908. In the last two years before the reorganization of the commission in 1915, Yates Snowden was elected vice-chairman on Smith’s nomination, but Smith in effect continued to serve as chairman himself.

73 Salley to Smith, Dec. 17, 1907, and Dec. 21, 1907, and Smith to Salley, Dec. 20, 1907, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. In the Dec. 21 letter Salley proposed taking on Sloan D. Watkins, who had been librarian at Furman and was then at the Library of Congress, as his assistant, but continued to hold that “an untrained man is worse than none.” Nothing came of the proposal. Although Salley in his Dec. 21 response said he agreed with Smith’s positions, there was a good deal of truth in Smith’s criticisms. The Correspondence of the Secretary contains a very large and revealing correspondence between Smith and Salley, 1905-1923. After 1915 the correspondence mostly relates to Smith’s research.

74 Salley to Smith, July 23, 1907, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.
Despite Smith’s view, documentary editing would continue to be a priority of the commission. In their report to the 1909 General Assembly the Historical Commission compared South Carolina’s “too scant” efforts at publication to North Carolina’s “some thirty-six volumes, averaging over one thousand pages each.” They asked for up to $5,000 for “printing of historical documents under a contract to be made with the State Printer,” but the commission’s appropriation for that purpose was only raised to $1,000 from $500 in 1912. In their report for 1910 to the 1911 General Assembly the commission said that they could not “too highly commend the faithful, assiduous and skilful services” of their secretary. His duties, however, had become “so much more onerous and the scope of his labor has so expanded” that there was an “imperative need” for an assistant. The commission also urged “a systematic plan” for printing “the early records of the State.”

The record of Salley’s documentary editions indicates a lack of long-range planning, especially in contrast to the carefully delineated goals of his successor J. Harold Easterby, but the size of the printing budget and the lack of assistance also help account for the myriad tiny volumes.

**Salley vs. Blease and a Reorganized Commission**

The commission’s request for an assistant met initial success in the 1911 General Assembly, but Governor Cole Blease vetoed the item. “I do not believe the clerk is necessary,” he wrote, “as the Secretary should do the work.” The House of Representatives voted to override the governor’s veto, but the Senate failed to provide the necessary two-thirds vote. The governor won this initial skirmish in what would become a major battle between Blease and Salley. Just as in Mississippi, where that state’s first archivist Dunbar Rowland would have to struggle to keep his department alive with the rise of populists like Theodore G. Bilbo, Salley represented the elitist or “Bourbon” powers that were under Blease’s attack.

Salley actively supported Blease’s opponents in the Democratic primaries for the governor’s office in both 1910 and 1912 and expressed his “candid opinion of him on many occasions.” As he put it in a 1911 letter to his Charleston friend Theodore D. Jervey, “an honest dispeptic is always preferable to a scoundrel and knave.” In 1912 he solicited a public statement of the “contest between the Governor and the Legislature” and, after Blease again won the Democratic primary, worked in the effort to prove “the recent Election frauds.”

As a result of their differences, Salley had to work hard
“to keep our freak governor from wiping out my department as a personal spite against me.”

As governor, Blease had the power to appoint members of the Historical Commission when their ten-year terms expired. Salley believed the governor wanted “to get those gentlemen on the Commission who will stick to me off and put on men who will remove me.” In October 1912 Blease asked the secretary of state for the dates on which the terms of “the present members of the Historical Commission” would expire. Blease mistakenly thought he might have the opportunity to replace Henry A.M. Smith, an epitome of the aristocratic South Carolinian that he despised, but Smith’s term lasted through 1918. Blease did not give up easily. Arguing from South Carolina’s dual office-holding prohibition, in December 1912 the governor appointed successors to both Smith and Joseph A. McCullough, a Greenville lawyer and staunch advocate of child labor legislation whose term on the commission was scheduled to last through 1920. President William Howard Taft had appointed Smith as a federal judge of the Eastern District of South Carolina in 1911, and McCullough had served several times as a special judge. Blease’s replacement for Smith, B. Franklin Kelley, a former state senator for Lee County, got an attorney general’s opinion that he was the “duly appointed and qualified successor of Judge Smith,” but neither Smith nor McCullough would give up their positions. At the 1913 annual meeting of the commission, Smith said he would dispute the matter with the attorney general to the Supreme Court.

Citing the commission’s defiance of his replacement appointments, Blease closed his lengthy opening message to the 1914 General Assembly with the request that the legislature “abolish this Historical Commission, in order to get rid of these men, and either create a new Commission, or have none.” “I am satisfied,” he wrote, “[that] the one we have is worthless, useless, and will prove some day to be more of a nuisance to people who desire to secure the true history of this State than of value.” The legislature ignored this request, but when the appropriations bill reached his desk, Blease vetoed both the entire section providing funds for the commission and each item in it separately. He told his supporters in the General Assembly that they would be “written in the history of this State as anarchists, as blackguards, as thieves in primary election matters, as favoring illiteracy in the State and as being opposed to honest government” if they

79 Salley to Capt. E.R. Clinkscales, March 12, 1913, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.
80 Salley to Joseph A. McCullough, Nov. 4, 1912, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.
81 Blease to R. M. McCown, Secretary of State, October 14, 1912, Miscellaneous Papers of Governor Coleman L. Blease, Series S532008, Box 1, S.C. Archives; Report of the Historical Commission . . . to the General Assembly . . . 1910, p.[3].
82 McCullough sketch, Snowden, History of South Carolina, Vol. IV, pp. 9-10; List of Commissions and Appointments, Series S213044, State and District Officers, 1898-1915, p. 110, S.C. Archives; Report of the Historical Commission . . . to the General Assembly . . . 1912, p. [3]. There was also a technical difficulty with the reappointment of McCullough to a full term; see Salley to McCullough, Nov. 1 and 4, 1912, and later letters, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.
83 Smith is in the Dictionary of American Biography. B. Franklin Kelley sketch, Bailey, Morgan, and Taylor, Biographical Directory of the South Carolina Senate, Vol. II, pp. 858-59; Thomas H. Peeples, Attorney General, August 27, 1913, to Hon. B. Frank Kelley, copy in Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. Salley’s terse minutes of the December 17 meeting say nothing of this matter, but Blease’s denunciation cited in the next note cites “a meeting” of that date for the defiance. See also the many letters concerning the fight with Blease in the Salley/Smith Correspondence, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.
voted to override his veto.\textsuperscript{85} Between the House and the Senate, overriding these vetoes required twelve separate two-thirds votes, but Salley had used his location in the State House well and won. He “got the support of twenty-five out of forty-five Bleasites voting, and not one single man of our faction failed me.” As he wrote another friend, “I had organized as no one else had.”\textsuperscript{86}

Oral tradition says that Salley, a small man, went to the YMCA to take judo lessons to defend himself during the height of Blease’s power. After his retirement, Salley told another tale that clearly reflected his view of Blease. In 1953 what seemed to be the lower part of the walking cane from the statue of George Washington on the State House steps was found. Salley scotched the excited belief that this was the portion of the statue broken off by Union troops in 1865. He had had a replacement “made and fitted into the grooves and socket of the original cane about 1908,” he wrote, but it, too, was broken off some years later. No doubt alluding to Blease, Salley reported that he had been told, “A politician much in the public eye at that time had been on a drunk and had pulled a pistol and fired at the statue and by a ‘near miss’ knocked out the cane.”\textsuperscript{87}

In 1912 Salley told a supporter, “Whether they stop my salary or not I am going to hold on to the office and accomplish as much as I can without funds.” In 1909-1910 he had built an elegant classical revival house with Doric columns on Laurens Street in Columbia. The house had a connecting breezeway to a smaller two-story house that he built two years earlier and now used for his private library of South Caroliniana.\textsuperscript{88} That library became so extensive that in 1942 the intellectual historian Richard Beale Davis touted it in his second article on “Source Materials for the Study of Southern Literary Culture.”\textsuperscript{89}

In 1918, after years of courtship and full dance cards, he married Harriet Gresham Milledge, a member of an eminent Georgia family. He later explained, “The only reason I postponed marriage so long was because I couldn’t convince a certain Charleston girl that I would make a suitable husband.” At the time of their marriage, Salley had just turned 47, and his bride was 36, the director of music for the Atlanta public schools. They had no children.\textsuperscript{90} As he had said at the beginning, he would build his legacy out of his historical calling.

As early as 1909 Salley wrote to a correspondent that he was “gradually losing my eyesight and impairing my general health in this work, and I am doing it because I love it and because I see a useful field to work and hear a call to duty.” He went on to report that he had “a father who is well enough

\textsuperscript{85} Ibid., pp. 1413-14.

\textsuperscript{86} Salley to Hon. Jos. A. McCullough, March 10, 1914, and Salley to Prof. M.L. Bonham, Jr., March 9, 1914, Correspondence of the Secretary. S.C. Archives. I am indebted to staff member Patrick McCawley for a number of citations on the battle with Blease.

\textsuperscript{87} The historian Lowry Ware, who had himself worked at the archives in the early 1950s, told staff member Robert Mackintosh the YMCA story about three decades ago. For George Washington’s cane, see The State (Columbia), Sept. 23, 1953, p. 10-B. I am indebted to retired staff member Marion Chandler for this citation.

\textsuperscript{88} Salley to Ben Hill Brown, Sept. 18, 1912, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives; Salley to August Kohn, Oct. 26, 1909, Folder 181, and March 3, 1910, contracts for completing the house at 901 Laurens Street, Folder 184, Salley Papers, Box II, Caroliniana Library; National Register Nomination for the University Neighborhood Historic District (2005), pp. 39-40 and 15, State Historic Preservation Office, South Carolina Dept. of Archives and History; nomination also available on the department’s website.


\textsuperscript{90} Salley sketch in History of South Carolina: Biographical Volume; Salley to Mrs. Smith, Jan. 13, 1949, South Carolina Historical Society; obituary of Mrs. Harriett M. Salley, age 95, Orangeburg Times-Democrat, Nov. 15, 1977, p. 2B. Mentions of courting, dance cards, and invitations to assemblies and balls are scattered through the first three boxes of the Salley Papers, Caroliniana Library.
off to give me a better business proposition at any time,” but he was dedicated to his mission. In seeking the support of the Edgefield delegation to the General Assembly in the battle with Blease in 1913, he declared that he would, if need be, “go on with the work at my own expense and at the sacrifice of some of my savings since I have been grown.” His political skills prevented that necessity, and he got to keep his salary, which had risen to $1,800 in 1914.91

Salley’s political troubles were not immediately over when Blease went out of office. He told North Carolina archivist R.D.W. Connor,

One half of my Commission was composed of Bleasites and they were out for my scalp. I didn’t do a thing but get the General Assembly to reorganize the Commission by composing it of the four professors of history in the four State Colleges, one member to be elected by the United Confederate Veterans and one by the South Carolina Historical Society.92

The act changing the membership on the Historical Commission met little opposition in the House and none in the Senate.93 Salley removed the commission from politics by making “the respective heads of the chairs of history” in the University of South Carolina, The Citadel, Clemson Agricultural and Mechanical College, and Winthrop Normal and Industrial College the majority on the commission. The substance of this change has held with appropriate alterations to this day. When Salley later came under attack by history professors, he regretted the solution he devised in his 1915 victory.

The World War Memorial Building

The storage space problems that would plague the commission for many years began in 1913. The General Assembly had directed that the records of “Pitchfork Ben” Tillman’s defunct liquor control agency, the State Dispensary, be turned over to the Historical Commission. Salley, who had no space for them in the commission’s two rooms, had to resort to a room in the basement of the State House.94 Things got much worse at the beginning of 1915 when “a great mass of records from the governor’s office” was “tumbled” into another dirt-floored basement room. By 1922 Salley had gotten concrete floors for two basement storerooms and was hoping to get the same for the one where the governors’ records were stored. He feared “an explosion” in that room, which had no ventilation, if there were a fire. Still “all alone in the work of collecting, shelving, filing, indexing and printing the state’s records,” it had been impossible “to handle all of these papers and at the same time look into all of the matters that have to be handled daily by my office.” Even with the clerical help that


92 Salley to Connor, Jan. 2, 1913, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. Blease’s three appointees were William Apollos James, a Bishopville Farmers’ Alliance and Grange leader; Claud N. Sapp, a Lancaster County lawyer; and W.H. Windle of Fort Mill.


94 Report of the Historical Commission of South Carolina to the General Assembly of South Carolina at the Regular Session of 1914 (Columbia: Gonzales and Bryan, State Printers, 1913-1914), p. 5. These records were moved several more times before being processed by a graduate student in the mid-1990s. See Chapter 7, “Methodology,” in Rita Foster Wallace, “South Carolina State Dispensary,” (Masters thesis, University of South Carolina, 1996).
the commission had unsuccessfully requested for a decade, South Carolina would be “far behind nearly every state in the union in the matter of proper housing.”\textsuperscript{95} But Salley suggested a solution. In 1919 Governor Richard I. Manning had proposed the erection of a memorial building to honor the state’s soldiers and sailors in the World War. The legislature had instead created two memorial commissions to erect separate buildings, one at the University of South Carolina for white soldiers and sailors and the other for African Americans at the State Colored Normal and Industrial School at Orangeburg.\textsuperscript{96} In late 1922 Salley had a conversation with Governor Wilson G. Harvey, a Charleston banker and active member of the Sons of the American Revolution with whom he was on a first-name basis. Following up in writing, Salley suggested that the Columbia World War Memorial Building be used as the state’s archival repository.\textsuperscript{97}

Thirteen more years would pass before this suggestion came to fruition. The 1919 act provided that the state would contribute $100,000 to each memorial building once a “sufficient” amount had been raised from private, corporate, and municipal sources. The Orangeburg memorial was never built, and fund-raising for the Columbia building was extremely difficult. At the end of 1921 after $23,236 was raised, that fund drive was suspended when the expenses of fund-raising threatened to equal the amount raised. During the Depression an additional $10,000 for the Columbia building deposited in local banks was lost when those banks failed. Originally the completed building was to be placed in the custody of the University of South Carolina. About 1925 Salley persuaded the commission for the Columbia building to agree that custody of their building when completed be given instead to the Historical Commission. Salley then worked with Richland County Senator James Henry Hammond, other members of the legislature, and the American Legion to get the 1919 joint resolution amended. In the negotiations Salley agreed to the addition of a representative of the American Legion on the Historical Commission and three such American Legion members on the Memorial Commission. The legislature added the American Legion member to the Historical Commission in 1930 and amended the authorization for the Columbia memorial in 1931.\textsuperscript{98}

Salley also raised money for the building. He was secretary of the commission to erect a statue of Wade Hampton in Statuary Hall in the United States Capitol. In 1929 he obtained the $502.80 left over from that effort for the memorial building. Earlier that same year the legislature passed a concurrent resolution authorizing Salley to sell a receipt signed by Thomas Lynch, Jr., and “turn over the proceeds of such sale to the Treasurer of the World War Memorial Commission.”\textsuperscript{99} Lynch’s signature is the second rarest of signers of the

\textsuperscript{95} Salley to Governor Wilson G. Harvey, Dec. 20, 1922, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.
\textsuperscript{96} Joint Resolution No. 313, \textit{Statutes at Large}, 31:637-39.
\textsuperscript{97} Salley to Governor Harvey, Dec. 20, 1922, and earlier letters to Harvey in the same folder; Wilson Godfrey Harvey sketch in Bailey, Morgan, and Taylor, \textit{Biographical Directory of the South Carolina Senate}, Vol. I, pp. 693-95. For this section on the World War Memorial Building, I am greatly indebted to staff member Steven D. Tuttle for a copy of his 1988 Southeast Archives and Records Conference paper on this topic and for the use of his research notes.
\textsuperscript{98} A.S. Salley, “World War Memorial Building Shelters Archives,” \textit{The State} (Columbia), Sesquicentennial Edition, March 21, 1936, pp. 3-6; Act No. 750, \textit{Statutes at Large}, 36:1271-72 (addition to Historical Commission); Act No. 560, \textit{Statutes at Large}, 37:1067-69 (amendment of World War Memorial joint resolution). The Memorial Commission minutes were already missing in 1936 when Salley wrote his article, causing him to use the “about 1925” date.
\textsuperscript{99} Salley, “World War Memorial Building”; \textit{Journal of the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, Being the Regular Session Beginning Tuesday, January 8, 1929} (Columbia: Gonzales and Bryan, State Printers, 1929), pp. 357, 412. It was Senator Hammond who again introduced the resolution.
Declaration of Independence. The document, cut from a volume of receipts to the Commons House of Assembly, received a good bit of national publicity and brought $9,500 at an April 25, 1929, auction at the Anderson Galleries in New York. Salley obtained authority from the 1934 General Assembly to sell cancelled stamps, making a small sum for the memorial fund in that year and the next. In 1938 Salley obtained a joint resolution authorizing the sale of a further Lynch receipt from the same volume to purchase equipment for the building. In the midst of the Depression, the second autograph sold for only $3,500. Salley told his successor at the South Carolina Historical Society, “I wouldn’t sell at all but I can’t get the money otherwise to take care of the millions of valuable papers which we have here and which I hope to make available to students of history.”

In a related effort, the Historical Commission briefly became custodian of the Woodrow Wilson boyhood home during these years. Built by Wilson’s parents in 1872, by 1928 the house was threatened with demolition. Local chapters of the American Legion and American Legion Auxiliary purchased the structure itself, but the land was owned by the commission for the neighboring Township Auditorium. In an effort led by Fitz Hugh McMaster, the 1929 legislature appropriated $17,500, and a matching sum was raised by grass root private and local government contributions. The state purchased both the home and the land and turned over its custody to the Historical Commission. The act provided for “fireproof additions or memorial buildings on said premises” to house relics of World War I, but Salley made sure that the state’s archival records were specifically excluded from the project. Salley was burdened with the paperwork of the building’s rehabilitation, but no additions were built. In 1932 the legislature transferred custody of the home to the State Department of the American Legion and American Legion Auxiliary. Unlike a number of her sister institutions, the state archives would not again be directly responsible for historic sites. By 1932 Salley believed the Memorial Building Commission had sufficient funds to ask the General Assembly for the promised $100,000 appropriation, but one member of that commission strongly opposed asking for the money in the midst of the Depression. Instead, Salley had to lobby with Governor Ibra Blackwood and the Memorial Commission to substitute a federal Public Works Administration grant. $33,200 from that source instead of $100,000

---

100 An image of the document from the auction catalog is now in its place on p. 278 of Series S165225. The receipts are for certificates issued to creditors of the public after the John Wilkes affair caused such a political crisis that the legislature could not pass an appropriations bill. The correspondence with Anderson Galleries is in Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. In 1952 the original document was, after changing hands twice, at St. John’s Seminary, Camarillo, California; Joseph E. Fields, “Lynch Autographs in South Carolina,” South Carolina Historical Magazine, 53 (1952): 129.

101 Salley, “World War Memorial Building”; Joint Resolution No. 1348, Statutes at Large, 40:2914-15; 1938 correspondence with Mitchell Kennerley of American Art Association, Anderson Galleries, Inc., New York, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. In 1952 this document was owned by the International Business Machines Corp. (Fields, “Lynch Autographs,” p. 129); it, too, is replaced with a facsimile from the dealer’s catalog on p. 279 of the manuscript.

102 Salley to Miss Mabel L. Webber, June 4, 1938, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.

103 Act No. 531, Statutes at Large, 36:961-63; Woodrow Wilson House File, 1929-1966 (bulk 1929-1930), Series S108184, S.C. Archives; Report of the Historical Commission of South Carolina to the General Assembly of South Carolina At the Regular Session of 1930 (Columbia: Printed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, 1930), pp. 5-7; Act No. 876, Statutes at Large, 37:1528-29. The insurance on the property continued to be in the Archives Department’s appropriated budget until at least the late 1950s.
from the legislature meant “a building about half the size of what we would have had and it is constructed of Indiana limestone when we might have had South Carolina granite.” Salley told the archivist of Alabama that he had hoped for space for a “museum feature” like Alabama had. As late as 1944 Salley still talked of trying to secure an annex “for a State Historical Museum,” but this function would never be attached to the state archives in South Carolina. Still, Salley believed he had acquired “space enough to care for the records I now have and for development for some years to come.”

His successor, J. Harold Easterby, disagreed. In 1951 he wrote that “its exterior is not unattractive, but, as a records repository, it is almost useless.”

University of South Carolina History Department Chairman Robert L. Meriwether obtained the university’s permission for construction of the building at the corner of Pendleton and Sumter Streets a short distance behind the university’s antebellum library building. Designed by the Columbia firm of Lafaye and Lafaye, the building had an upstairs shrine and ground floor quarters for the Historical Commission. The commission occupied the building in November 1935.

The 1931 act giving custody of the World War Memorial Building in Columbia to the Historical Commission provided that the Memorial Commission for that building would be terminated and the building transferred to the Historical Commission when it was “completed.” When Salley and the state’s records moved in in late 1935, it was only as “custodian for the memorial commission until the building is equipped as fully as available funds will permit.” The hope of obtaining the $100,000 authorized in 1919 did not die, and the Memorial Commission lingered on. In 1946 Salley reported that the Memorial Commission “contemplated” using $20,000 to air condition the building, and as late as 1952 Salley’s successor Easterby considered building an extension between the World War Memorial Building and the South Caroliniana Library. Finally on April 1, 1952, the attorney general issued an opinion that “the Commissioners for the Columbia building went out of office upon the completion of the building” and the $100,000 in state funds was no longer available.

Alexander Salley’s detailed published account of the construction of the World War Memorial Building makes clear that obtaining the building for the Historical Commission

---

104 Salley to Mrs. Marie Bankhead Owen, Jan. 29, 1938, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. Salley, “World War Memorial Building” gives the details of the $76,743 that had been raised. With the PWA money, the building contract was for $101,824. For the idea of adding a museum annex, see Salley to Ralph O. Tuten, Executive Secretary, Preparedness for Peace Commission, Columbia, S.C., Dec. 13, 1944, filed under the Preparedness Commission, Correspondence of Secretary, S.C. Archives.

105 J.H. Easterby, The Study of South Carolina History, Bulletin No. 13 of the Historical Commission of South Carolina (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by the State Commercial Printing Company, 1951), p. 21. This bulletin, a major review of the historiography and status of the history of South Carolina, was the dinner address at the 1950 annual meeting of the South Carolina Historical Association. It was reprinted from the 1950 Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association.

106 Salley, “World War Memorial Building.” Flinn Hall, which stood between the library and the building site and which had been built as faculty housing for Prof. John LeConte in 1860, had to be moved back behind the new building when the site was found to be too small.

107 Act No. 560, Statutes at Large, 37:1067-69; Salley to Basil Stockbridge, Secretary, War Veterans Memorial Building Commission, Atlanta, Georgia, March 30, 1946, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives; J.H. Easterby to Dr. Granville G.T. Prior, Chairman of the Historical Commission, Feb. 22, 1952; J. Harold Easterby draft building reports, 1952, citing attorney general’s opinion of April 1, 1952.
that Salley even consulted the commission about adding a representative of the American Legion to their number in 1930.

Matters changed dramatically in early 1934. Alester G. Holmes was then the Clemson Agricultural College representative on the commission and its chairman. Holmes asked Salley to look through their minutes to determine “whether the commission has ever authorized any one to represent it in any way or manner formally or informally before the War Memorial Commission or in connection with this proposed memorial.” When Salley’s reply only summarized his personal efforts, Holmes procured a signed resolution from other members of the commission and appointed Robert L. Meriwether to represent the commission with the World War Memorial Commission. Although Holmes told Salley that this action was “not intended to reflect upon you in any way,” it is clear that Salley’s unilateral actions with regard to the World War Memorial Building played a role in the highly critical view of Salley that surfaced among the members of his commission at this time.110

A.S. Salley: A Beleaguered But Proud Man

Alexander Salley was clearly overwhelmed in the nearly two decades that he worked alone. With no help in answering the routine reference queries that poured in, he could not devote the time that he wished to the arrangement, indexing, and publication work that would make the records more generally available. As he put it in his third report, “This last feature of my work I find the most trying, as most correspondents write as if they thought that the records were already so


109 (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by the State Company, 1922).

110 Holmes to Salley, Feb. 7 and March 8, 1934, Historical Commission folder, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.
perfectly indexed as to enable an official to give full information of any individual or event at any time connected with this State after a moment’s investigation.”

The eventual addition of a stenographer did not help. Salley’s annual reports in the late 1920s and early 1930s repeatedly made the complaint that his office was “so flooded with letters and callers seeking information that most of each day is taken up with correspondence and visitors.”

“I am now,” he added, “obliged to observe much later hours than the law requires of me; to work through holidays and the Saturday half-holidays; to almost entirely deny myself any recreation.”

An avid outdoorsman, Salley published a book about hunting. The workload did not completely preempt that avocation. The historian Philip M. Hamer, who became director of the National Historical Publications Commission, liked to tell the story of the time in the early 1920s when he arrived at the Historical Commission. He found an envelope on the door containing the note, “Gone hunting. Here is the key. Come in and make yourself at home. A. S. Salley.”

Salley’s personality exacerbated the workload problem. It was one thing to write a professional colleague in another state, “one half of my time is taken up with the vaporings of the abominable patriotic societies which are never patriotic. Idiotic would suit better. I can’t shake them off, can’t turn without having one of them with some new nonsense.”

Salley was deeply offended by this suggestion, and his heated replies say a good deal about the situation and his personality. “No human being,” he replied, “can make a proper report on South Carolina archives until some preliminary work...”


112 The identical wording was used was used in the reports to the 1929 through 1932 legislatures. The Happy Hunting Ground; Personal Experiences in the Low-Country of South Carolina (Columbia, S.C.: The State Company, 1926); Archives News,’ South Carolina Historical Magazine 68 (1967): 266 and Hamer obituary, ibid. 72 (1971): 238.

113 Salley to Herman V. Ames, Chairman of the Public Archives Commission of the American Historical Association, May 10, 1911, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.

114 Edith M. DeLorme, Recording Secretary, D.A.R., Feb. 23, 1909, to R.M. McCown, Secretary of State and Chairman, Historical Commission, with resolution, extracts from letters from Salley, and McCown’s Jan. 3, 1910, reply on behalf of the commission after their Dec. 8, 1909 meeting, and June 1906 correspondence with M.C. Butler, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. I am indebted to staff member Patrick McCawley for references in this section.
has been accomplished. There is not another living soul in this State who has anything like the grasp of the situation that I have.” Refusing to work in tandem with Snowden, Salley said he would resign from his role in the Public Archives Commission if Snowden were given the task. It would be “some years to come” before Salley himself could prepare the report. Ames was “surprised by the tone” of Salley’s letter and tried to calm him down. In response, Salley was frank in his evaluation of Snowden:

He is one of those charming men who can entertain the boys at the club with good stories, read and superficially digest thousands of interesting historical facts and entertain the uninformed with inaccurate recitals of them until they think him a great historical scholar, but when it comes to doing any real work he is the last man in historical circles in South Carolina that anybody wants to associate with in work. The other man will do all of the work. He is a bohemian.

Nonetheless, despite having “to waste much time each day bothering with things that are not historically worth while,” Salley hoped to have “a full report on the records of this State” ready the next year (1913) when the American Historical Association would meet in South Carolina.116

Salley had been instrumental in procuring the South Carolina venue for the meeting. In May 1911 he had proposed that the South Carolina Historical Society invite the association to meet in Charleston in 1912. Two members had thought the society “too poor to entertain such a great body,” but Salley was sure the Chamber of Commerce, city council, and “other commercial bodies” would pitch in. But arrangements became confused due to what even Salley was willing to call “the slowness and unbusinesslike methods of some of our people down this way.” Late in 1911 University of South Carolina President Samuel Chiles Mitchell, himself a historian with a University of Chicago Ph.D., ran into Salley on the street. Thinking the Charleston invitation dead, they decided to invite the association to Columbia in 1913 instead. Salley’s friend Waldo Gifford Leland, secretary of the American Historical Association, was put in an embarrassing situation with invitations from both cities. In the end the problem was resolved by meeting in both places at the end of 1913.117

Seventy-six of the some 200 gentlemen who attended the two days of sessions in Charleston arrived on a special train from New York. Early on the morning of December 31, another special train brought the members and some 50 of their wives to Columbia for the final day’s meeting at the Jefferson Hotel. The Chamber of Commerce gave them a luncheon, and, at the end of the sessions, the Columbia Automobile Club took them for a tour of the city and its suburbs. Solon J. Buck, who was about to become director of the Minnesota Historical Society and would eventually be the second archivist of the United States, gave the address at the fifth annual Conference of Archivists that afternoon. Buck argued that centralization at state capitals was “the most feasible method of insuring the preservation of noncurrent local archives.” Salley joined the archivists of North Carolina, Alabama, and Mississippi in responding to the address. Like his

115 Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1897 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1989), pp. 442-49; Ames to Salley, Nov. 15, 1906, Salley to Ames, Nov. 17, 1906, and Ames to Salley, Jan. 3, 1912, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. Wilberforce Eames shared credit for the list of journals, but his role is unclear.

116 Salley to Ames, Jan. 10 and 17, 1912 and Ames to Salley, Jan. 12, 1912, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.

co-worker from North Carolina R.D.W. Connor, Salley did not support the centralization of local records. Their nature, Salley said, was such that the student would not “derive much advantage from them.” Still, Salley thought he should visit “a number of county seats” in his still-projected but never-completed report on South Carolina government records. Salley sympathized with county officers, very few of whom “can give an intelligent answer as to the history of county records.” “We should hardly blame them,” Salley added. “What with the D.A.R. and the pesky ancestor hunter asking stupid questions it is enough to sour them on mankind. My own disposition suffers thereby.”

Salley chaired the Columbia Chamber of Commerce committee that prepared a pamphlet on the city for the American Historical Association meeting. His status in the historical community at the time is further indicated by his response to a reference query from the architectural historian Fiske Kimball. Prof. Ulrich B. Phillips, then the leading historian of slavery, had referred Kimball, who was interested in Columbia’s first State House, to Salley. Salley responded that “if my friend Phillips had been ‘on the job’, as he himself would doubtless put it,” he would have referred Kimball to Salley’s contribution on that topic in the convention booklet. In 1914 the American Antiquarian Society honored Salley with election to its membership.

Earlier, in his only appearance in the American Historical Review, Salley had combated the so-called Mecklenberg Declaration of Independence of 1775. Salley was widely known for his campaigns against myths and errors. In a typical comment, he told a Winthrop College professor, “If you see anything in an encyclopaedia it is pretty apt to be wrong.” In 1909 a satiric poem in the Charleston News and Courier entitled “The Doom of Art” made fun of his propensity. The artist who wasn’t there when Sargent Jasper raised the flag at Fort Moultrie or did not with his own eyes see Rebecca Motte fire her own house was “doomed by Mr. Salley.” The poem went on:

Mere fancy scenes. Suppress them, please; They’ve heard from Mr. Salley.

Salley thought the noted Charleston author John Bennett had written the poem and sent him an insulting postcard. Bennett then asked

---


119 Salley to Ames, Jan. 17, 1912, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. In 1934 the Duke University historian R.H. Woody finally prepared a lengthy report on South Carolina’s government records for the American Historical Association, but it was not published (in The American Archivist) until 1939. With the move to the World War Memorial Building and the work of the Historical Records Survey, his 1934 effort was outdated and had to be abridged and modified. It contains good, documented, information on the history of the records. See the correspondence between Woody and Anne King Gregorie, March 13-May 8, 1939, Out of State Correspondence, 1936-1939, Correspondence . . . of the Historical Records Survey. R.H. Woody, “The Public Records of South Carolina,” The American Archivist 2 (1939): 244-63.

120 Kimball to Salley, Feb. 13, 1915, and Salley to Kimball, Feb. 17, 1915, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives; Columbia, South Carolina: Chronicles and Comments, 1786-1913 (Columbia: Columbia Chamber of Commerce, 1913).


123 Salley to Miss Grace Dell James, Winthrop College, May 24, 1906, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.
his friend Yates Snowden to intervene. Snowden himself was then barely speaking to Salley but hand delivered a letter to smooth over the affair. In the course of the correspondence, Snowden reported that Salley’s former advocate Fitz Hugh McMaster had twitted Salley in the Columbia Record about myths. When McMaster passed Salley in the State House, Salley used “a most insulting epithet.” McMaster threw down his documents and, but for the interference of a friend, would have hit him. Snowden thought Salley “could fill a very useful role, but for his epigrams and stupendous self-conceit.”

Playful references like “Alexander the Great Salley Jr,” “you-like the Pope and Aleck Salley-are infallible,” “sheer terror of Alex Salley’s white-hot scornful pen,” “almost as proud as Aleck Salley,” and “Salley-like, I can find a wrong date” spattered the correspondence between Bennett and Snowden over the years.125

Alexander Salley’s personality sparked reactions like these, but they also grew out of the fact that for many years he was the authority on any number of questions about the history of his native state. In an appendix to his third annual report, he assembled evidence that Andrew Jackson was born in South Carolina, not North Carolina. Salley did not shrink from perennial controversies in his attempts to answer oft-asked questions. In 1915 he started a series of “small historical bulletins for free distribution” which he hoped would save time in dealing with “popular subjects.”126 The first bulletin briefly recounted the history of the premier artifact in the hands of the commission, the Andrew Jackson vase. A splendid piece of presentation silver given to Jackson by the “Ladies of South Carolina” after the battle of New Orleans, the vase had ended up with the secretary of state and was transferred to the commission at its founding. Repaired and displayed in the commission office in the State House in a specially built case, the vase prompted questions that were easily answered by the tiny booklet.127

Salley published a dozen bulletins during his tenure on such subjects as the state flag, the 1756 silver mace of the Commons House of Assembly, The Introduction of Rice Culture into South Carolina, the state’s delegates to Continental Congress and signers of the Declaration of Independence, and The Boundary Line Between North and South Carolina. True to form, Salley’s Bulletin No. 8, The Origin of Carolina, railed against the myth that Carolina was named for the French King Charles IX. His President Washington’s Tour Through South Carolina in 1791 was prompted by “so much misinformation” and “numerous errors” in a recent publication on the southern tour and in the edited versions of Washington’s diaries. In an annual report, he proudly noted that his bulletin on Parris Island had resulted in the United States government correcting the spelling of the marine training station and post office there.128

125 Ibid., pp. 38, 156, 186, and 264.
128 All of the bulletins are listed in the bibliography of the agency’s publications at the end of this history. In his report to the 1918 General Assembly, Salley reported that he printed 1,000 copies of Bulletin No. 3 at a cost of $28.00. For the quotes, see p. 5 of Bulletin No. 12. For Parris Island, Report of the Historical Commission . . . to the General Assembly . . . 1920, p. 5.
Most of the bulletins were heavily documented and larded with extensive quotes from primary sources. Three other booklets on the state seal, the State Houses, and the Lords Proprietors were not part of the bulletin series but filled a similar purpose. A number of these booklets were for many years the standard sources on their subjects. In 1951 Salley’s successor, J. Harold Easterby, added a thirteenth bulletin that provided a thorough overview of the historiography and research repositories of the state, but the series was then discontinued. Easterby reprinted ten of Salley’s free bulletins and booklets during the 1950s. More recent publications, including substantial illustrated booklets issued by the department in the 1990s, have long since superceded most of them.

The 1924 General Assembly at long last provided $1,800 for the salary of an “Assistant Secretary.” Salley, whose own salary was now $3,000, hired Miss Harriet J. Clarkson. She began work on April 1, 1924, then the beginning of the fiscal year. Clarkson, the unmarried daughter of a prominent Columbia family, had earlier worked as a secretary in a bank and in another state office. With the more appropriate title of “stenographer,” Miss Clarkson would stay on for twenty-three years. Two women who would be the first to receive the Ph.D. in history from the University of South Carolina arrived in Columbia in 1925. In 1929 Salley wanted to hire one of them as his potential successor, but, in one of the near misses of history, it was not to be.

Leah Townsend and her close friend Anne King Gregorie would become protégées of the chairman of the University of South Carolina History Department, Robert L. Meriwether. In their mid-to-late thirties when they arrived in Columbia to pursue masters degrees, both women sometimes stayed in the Meriwether household. Meriwether’s wife, Margaret Babcock Meriwether, called them “the Twins.” Both went off to the University of Wisconsin after earning their masters degrees in 1926. Both worked on the Draper manuscripts while studying there before returning to South Carolina to earn their Ph.D.s under Meriwether in 1929.

In the late summer of 1929, Leah Townsend, whom Margaret Meriwether now called “our adored teeny Prof,” began to take and transcribe shorthand at the Historical Commission on a temporary basis in place of Miss Clarkson.

Alexander Salley told Robert Meriwether that Townsend was “the person” to succeed himself as secretary. Salley wanted to keep Townsend on but

---

129 A.S. Salley, Jr., The Seal of the State of South Carolina (Columbia: Published by The State Company, [1906]); A.S. Salley, The State Houses of South Carolina, 1751-1936 (Columbia: Printed for the Joint Committee on Printing, 1936); A.S. Salley, The Lords Proprietors of Carolina (Columbia: Printed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, General Assembly of South Carolina, 1944). In the Report of the Historical Commission of South Carolina to the General Assembly of South Carolina at the Regular Session of 1937 (Columbia: Printed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, General Assembly of South Carolina, [1937]), p. 5, Salley reported that the General Assembly printed 25,000 copies of the State Houses booklet.

130 Report of the Historical Commission of South Carolina to the General Assembly of South Carolina At the Regular Session of 1925 (Columbia: Printed under the Direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, [1925]), p. 4.

131 James E. Hunter, Jr., and Inez Watson, editors, 1947 Legislative Manual (Columbia: Printed for the House of Representatives by The State Commercial Printing Co., 1947), p. 259. Research notes on the members of the Social Survey Club of Columbia, of which Miss Clarkson was a member, by Martha Stroup, wife of the director of the Department of Archives and History. Clarkson’s successor, Mary Belle Crawford, appears in the 1948 Legislative Manual.

could not bring himself to let Miss Clarkson, who had injured her hand, go. A maneuver to get an adequate additional salary to hire Townsend failed. Meriwether’s wife reported that “Alex is actually exciting his lazy self about getting her back in his office” and expressed surprise at this action from “the little shrimp.” The maneuver involved getting an equal salary for a caretaker for the Woodrow Wilson House, then in the commission’s custody, and switching Miss Clarkson into that position. The legislature reduced the Wilson House salary figure from $1,800 to $1,000. When Meriwether, at Salley’s request, asked Townsend if she would “start at” the lower figure, Townsend said “very positively no.” Faced with the Great Depression and the attitudes toward women of the time, neither Townsend nor Gregorie would ever get a permanent collegiate position. After a stint at a Pan-American Conference at the University of Havana, Townsend became a lawyer in her native Florence. Gregorie will reappear in this story at the head of the Historical Records Survey in South Carolina.134

From 1924 until 1936 Salley had only the assistance of Miss Clarkson. When a third staff member finally joined the commission on July 1, 1936, he was a 37-year-old self-trained historian whose formal education had gone no further than the Wofford College Fitting School. Francis Marion Hutson, as he himself liked to point out, was descended from or related to practically every South Carolina historical figure. After a decade in the hardware business, Hutson had been the principal researcher and author of a history of his native Prince William’s Parish and its plantations. Alexander Salley contributed a chapter and an introduction to the book and got to know Hutson.135 Salley was 65 years old when he hired Hutson. Seven years before that he had already struck a researcher as a “very fine old gentleman.”136 With no college-educated historian on his staff, Salley would labor on for thirteen more years before he was finally forced to retire.

**Early Skirmishes in a Historical Battle**

Alexander Salley’s relationship with his commission changed at the December 13, 1930, annual meeting. At that meeting Robert L. Meriwether of the University of South Carolina became chairman in place of the aged Washington Augustus Clark, and Alester G. Holmes of Clemson College became vice-chairman. It was these two men to whom Salley referred when in 1939 he reported “trouble with two members of the Commission under which I work.” “There is always someone,” Salley continued, “that believes

---

133 Leah Townsend, letter postmarked Aug. 2, 1929, and postcard postmarked Sept. 29, 1929, to her sister Helen Zeigler, Leah Townsend Papers, South Caroliniana Library. The Margaret Meriwether quote is in her letter postmarked March 1930, to Deda [Leah Townsend], ibid. In the August 2 letter Townsend reassured her sister “there is really nothing whatever but three or four letters a day to do in this office, so you need not fear for my health.”

134 Margaret B. Meriwether to Anne King Gregorie, Dec. 6, 1929, and Robert L. Meriwether to Gregorie, Feb. 15, 1930, Anne King Gregorie Papers, South Carolina Historical Society; copy of letter from Gregorie to Margaret Meriwether, Feb. 16, 1930, sent to Helen Zeigler, and William C. Hall, former placement officer at the University of South Carolina, to Townsend, March 27, 1930, Townsend Papers, Caroliniana Library.


136 J.T. Dorris to “The Archivist For South Carolina,” August 8, 1940, recalling a visit in the summer of 1929, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.
that he can do a little bit better than anybody else."\(^{137}\)

Meriwether had replaced Yates Snowden as chairman of the university history department in 1929. His work for the university acquired a twin focus in 1931 when the university president appointed him chairman of a committee to strengthen the library's holdings of South Caroliniana. The university's South Carolina special collections had their origins with Snowden in 1906, but grew dramatically under Meriwether's leadership. Snowden had initially recognized the clear distinction between the public records "being collected and classified by Mr. A.S. Salley, Jr." and the types of materials that the university sought. Public records, Snowden wrote, are "not available for a college collection, for they are the inalienable property of the State." Meriwether also saw the distinction, but as the South Caroliniana collection grew and his attempt to reform the Historical Commission became a personal fight with Salley, the division of responsibility was not always clear. By the end of the battle Salley erroneously believed that Meriwether aimed to take all the state's records "from this building to the South Caroliniana rooms." This, he thought, would mean the "destruction" of his life's work.\(^{138}\)

Nearly two decades younger than Salley, Meriwether was a Wofford College graduate. When Meriwether's Columbia University Ph.D. dissertation was at long last published in 1940, his preface contained profuse thanks to Salley in aiding his research,\(^{139}\) but by then Meriwether's challenge to Salley's leadership was a decade old. Faced with the United Confederate Veterans' demand for faster publication of rosters, at the 1930 meeting the commission adopted a resolution calling for a three-man committee to prepare "general recommendations as to the entire procedure of the Commission." Meriwether appointed Holmes, Winthrop College Professor Warren D. Keith, and himself to the committee.\(^{140}\)

The 1931 report was sharply critical of the commission's accomplishments. After a nod to Salley's "splendid work" in publishing records and answering queries, the committee found that Salley was "almost crippled" by inadequate space and staff. The pace and mode of publication received much of the committee's attention. The eight thousand pages Salley had printed since 1906 were "too small a fraction of the total." He had only been able to keep up his pace in recent years by printing indexed lithographic facsimiles, but the report ordered that be stopped except for...
original records. The transcripts of records in the British Public Record Office that Salley had begun to print in 1928 were “unchecked” copies and “not entirely dependable for historical research.”141 The report considered most of Salley’s volumes “too small for effective use” and proposed volumes “of not less than five hundred pages” in sets with uniform bindings. It urged that Salley “turn over all possible routine matters” to Miss Clarkson and that the commission hire, “as soon as financial conditions justify it,” an additional staff member “trained in historical research.”

The report found the staff of two “totally inadequate” and the commission’s storage of records “in the cellar . . . a disgrace to the state.” Adopted at the 1931 annual meeting, the report was printed as the commission’s report to the General Assembly. The report authorized a three-member executive committee “empowered, in consultation with the Secretary, to carry out the decisions of the Commission” and to draw up a “publication program.” Salley and Miss Clarkson were “asked to arrange their schedules so that the office will be open continuously from nine to five.” Although adopted and printed, the report met resistance on many points from the commission’s easily offended secretary. It was but the first skirmish in what would become a long-standing battle between Meriwether and other members of the commission and Alexander Salley.

The executive committee, also composed of professors Meriwether, Holmes, and Keith, for several years actively tried to invigorate and alter the commission’s work. It agreed to a temporary postponement in 1932 of the required 500-page volumes due to “the emergency of these times.”142 The committee’s 1933 report cited “the fact that many of the historical records of South Carolina are not classified nor properly cared for” and “the very slow progress in editing these records.” It proposed transfer of records to the university library until “proper and permanent provision is made for them by the State.” Leaving the “routine work” to Salley and Miss Clarkson, the executive committee itself hoped to “employ persons properly trained or prepared for such work to classify, copy or edit these papers.” The full commission approved the 1933 executive committee report, but a change in the fiscal year and therefore the deadlines for annual reports meant that it was not printed. Nothing came of the plan to remove functions to the university, perhaps because it was dependent on “such funds as may be available,” and the availability of space at the university’s library.143

The battle escalated in 1934. Without consulting the commission, Salley attempted to add three additional ex-officio positions to its membership. His motives for adding the vice-chairman, secretary, and treasurer of the World War Memorial Commission to the Historical Commission may well have been related to the building that soon would be under construction. But Salley clearly thought Meriwether and Holmes were trying to “rob” him of his accomplishments. The additional ex-officio members would have

141 In 1930 the historian David Duncan Wallace had discovered a “very important” error in the transcripts and informed both Salley and Meriwether. The 1730 township scheme in the transcripts was endorsed as “for Col Johnson,” but the Public Record Office informed Wallace that the original was endorsed as “from” Robert Johnson. Wallace to Salley, with copy to Meriwether, March 26, 1930, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.

142 Undated note from Meriwether to Salley in a revealing folder kept by Salley of all the correspondence, reports, etc. concerning the disputes with the commission and its executive committee in 1934 and 1935. Clearly kept separately from Miss Clarkson’s main alphabetical files, it had been filed under Alester G. Holmes sometime long after Salley’s day and is now filed under Historical Commission, Records of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.

143 1933 executive committee report inserted between the minutes of the Sept. 30, 1933, and May 19, 1934, meetings, Minutes of the Historical Commission, pp. 129-131. Salley was to give as much time “as may be available” to continued editing but under the direction of the executive committee.
diluted the power of his academic opponents on the commission. His unilateral action in going to the legislature raised the stakes. The bill adding the members to the commission quickly passed the House of Representatives; by early March the bill was in the Senate Judiciary Committee.\(^{144}\)

In order that 500-page volumes could be printed, Meriwether came up with the idea of diverting printing appropriations to hiring a graduate student part time to prepare copy. On the afternoon of May 3, 1934, he went to the State House to discuss the matter with Salley before presenting it to the executive committee. The meeting turned into a confrontation, apparently initiated by Salley, over the World War Memorial Building and the addition of members to the commission. Salley claimed he was being “browbeaten,” and Meriwether resorted to written communications rather than face Salley in person. In years to come after Salley had moved into the World War Memorial Building, graduate assistants would carry messages across the few feet from the South Caroliniana Library so that the two men did not have to meet.\(^{145}\)

Merviether proposed hiring Carl L. Epting to prepare copy under the direction of the executive committee while Salley continued working on the copy from the 1703 Commons House journal. Epting had taught history at Columbia College and Wofford College since completing his masters degree and was now working on a Ph.D. The proposal went forward from the executive committee to the full commission, but Salley defeated Meriwether there on May 19, 1934. Salley presented a letter from the secretary of the Civil Contingent Fund Committee saying that the printing money could not legally be transferred for copying expenses and explained his procedures to obligate the appropriation until the 500 pages were printed. Salley and Meriwether sparred over the quantity of Salley’s publishing, but most of all Salley argued that hiring Epting would be “a reflection upon me personally.”\(^{146}\)

Professor Keith did not support Meriwether and Holmes at this critical juncture and was joined by Theodore D. Jervey (president of the South Carolina Historical Society) and Prof. Smith J. Williams of The Citadel. A second vote suspended the 500 page requirement and allowed Salley to proceed with publishing a small 1703 Commons House journal. After the meeting Keith wrote Salley that Meriwether was “pretty cut up with me about my not supporting the executive committee.” At the meeting Meriwether had nominated Salley for another year as secretary and later that day wrote to congratulate him on his victory. Meriwether assured Salley he did not want to “deprive you of your office,” but would “continue

\(^{144}\) The choice of the vice-chairman is explained by the fact that the governor was ex-officio chairman of the Memorial Commission. *Journal of the House of Representatives of the Second Session of the 80th General Assembly of the State of South Carolina* (Columbia: Printed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, 1934), pp. 887-88, 903, 917, 1010; *Journal of the Senate of the Second Session of the 80th General Assembly of the State of South Carolina* (Columbia: Printed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, 1934), p. 540. For “rob” see Mabel L. Webber, Secretary-Treasurer and Librarian, South Carolina Historical Society, to Salley, March 20, 1934, Box IV, Folder 369, Salley Papers. For the commission not being informed, see below.

\(^{145}\) Notes from Meriwether to Salley, May 3, 1935, Historical Commission folder, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. Recollections of Louise Pettus, who worked at the South Caroliniana Library in 1946-1947, as reported to the author in e-mails of August 18, 2005.

\(^{146}\) Meriwether, note transmitting draft executive committee report to Salley, May 13, 1934; draft report, Salley’s response; and supplementary executive committee report, Historical Commission folder, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. The reports and Salley’s response are also transcribed in Salley’s hand in the May 19, 1934, Minutes of the Historical Commission, pp. 131-39.
to express, frankly and vigorously, my dissent to your action, and inaction,—equally deplorable it seems to me.”

Illness had forced Prof. Holmes to miss this critical meeting even though he was then the commission’s chairman. In a letter to Salley afterwards he expressed his belief that Salley was “violating the law” when he “undertook last winter to change the complexion of the commission.” That issue rankled even though protests from members of the commission had killed the bill in the Senate Judiciary Committee. Salley did not rest with his victory at the 1934 commission meeting. On February 12, 1935, twenty-seven of his supporters in the House of Representatives introduced a bill “to abolish the Historical Commission and devolve the duties thereof on a State Historian.” Amended in the House and in the Senate Judiciary Committee, the bill reached the floor of the Senate, but on the motion of J. Strom Thurmond, then a state senator, the bill was recommitted to committee on March 7 and died. Meriwether reported to Anne King Gregorie that “others took the initiative” in opposing “Salley’s bill to abolish the Historical Commission” and that therefore Salley could not “point to me as his chief or only enemy in this affair.”

A special executive session meeting of the commission later that spring tried to promote “a more harmonious relationship between members of the commission and its Secretary.” Holmes and Meriwether again disclaimed any intent to “discredit and displace Mr. Salley.” A motion forbidding the secretary from making any “move to initiate, or influence, legislation in connection with the composition of the Historical Commission without first presenting the proposed action to the Historical Commission” passed with only one dissenting vote. With the commission divided, the battle with Salley then subsided for a decade. Meriwether and others began to get things done by working around Salley rather than confronting him.

Alexander Salley’s friend Theodore Jervey had cast the one dissenting vote. Jervey, of an old Charleston family, had once supported Ben Tillman but became wary of non-elite whites as well as of Blacks. A lawyer, chairman of the Charleston Democratic Club, and long-time city police recorder, Jervey used the new “scientific” history to defend his conservative views. In a 1905 novel and his 1925 book *The Slave Trade: Slavery and Color*, he went beyond segregation to argue for diffusion of Blacks throughout the country to dilute their proportion in the state’s population. Jervey believed that an intelligent white aristocracy should direct South Carolina’s future.

A man of his time, place, and class, Alexander Salley shared Jervey’s views. His father and grandfather had served the Confederacy. The

---

147 Minutes of May 19, 1934; Keith to Salley, undated 1934 letter, and Meriwether to Salley, May 19, 1934, Historical Commission folder, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.

148 Holmes to Salley, June 4, 1934, Historical Commission folder, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. Holmes’s letter speaks of being “put in the position of apparently opposing good men.”

149 *Journal of the House of Representatives of the First Session of the 81st General Assembly of the State of South Carolina* (Columbia: Printed under the Direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, [1935]), pp. 340, 353, 364, 392, 550-51, 564; *Journal of the Senate of the First Session of the 81st General Assembly of the State of South Carolina* (Columbia: Printed under the Direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, [1935]), pp. 225, 328, 349; Meriwether to Gregorie, March 19, [1935], Anne King Gregorie Papers.

150 Minutes of the Executive Session, June 29, 1935, Historical Commission folder, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. These minutes are not in the minute book. See also Meriwether’s historical account in a lengthy November 1947 memorandum to the commission, Robert L. Meriwether Historical Commission File, 1945–1949, South Caroliniana Library.

congressman for whom Salley briefly worked in Washington, William Elliott, was twice unseated by electoral challenges from Black Republicans. The second unseating sent Salley back to Charleston, scurrying for some time to find another job.152 To preserve “racial integrity” against miscegenation, Salley thought the South should do all in its “power to scatter the negroes to the uttermost parts of the world.” For Salley, the period 1861-1876 was “the War of Northern Aggression and the Reconstruction nightmare.”153 “The repeal of the fifteenth amendment,” he believed, “would prove one of the greatest blessings that could come to this country.”154

Jervey had become president of the South Carolina Historical Society in 1930 when Salley’s mentor Joseph W. Barnwell died. That same year Salley became the society’s first vice-president, and both men would continue to serve for a decade. Salley and his wife sometimes stayed with the Jerveys when they went to Charleston for Historical Society meetings. In the midst of the Depression the society was barely hanging on in one rented room in the Charleston Library Society’s building, but continued to publish its magazine to which Salley made frequent contributions.155

In the same year that Jervey and Salley became president and vice-president of the Historical Society, a group of college and secondary school history teachers organized the South Carolina Historical Association. J. Harold Easterby, then a history professor at the College of Charleston, was among these professionals. Research papers were read at the new association’s annual meetings and proceedings were published. As Easterby put it a quarter century later in an address at an American Historical Association meeting, the association was “undoubtedly” founded “in a spirit of protest against the Historical Society.” Jervey, he remembered, though it highly undignified to send invitations to prospective members.156 In 1940 when Jervey became too aged to continue to serve, Easterby was elected president of the Historical Society. A very busy man, he regretted having to accept. As he explained to Anne King Gregorie, “This seemed the only way of heading off Mr. Salley,” Salley angrily resigned from the society, blaming Meriwether for what he regarded as a tremendous affront. Jervey, whose second

---

152 His grandfather, Dr. Alexander Samuel Salley, served as a surgeon, and his father, Alexander McQueen Salley, a cadet at The Citadel, saw some state service. Salley sketch in History of South Carolina: Biographical Volume. Elliott sketch in Biographical Directory of the United States Congress (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1989); Maurine Christopher, America’s Black Congressmen (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1971), pp. 113-22. Salley sought the position of private secretary with Joseph H. Earle, who was elected a U.S. senator from South Carolina later in 1896; took a Civil Service exam for a job in the Custom House; sought a position with the Library of Congress; and inquired about positions in lawyers’ offices in Augusta, Georgia. Correspondence of August 1896-April 1897, Box 1, Salley Papers, Caroliniana Library.

153 Salley to R.A. Meares, Sept. 21, 1911, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. I cannot now find the source of the exact phrasing of the last quote, which I saw years ago, but similar phrases abound in the Salley correspondence.

154 Salley to Harry W. Jones, Mount Vernon, Iowa, Feb. 26, 1907, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. In the same letter Salley wrote, “Ninety-nine percent of the Negroes are incompetent for anything but the meanest manual labor and even at that they are generally inferior to the same class of white laborers,” and argued that the “greatest danger” was “race-amalagamation” and the resultant “inferior mongrels.” Mississippi’s first archivist held similar views; Galloway, “Archives, Power, and History: Dunbar Rowland and the Beginning of the State Archives of Mississippi,” pp. 89-92.

155 For the condition of the society and their friendship see Jervey’s letters to Salley, Box IV, Salley Papers. Officers lists are at the front of various volumes of South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine.
ten-year term as the society’s representative on the Historical Commission had not expired, continued to provide a vote or potential vote for Salley until the end of 1944 when he was 85.\footnote{157} In three of those years the commission did not even meet.

Rather than violate the commission’s prohibition on unilaterally trying to change its membership, Salley began to use his legislative contacts to render the commission powerless. His mechanism was provisos on the annual appropriations act. The appropriation act for fiscal year 1940/1941 removed the commission’s power to annually elect its secretary. Instead, Salley’s term of office was “fixed at six (6) years from the date of his last election, June 24, 1939.” He was also empowered “to select his assistants, subject to approval by the Commission.” Three years later the proviso was reworded to remove the commission’s approval on hiring. These provisos assured that Salley could not be forced to retire until 1945 when he would be 74, but as that year approached he again made use of the legislature. The appropriations act for fiscal year 1944/1945 lengthened his term to ten years from the 1939 election and provided that his successor had to be “confirmed by the Senate.”\footnote{158} This last extension would eventually hold in 1949 but not without further battles.

### Records Work in the 1930s and 1940s

Defeated in 1934 in his efforts to reform the Historical Commission, Robert L. Meriwether took a leadership role in records work independent of that body. He, along with Anne King Gregorie and J. Harold Easterby, took advantage of programs to find work for the unemployed during the Great Depression. Their ambitious initiatives to deal with the state’s historical records were in sharp contrast to Salley’s more limited efforts.

A November 1933 conference at the White House and a meeting ten days later at the South Carolina Governors’ Mansion led to a Daughters of the American Revolution and Civil Works Administration project to transcribe antebellum wills statewide.\footnote{159} Meriwether’s protégé Anne King Gregorie had been mending colonial deed

\footnote{156} For more on the association, see pp. 58 and 62. Easterby quotes from his apparently unpublished speech, “The Colonial Records of South Carolina: An Adventure in Editing and Publishing State Archives,” filed in Box 1 of Series S108163, Agencies, Commissions, and Organizations File, S.C. Archives. Easterby delivered the speech at the Society of American Archivists luncheon at the annual meeting of the American Historical Association in New York, Dec. 30, 1957. The speech also cites the dropping of the and Genealogical from the title of the society’s magazine as a favorable indication of the changed times. In his 1950 overview of the state of South Carolina history, Easterby noted that “the leaders in the new organization would have gladly suggested a union with the old, had they felt that the conservative men who were then directing the policies of the Society would have had the slightest interest in the plan”; \textit{Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association}, 1950, p. 65.

\footnote{157} For Jervey’s retirement as president of the society but continued membership on the commission see notes of meetings of Jan. 12, 1940, and Dec. 1, 1944, in \textit{South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine}, 41 (1940): ii, and 46 (1945): 57, and J.H. Easterby to Dr. Granville T. Prior, December 31, 1952, Archives Department File, Series S108076, Correspondence of the Director. From 1949 to 1965, when a new file scheme was implemented for the department, correspondence with the commission and other key material relating to the administration of the department were kept in a separate subset of the director’s correspondence that came to be called Archives Dept. File.” For Salley’s resignation, see Easterby to Salley, April 6, 1940, Salley Papers; I am indebted to Kathryn Graham’s seminar paper for this reference. The resignation was apparently temporary. For Jervey’s death notice see \textit{South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine}, 49 (1948): 66-67.

\footnote{158} \textit{ Statutes at Large}, 41:1979, 43:356, and 43:1464.

\footnote{159} Judith M. Brimelow and Wylma A. Wates, \textit{South Carolina Will Transcripts}, 1782-1868 (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1980), pamphlet accompanying Microcopy Number 9.
books in the Charleston County Register of Mesne Conveyance office on a volunteer basis and in early 1934 agreed to supervise relief workers in Charleston, which then retained many of the state’s colonial records. These workers went beyond repair by forceps, silk, and paste to transcription. Copies of the typed transcripts were provided to the Caroliniana Collection at the University of South Carolina. In April 1934 Meriwether and Easterby met with Gregorie to discuss ways of expanding the work statewide. By the fall of 1935 Gregorie was the supervisor of a Statewide Historical Project, sponsored by the university and the Works Progress Administration (WPA).  

Initially as supervisor of this statewide transcription project Gregorie was headquartered in the Fireproof Building in Charleston, but by late February 1936 she worked with her own typewriter brought from home at a table on the top floor of the stacks of the University of South Carolina library. When Meriwether, on behalf of the Caroliniana Committee of the University of South Carolina, applied for the South Carolina portion of the national Historical Records Survey, he named Gregorie as its state supervisor. Flora Belle Surles, whom Gregorie had met while teaching at the University of Alabama and who became her life-long companion, took over the earlier statewide transcription program.

Gregorie told Luther H. Evans, the National Supervisor of the Historical Records Survey, that he might well “wonder at the stupidity of anyone attempting this work” with the education level of the eligible relief workers, but she assured him that she had been making “the best of bad bargains” all her life.

The closely related survey and transcription programs eventually encompassed everything from federal, state, and local government records to church records, private manuscripts, tombstone inscriptions, early imprints, and works of art. Early on Gregorie informed the national office of the “peculiar problem” of the “state archives in the office of Mr. Salley, Secretary of the Historical Commission.” The records were “piled on the floor of the new World War Memorial Building.” Salley did not think “suitable persons” could be found on relief rolls and wanted a card catalog and “the papers tied and filed in packing boxes.” In her initial talks with Salley, Gregorie agreed with his terms and proposed hiring “his sister from Orangeburg to supervise the work.” The national office thought the negotiations with Salley “a signal victory,” but Gregorie would continue to find Salley obstructive rather than helpful. Salley’s sister declined the appointment and “several others . . . [Gregorie] approached seem to feel that they do not care to be thrown to the lions!”

---


161 Gregorie to Evans, Feb. 19, 1936, and March 2, 1936, Washington Correspondence, 1936, Folder 1, Correspondence, Reports, and Administrative Files of the Historical Records Survey, Series F602502, South Carolina Dept. of Archives and History. Working in the office of the Writers Project in a bank building on Main Street did not work out.


163 Gregorie to Evans, Feb. 19, 1936, Washington Correspondence, 1936, Folder 2, Correspondence . . . of the Historical Records Survey.

164 Gregorie to Evans, April 19, 1936, and Sargent B. Child, Field Supervisor, writing for Evans, to Gregorie, April 20, 1936, Washington Correspondence, 1936, Folder 2, Correspondence . . . of the Historical Records Survey. Child had been in South Carolina and had the opportunity for personal conversation with Gregorie about a week earlier.
possibility, a Citadel graduate with “an ancestry that Mr. Salley can find no fault with” failed to pan out long term. Eventually Gregorie hired Robert Woodward Barnwell, Jr., to supervise the work on state government records at the Historical Commission and in state offices and basements.

Barnwell, who had completed his course work for a Ph.D. in history at Duke University, took over the survey of state records September 1, 1936. The survey workers in the World War Memorial had begun with some 3,000 volumes that were cleaned, described, and “classified as to series.” Later workers were assigned the tasks of finding petitions to the General Assembly in the “junk pile” and rough sorting those loose records, first chronologically and then by office of origin. Gregorie and Barnwell were frustrated by the delays caused by Salley’s criticisms of their work, and the work with state records was further slowed when Barnwell resigned at the end of June 1938 to complete his dissertation. Later that year Carl Epting, whom Meriwether had earlier hoped to hire for editing work, was in charge of three workers in the Memorial Building, two working with the loose papers and one “acting as clerical helper to Mr. Epting in his research on the development of state offices.” Salley revealed his attitude toward the relief workers when he told a leading autograph dealer that he believed these “inexpertfilers” had stolen valuable items.

The “signal victory” of being allowed to work with the records in the World War Memorial Building did not ameliorate the general situation. Salley’s counterpart in North Carolina, Christopher C. Crittenden, was asked to prepare a paper on “Historical Agencies and Societies in the South” for the December 1938 annual meeting of the American Historical Association. Anne King Gregorie sent a “brutally frank” response to Crittendons request for information. Gregorie

---

165 Gregorie to Evans, May 2, 1936, Washington Correspondence, 1936, Folder 2.
167 Salley to Mary A. Benjamin, Director, Walter R. Benjamin Autographs, New York, Aug. 28, 1944, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.
thought that the University of South Carolina History Department was South Carolina’s “strongest point” and characterized her personal relations with Salley as “friendly.” The department, however,

was handicapped at every turn by the present ineffectiveness and open antagonism of the South Carolina Historical Commission, which legally holds the key position for historical activities in the state. Mr. A.S. Salley, secretary of the Commission, dominates the state legislature, the South Carolina Historical Society, and the Commission itself. Old, bitter, and incapable, he regards every attempt to improve conditions as a personal attack upon himself.

Gregorie sent blind copies of her response to both Meriwether and Luther Evans.168

Barnwell returned as supervisor of the state records survey in July 1940 but changed national policy threw a monkey wrench into the work. Barnwell and Gregorie were planning a single volume for all colonial and state offices, but in September the national office instructed that each office have a separate volume. Barnwell chose the secretary of state as the office “most desirable to be completed.” The national office also instructed that the statutes be scanned page-by-page for the history of offices. While workers did that, Barnwell concentrated on the early secretary’s records in both the War Memorial Building and the probate judge’s office in Charleston and on a much expanded historical essay on the secretary of state’s office. As the Historical Records Survey drew near to its premature close, “the inventory of state archives” was still “in a very incomplete condition.”169

The South Carolina Historical Records Survey included more than 130 workers at the peak of employment in late 1938. Most of them were totally unfamiliar with records work, and meeting the bureaucratic requirements of the relief program was a gargantuan task for Anne King Gregorie. Much of the work had to be repeatedly rechecked or even redone. Yet the survey did a remarkable amount of good records work. State government records, both in Salley’s custody and elsewhere in state offices, never had the highest priority. As Gregorie put it in a 1936 report, the “major objective of the Survey since it opened” was the survey of county government records.170

When the project was aborted in 1941, the only published results were excellent county inventories for fourteen of the state’s forty-six counties. But the unpublished research and inventory materials and the thousands of pages of typescripts from the related transcription program, some of which preserve information that does not now survive in the original format, are also a valuable legacy of an ambitious attempt to rescue the state’s records. Neighboring North Carolina, with more than twice as many counties, was the only state to publish a records survey for all of its counties.171

168 Gregorie to C.C. Crittendon, December 8, 1938. I am indebted to the files of retired staff member Wylma Wates for a photocopy of this correspondence, the original of which I have been unable to locate. I have filed the photocopy, marked as to its origin, in Washington Correspondence, 1938, Folder 4, Correspondence . . . of the Historical Records Survey.


170 Gregorie to Evans, Nov. 22, 1938, Washington Correspondence, 1938, Folder 4, Correspondence . . . of the Historical Records Survey (peak of 133); Copp, “South Carolina Historical Records Survey,” passim; quote in report of Sept. 15, 1936, Semi-monthly reports, 1936-1937.

171 About 75 cubic feet of records of the Historical Records Survey and the related transcription project are at the Department of Archives and History. Portions relating to non-governmental records are at the South Caroliniana Library. Ansley Herring Wegner, History for All the People: One Hundred Years of Public History in North Carolina (Raleigh: North Carolina Division of Cultural Resources, 2003), pp. 17-18.
The masses of records in county courthouses were also a concern of local officials, but from a different perspective. In April 1937 Luther Evans in Washington got wind of a bill in the South Carolina legislature that he described as a wholesale authorization for county clerks “to destroy old and useless records.” Evans urged Gregorie to “look into the matter at once.” In fact, an act giving a committee of Colleton County officials the power to dispose of that county’s records had already been signed into law, and other counties were seeking disposal powers.\(^{172}\)

This potential disaster had already spurred Meriwether into action. He and University of South Carolina President J. Rion McKissick consulted with Alexander Salley and convinced State Representative Calhoun Thomas to introduce a bill that authorized county officers to transfer records that were “out of date, obsolete and unnecessary in the conduct of and use in the business of said office” to the University of South Carolina. Meriwether wanted a provision authorizing destruction of those records rejected “as worthless” by the university, but Salley suggested that clause be left off. Meriwether feared a deluge of rubbish without the provision, but the act was signed into law without it on April 30, 1937.\(^{173}\) A mimeographed letter from President McKissick went out to each county official enclosing the new law. Meriwether felt “rather appalled” at the prospect of a flood of local records for which he had “neither money nor staff,” but felt compelled to come forward “to meet an emergency in which the Historical Commission was not interested.”\(^{174}\) Transfers were not as large as feared, and the law was rescinded after Salley retired. Both original local government records and WPA transcripts of them were subsequently transferred from the university to the Historical Commission and its successor the Archives Department.

Doing something to make the unpublished colonial and state records in Salley’s custody more widely accessible interested Gregorie more than “any heretofore suggested undertaking of the Survey,” but she faced “Mr. Salley’s undoubted refusal to cooperate.” In late 1938 Gregorie was “electrified at the thought of microfilm,” but the obstacles to filming the great series of colonial and early national records seemed almost insurmountable. Gregorie schemed about getting space for that work in the old University of South Carolina Library, next door to the World War Memorial, when the new library under construction was complete.\(^{175}\) In 1940 Robert L. Meriwether successfully campaigned to reserve the 1840 building as a separate repository for his growing South Caroliniana collection, but Gregorie’s dream of microfilm would eventually be fulfilled. A research project in Illinois initiated microfilm work in South Carolina.

The Illinois Historical Survey at the University of Illinois was a very different organization than Gregorie’s federally-funded depression relief project. Established in 1909, the Illinois Historical Survey gathered research materials for a documentary history of that state and for the *Centennial History of Illinois*. In 1940 the survey staff was working on the Anglo-French conflict, 1745-1763, and had already obtained

\(^{172}\) Evans to Gregorie, April 16, 1937, Washington Correspondence, 1937, Folder 2, Correspondence . . . of the Historical Records Survey, and related bill and act materials in the same folder; Copp, “South Carolina’s Historic Records Survey,” pp. 64-65.

\(^{173}\) Meriwether to McKissick, no date, J. Rion Mckissick Papers, 1936-1937, Box 3, South Caroliniana Library; *Statutes at Large*, 40:402-3. I am indebted to Kathryn Graham for the McKissick correspondence reference.

\(^{174}\) Gregorie to Evans, May 22, 1937, Washington Correspondence, 1937, folder 2, Correspondence . . . of the Historical Records Survey.

\(^{175}\) Gregorie to Evans, Oct. 17, 1938, Washington Correspondence, 1938, Folder 4, Correspondence . . . of the Historical Records Survey.
copies of materials in the Public Record Office and the British Museum. Charles W. Paape wrote Alexander Salley asking about the cost of microfilm of South Carolina’s already well-known “Indian Books.” In a curt reply, Salley noted that he had “no facilities for making microfilm” and that there were many other materials for Paape’s subject. In the summer of 1941 Paape journeyed to South Carolina and in six weeks time personally microfilmed the “Indian Books;” the letter book of the Committee to Correspond with the Colony’s Agent in Great Britain (Charles Garth); and all of the Commons House, Upper House, and Council journals that Salley had not already printed.176

William Sumner Jenkins, a professor of constitutional law at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, that same year initiated a national microfilming project for early state records in conjunction with the Library of Congress. Jenkins arranged to get copies of the Illinois filming. Just days after Pearl Harbor, Jenkins and his cameraman arrived in Columbia and brought the South Carolina legislative filming forward from the American Revolution to 1800.177 After a hiatus during the Second World War, more filming was done in the War Memorial Building, including manuscript legislative journals through 1832; the engrossed acts and the records of the register of the province of the Proprietary Period; the colonial treasury records; the ship registers, 1735-1765; and Governor John Drayton’s letter books. The project’s published microfilm collection, The Records of the States of the United States, made more than sixty microfilm rolls of records in the World War Memorial Building more widely available just as Alexander Salley retired. Totaling more than 1,800 rolls of film, the project continues to provide scholars remote access to some of the nation’s most important records.178

In 1942 when she headed up an effort to protect cultural resources from the dangers of the war, Anne King Gregorie thought microfilm the only answer for preserving the “historical records of national importance” around the state, but aside from the work that outsiders had already done, this would have to wait until the 1950s under Salley’s successor.179

Movement of the Historical Commission into the World War Memorial Building in late 1935 had at last provided more room for housing records, but staff to process them remained a major obstacle. Salley moved the records in Historical Commission custody from basement storerooms, the commission office, and the third floor of the State House but other than what the Historical Records Survey workers accomplished, little progress was made in arranging them. In 1938 the commission voted to ask the legislature

176 Information on the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign library website (www.library.uic.edu) accessed on March 14, 2007; Charles W. Paape to Salley, July 30, 1940, and Salley’s Aug., 2, 1940, response, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives; Anne King Gregorie to C.W. Paape, Feb. 19, 1942, and Paape’s Feb. 23 response, Box 19/3, Anne King Gregorie Papers, South Carolina Historical Society. The Illinois Historical Records Survey was a separate and different organization.


179 Gregorie to Robert N.S. Whitelaw, Chairman of the Committee on Conservation of Cultural Resources, Feb. 27, 1942, Box 19/3, Gregorie Papers.
to more than triple its appropriation by adding $25,000 for equipment and additional “filing clerks” to work on “the great mass of undigested books and papers in the custody of the Commission.”180 This request brought no immediate results, but a spectacular discovery of further records in the State House in 1940 led to a renewed effort to arrange the state’s records.

Early in 1940 Senator Edgar Brown happened to go to the stockroom of the Joint Committee on Printing. About twenty years earlier the secretary of state had deposited some documents there that he had never turned over to the Historical Commission. Among them Senator Brown “by chance discovered” the original South Carolina Constitution of 1776. In two days the General Assembly passed a concurrent resolution establishing a special committee to make “recommendations to the General Assembly as to the proper handling of these valuable papers in conjunction with the Secretary of the Historical Commission.”

The committee, composed of two senators, two representatives, and Alexander Salley, “hurriedly examined” the records and found there were also original legislative acts from the colonial period. Excited over “the first State Constitution ever adopted in America” and other valuable records still “stored in a junk room in the State House, some in a cellar, some among old papers in the State Treasurer’s office,” the committee recommended “having these documents assorted, valued, restored and placed either in the Archives of the Historical Commission of South Carolina, and/or the library of the University of South Carolina.”181

Senator Brown, one of the most powerful state senators in South Carolina’s long history as a legislative state, obtained a supplemental appropriation of $2,000 with which Salley hired temporary staff and purchased some equipment. From the beginning Brown had the matter “largely referred for attention to Mr. Salley,” and the next year two additional permanent clerks and money for “additional clerical help” were added to the commission’s regular appropriation. President McKissick wrote Senator Brown trying to obtain some of the documents, and Brown added a note to Salley that he “would like for some of these papers to be put at the University.”182

The Speaker of the House of Representatives, Solomon Blatt, an avid supporter of the university, even got a concurrent resolution passed transferring the newly discovered records to the custody of the University South Caroliniana Society “for safe keeping and study.” While the resolution provided that the items were to remain “the property of the said State of South Carolina,” Meriwether told the Historical Commission and its secretary that he did not approve of such a transfer. The items should be “in the custody of the

---

180 Minutes of the Historical Commission, June 25, 1938, p. 143.
181 “Report of the Secretary,” Report of the Historical Commission of South Carolina to the General Assembly of South Carolina at the Regular Session of 1942 (Columbia: Printed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Public Printing, [1942]), p. 4; Journal of the Senate of the Second Session of the 83rd General Assembly of the State of South Carolina (Columbia: Printed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Public Printing, [1940]), pp. 41-42, 49, and 1445-46 (the report of the committee).
Salley hired Senator Brown's "young friend, Miss Bush" as one of the temporary summer workers on these records. Mrs. Louise Caughman, one of the two new permanent clerks that Salley hired in 1942, was the sister of another powerful state senator closely connected with Brown, Richard Manning Jefferies. Caughman had earlier been a WPA worker under Barnwell at the Memorial Building, but lost her eligibility in October 1940. Jefferies, president pro tempore of the Senate, was serving as governor in 1942 due to the death of a lieutenant governor who had become governor. Edgar Brown's daughter married Jefferies' son. Aleck and Edgar, as they called each other, were more than casual friends. Much of Salley's success in maintaining his position can be explained through his close contacts with what opponents of Senator Brown called the "Barnwell Ring."

Now that he had both staff and space, Salley could tackle the mass of papers rescued from plunder rooms and the basement in the State House. In the next few years Salley's annual reports would recount, "Many thousands of documents have been filed by subject matter.

In this work the old filing in pigeon holes was abandoned for more modern file folders and cabinets. In fiscal year 1942/1943 so many folders were used that Salley had to twice call on the Civil Contingent Committee for additional funds to buy folders. For fiscal year 1944/1945 Salley could report, "More papers have been made readily available by our filing system than in any previous year since the establishment of the department." That year the most spectacular find among the "many documents that no one knew were in existence" was the South Carolina copy of the United States Bill of Rights.

The two core concepts of modern archival theory and practice, respects des fonds (or provenance) and original order, developed in France and Germany in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Records from different creators should be kept separately and not intermixed, and, if at all possible, the original filing order should be maintained or recreated. Codified in an 1898 Dutch archival manual, these principles long had competition in the United

---

183 Journal of the House of Representatives of the Second Session of the 84th General Assembly of the State of South Carolina (Columbia: Printed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, [1942]), pp. 1409-10, 1473; Memorandum from Meriwether to the members and secretary of the Historical Commission, July 6, 1945, Meriwether Historical Commission File, South Caroliniana Library. The memo did state that the commission could transfer "such state records as the Commission might find itself unable to care for, or which it might think would be more useful in the South Caroliniana Library" and went on to argue that gubernatorial papers were the property of the governor. For Blatt's support of the university, see John K. Cauthen, Speaker Blatt, His Challenges Were Greater (1965; reprint edition: Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1978), pp. 204-6.


185 Report of the Historical Commission of South Carolina to the General Assembly of South Carolina at the Regular Session of 1944 (Columbia: Printed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, [1944]), p. 4. The identical wording about "Many thousands" was used in the reports to the 1942 and 1943 legislatures.

186 Report of the Historical Commission of South Carolina to the General Assembly of South Carolina at the Regular Session of 1946 (Columbia: Printed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, [1946]), p. 4.
States from library-based subject arrangements. As early as 1909 the principle of provenance was discussed at the American Historical Association's Conference of Archivists, and Mississippi's state archivist disavowed the library methods in 1912. From its beginnings in 1935-1936, the National Archives observed the twin classic rules, then just becoming available in English, but state archives did not always observe these principles. As Ernest Posner put it in his classic *American State Archives*, published in 1964, for some archival agencies “the first order of business has to be expiating the sins of the past.”

The Historical Records Survey had been careful to classify records “according to office of origin and kind of record” in what sorting of the vast pile they had been able to accomplish. Faced with masses of papers that had been moved from pillar to post and a staff with little professional training, Alexander Salley did not attempt to segregate records of various state officials. Over 40,000 plats were easy enough to file alphabetically, but, armed with advice from the Massachusetts Historical Society, Salley instead used a subject scheme for the bulk of the loose documents. Without regard to whether they were records of the legislature, the secretary of state, the governor, the comptroller general, or some other official, these papers were filed under such topics as Indian Affairs, Public Improvements, Slavery, Education, Societies, and Military Affairs. Some headings or subheadings kept record series basically together, but many did not. By 1945 Salley reported over 15,000 papers filed in the first chronological segment, those papers predating 1800, and much work on the second, 1800-1830.

By the time he retired in 1949, work was in progress on the final section, 1866-1877. Known as the “Green Files” for the rows of green file cabinets in which they were housed, these subject files contained some of the most historically valuable records in the custody of the commission, especially the incredibly rich records of the antebellum legislature. As early as late 1941 Salley could report, “Many investigators in the office during the current year have been able to see papers of benefit to them that have been inaccessible heretofore.” Such continued to be the case, but the file folders proved to be acidic and, as Posner put it in 1964, the task “of reconstituting original provenances” still had to be done. When the bulk of the “Green Files” before 1866 were disassembled in the 1970s and 1980s, automation allowed both filing by provenance and detailed access to legislative papers by computer-generated indexes.

### The Battle Renewed

The processing work of the 1940s, even though to modern eyes in several ways unfortunate, blunted some of the Historical Commission's criticism of Alexander Salley. Their powers negated by provisos on appropriation acts and internal division, the commission did not meet in 1942, 1943, and 1944. When Robert L. Meriwether

---


renewed his campaign in 1945, his focus would be even more on publications. The preamble to the resolutions Meriwether introduced at the June 30, 1945, annual meeting of the commission noted that the commission had been “severely criticised for the slow progress of publication of the state’s records” and that “no one now on the staff . . . except the Secretary himself” had the “training and technical knowledge” for editing the records. Salley objected to adopting the preamble without a separate vote, but it and the resolutions each passed by a vote of four to one, with only Col. Williams of The Citadel voting no. The commission not only resolved to “secure a person approved by the Commission competent to edit copies of these records for publication” but also requested the legislature to omit provisos from the appropriation bill “setting the term and appointment of the secretary” and allowing him to “appoint the employees paid by the appropriation.” A separate resolution accepted the “present term of the Secretary as extending to 1949” as “being entirely agreeable to the Commission.” The meeting, which included the reading of Salley’s annual report, lasted only an hour. A similar short and tense meeting the following year “readopted” the same resolutions after debate “over the fact that the General Assembly had not complied with the requests” of the previous year.193

A 1945 act established a state retirement system and provided that those who had “attained the age of seventy years shall be retired forthwith.” Exceptions were made for a year-to-year extension with approval of both the employer and the Retirement Board. When Salley reached the June 24, 1949, date for his term of office set in the appropriations act for 1944/1945 and agreed to by his commission, he would be 78. An amendment to the retirement act passed only weeks before that date restricted extensions to age 72.194 An attempt in 1948 to further extend Salley’s appointment for two more years, when he would have been 80, brought the dispute to the floor of the General Assembly and the newspapers. Oscar H. Doyle, an Anderson lawyer who had represented the American Legion on the commission since 1932, joined Meriwether in leading the renewed battle against Salley and his supporters. Doyle was instrumental in the establishment of a roadside historical marker program in South Carolina and may have become soured on the commission’s secretary through that effort.

The 1905 act reorganizing the Historical Commission had given that body “the direction and control of the marking of historical sites,” thus mandating an at-least-nominal connection with the commission for the roadside marker program. Over the years Salley often worked with patriotic organizations to erect monuments for which he wrote the inscriptions and provided dedicatory remarks. The organizations footed the costs, for which the commission had no funds. At the instigation of Chairman W.A. Clark, in 1929 the Historical Commission obtained a $500 legislative appropriation for markers at historic sites. Salley obtained a State Highway Department permit that allowed him to erect a few granite markers on highway right-of-ways. He also used some of the money in the next few years to place aluminum roadside directional markers to such sites as the grave of Francis Marion and the birthplace of Andrew Jackson.195 The appropriation for marking historical sites dwindled to $250 in 1932, then disappeared, but a national movement to erect metal highway historical markers was well underway. Salley used the Clifford L. Walker firm of Richmond to procure his few aluminum markers. The Charleston Chamber of Commerce

---

193 Minutes of meetings of June 30, 1945, and June 29, 1946, Minutes of the Historical Commission, pp. 146-47. In the 1946 minutes Salley first wrote “demands” and then overwrote the word “requests.”

194 Act No. 157, Statutes at Large, 44:219; Act No. 267, Statutes at Large, 46:433. The amendment did allow continuance to “the end of the term of office to which . . . appointed.”
and other Charleston and Berkeley County forces obtained an appropriation to erect historical markers on the new Mid-Coastal Highway. Walker assiduously sought both this business and to add a South Carolina state program to the roadside markers he was supplying Georgia, Massachusetts, and Virginia.196

In 1935 Clifford Walker informed Salley that Oscar H. Doyle “as a member of the State Historical Commission” had been “selected to initiate a state-wide program for markers.” Exactly how the initiative devolved on Doyle is unclear, but Doyle obtained a $3,000 Works Progress Administration grant to start a program of roadside historical markers in South Carolina. Doyle had studied the extensive Virginia roadside marker system and led the South Carolina effort quite independently of Salley. He hired Nora M. Davis, a Troy, South Carolina native who had a M.A. in English from the University of South Carolina, to run the program. Miss Davis began her work in January 1936 out of a room at the University of South Carolina, but soon moved into the World War Memorial Building.197

Committees in each county helped compile a list of almost 1,300 potential sites. The Historical Commission appointed Salley, Meriwether, and Davis to design the cast aluminum markers. By July 1939 the Highway Department had erected fifty-nine of the program’s markers and, by a 1938 agreement, had agreed to build and maintain 100 foot “parkways” so that motorists could safely pull off the highways to read the inscriptions. The South Carolina program was part of a national movement of the time, but unlike neighboring North Carolina, which also had started their program in 1935, South Carolina had no state funds to pay for the markers. The Columbia Sesquicentennial Commission paid for fifty of the earliest fifty-nine markers, and others had to be funded by “patriotic organizations, public-spirited clubs, generous individuals, and prosperous churches.”198 With the Historical Commission’s approval, Doyle obtained a

195 Salley to McCain, Sept. 18, 1939, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives; Minutes of the Historical Commission, Dec. 8, 1928, p. 125; Ben M. Sawyer, Chief Highway Commissioner, to Salley, May 8, 1929, Historical Markers Folder, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives; Report of the Historical Commission . . . to the General Assembly . . . 1930, p. 5; Report of the Historical Commission of South Carolina to the General Assembly of South Carolina at the Regular Session of 1931 (Columbia: Printed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, 1931), p. 5; and Report of the Historical Commission of South Carolina to the General Assembly of South Carolina at the Regular Session of 1933 (Columbia: Printed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, 1933, p. 8. See also Salley’s discussion of his granite markers in an Aug. 6, 1955, letter to the editor of The State.

196 Clifford L. Walker file, 1929-1941, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. This massive file includes correspondence concerning Salley’s attempt to use an “Iodine State” design in one of his few textual markers.

197 Walker to Salley, July 12, 1935, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives; Minutes of meetings of June 29, 1935, and June 27, 1936, Minutes of the Historical Commission, pp. 139-40; The State (Columbia), January 25, 1936, clipping in Box 1, Series S108063, Papers of Nora Davis, Historic Marker Survey, S.C. Archives; Nora Marshall Davis sketch, Louise Jones Dubose, editor, South Carolina Lives: The Palmetto Who’s Who (Hopkinsville, Kentucky: Historical Record Association, 1963), p. 140. Letters to chairs of county committees initially were sent from Room 10 of Davis College, but Miss Davis soon moved to the World War Memorial. She did not want to abide by the five o’clock closure of the Historical Commission doors and was initially temporarily put in the chapel upstairs. The Memorial Commission complained of “cigarette stumps and match heads” from the chapel being “used as a workshop,” and Davis was moved downstairs. Doyle to Salley, Nov. 30, 1936, and Salley to “Oscar,” Dec. 1. 1936, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives.

198 Nora M. Davis, Report on the Historical Markers Survey of South Carolina, August 19, 1939, Nora Davis Papers; Wegner, History for All the People, p. 19. For the history of the program, see also J.H. Easterby to Calhoun A. Mays, Aug. 23, 1951, Archives Department File, Series S108076, Correspondence of the Director.
legislative appropriation to the American Legion to continue Davis's salary after the WPA grant ended. Although Davis had an office similar to Salley’s on the ground floor of the World War Memorial Building, Doyle continued to be listed as the “sponsor” or “supervisor” of the project.199 One Columbia committee member consulted Salley to correct errors in the inscriptions for its markers, but Salley was otherwise isolated from the marker effort. He complained to Clifford Walker, “As far as the whole set-up is concerned they care nothing about whether it is right or wrong so long as it suits them.”200 Under Salley’s successor J. Harold Easterby, historical markers became an integral part of the Archives Department.

The historical marker business demonstrates the distance between Commissioner Doyle and that body's secretary. In the failed 1946 attempt to eliminate the appropriation act provisos, Doyle got the advice of his state senator, who recommended waiting until the bill reached the Senate Finance Committee. As Doyle put it, “If we start now we will probably have Salley to fight all the way up and none of us can just live with the General Assembly like Salley can.”201 Salley surely did keep his political fences mended. Two years earlier he told a friend that his attention had been briefly occupied with “getting my nephew John Riley elected to Congress.”202

In a January 1947 hearing before the Budget Commission, Historical Commission Chairman William Way asked that the commission’s powers be restored. In 1940 when the appropriations proviso first removed their power to elect the secretary, Professor Holmes had angrily moved “that the General Assembly be requested to abolish the Historical Commission.” The commission had then “indefinitely postponed” the motion. Way, who represented the South Carolina Historical Society on the commission, now told the Budget Commission that its members had the “general opinion” that “it should be abolished rather than kept in its present state of responsibility without authority.” Way asked Meriwether to present the commission's case for renewed authority, but Salley, according to Meriwether, took the floor “and talked for all but four minutes of our time. He made it a story of continual interference by me, mentioning me repeatedly by name and no one else.” In the short time left, Meriwether argued that they “merely” wanted “to establish the authority of the Commission and declared there was criticism, serious and justifiable on the score of publication.” Senator Brown “asked jokingly why there was any fuss, and gave his opinion that the Historical Commission should act only in an advisory capacity.”203

By November 1947 with the end of Salley’s term only a year and a half away, Meriwether

199 Minutes of meetings of June 27, 1936, and June 26, 1937, Minutes of the Historical Commission, pp. 140, 142. The funding to the American Legion appears in the contributions section of the annual appropriations acts for fiscal years 1937-1938 through 1947-1948. Davis’s salary through 1942-1943 was $1,500 but was raised to $1,620 in 1943-1944. Salley never listed Davis in the Legislative Manual, which in this period listed all employees of the agency. Davis resigned to care for an invalid sister in 1945.

200 Salley to Walker, January 21, 1938, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. Salley also complained that most of the Columbia markers “will be erected about town where they will soon be scratched up by the children, desecrated by college boys and vicious vandals.”

201 Doyle sketch in History of South Carolina: Biographical Volume, pp. 147-48; O.H. Doyle to Meriwether, Feb. 28, 1946, Meriwether Historical Commission File, South Caroliniana Library.

202 Salley to Brigadier General John T. Kennedy, Nov. 18, 1944, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. John Jacob Riley served in the U.S. House of Representatives for eight terms, 1945-1949, 1951-1962.

203 Meriwether to Doyle, Jan. 31, 1947, Meriwether Historical Commission File, South Caroliniana Library; minutes of meeting of June 29, 1940, Minutes of the Historical Commission, pp. 144-45. In this period the minutes of the Budget Commission contain only financial authorizations.
sent a lengthy memorandum to the commission proposing the hiring of J. Harold Easterby as Salley’s successor. After a detailed recounting of the statutory history of the agency and the long dispute with Salley, Meriwether proposed that the commission offer the position to Easterby through a declaratory resolution that all six current members of the commission intended to vote for him at the proper time. Meriwether went on to suggest that the commission ask the legislature for $1,200 to pay Easterby for four months work in the interim to prepare “a comprehensive program of publication of records and care of state and local archives.”

Although at first Granville T. Prior, the new representative of The Citadel on the Historical Commission, wanted to postpone any action until either Salley had agreed to the proposal or “definitely announces his intention of retiring,” Meriwether’s resolutions were unanimously adopted at a December 6, 1947, meeting of the commission in executive session. By December 17 Easterby had talked with College of Charleston President George D. Grice, who was willing to grant a leave of absence of up to five years. Salley’s friends in the legislature would soon threaten these plans.

The appropriations bill for fiscal year 1948-1949 passed the House of Representatives with the proviso ending Salley’s term on June 24, 1949, unchanged, but when the Senate Finance Committee, chaired by Edgar Brown, issued their report on February 10, 1948, the term had been extended for two more years until June 24, 1951. The Senate bill did initially add the $1,200 for Easterby’s planning work, but if Salley were to continue in control of the agency until he was 80, the commission’s plans would have been for naught. To make matters worse, on February 26, 1948, two representatives introduced a bill in the House to abolish the commission and devolve its duties on the “state historian,” the new title Salley had been given in a proviso to the fiscal year 1946-1947 appropriations act.

---

204 Meriwether proposal to the commission marked c. Nov. 10, 1947, Meriwether Historical Commission File, South Caroliniana Library.

205 Granville T. Prior to Meriwether, Nov. 30, 1947; Meriwether to Prior, Dec. 4, 1947; Resolutions Adopted at a Meeting of the Historical Commission in Executive Session, Dec. 6, 1947; and Easterby to Meriwether, Dec. 17, 1947, Meriwether Historical Commission File, South Caroliniana Library. There is no record of the Dec. 6 meeting in the commission’s official minute book being kept by Salley.

Working behind the scenes, Meriwether thought he had agreement from Senator Brown and others to allow most of their program to go forward in July 1949 as long as Salley retained the title and salary of “state historian.” But this agreement fell apart. On February 19, 1948, the Senate struck the planning money from the budget. By February 24 Meriwether made the commission’s campaign public with a statement to the press. Joining others in “paying tribute to A.S. Salley as a ‘walking encyclopedia’ of information on the state’s history,” he went on to point out problems that had been “neglected and ignored.” The commission, Meriwether said, would not object to “any special provision” that the legislature “may care to make for Mr. Salley,” as long as the provisos were eliminated and the commission’s powers restored, thus enabling it “to plan and put in effect the archives program the state needs and deserves.”

The first attempt to defeat the extension of Salley’s term failed in the Senate on February 26. Oscar Doyle, the commissioner working most closely with Meriwether, got his state senator (J.B. Pruitt) to move that all the provisos be stricken from the Historical Commission section of the appropriations bill. Senator Calhoun A. Mays, a Greenwood lawyer who would subsequently chair the Historical Commission, joined in the motion. The Columbia Record reported that Pruitt argued that the provisos had stopped the commission from functioning. While Mays said positive things about Salley, he argued, “This kind of legislation has no place in the appropriations bill.”

Commissioner Doyle now publicly took the gloves off. In contrast to Meriwether’s tactful press release, Doyle bluntly stated that the bill in the House of Representatives to abolish the commission was “political demagogy.” Doyle added, “Mr. Salley is apparently spending a major portion of his time trying to abolish the commission, rather than doing the things the commission wants done,” and proclaimed the talk that he was indispensable was “a lot of eye wash.” In terms of retirement, Doyle argued, “There is no earthly reason why Mr. Salley should be the sole exception to the declared policy of the state.”

Meriewether and Doyle organized a two-pronged effort, trying to both defeat the House bill abolishing the commission and to have the provisos deleted in the free conference committee on the appropriations bill. By the time the House Education Committee scheduled a hearing on the House bill for late March, its chairman, Tracy T. Gaines, reported, “He had correspondence on this matter from all over the state.” Doyle, long a state leader in the American Legion and now the United States Attorney for the Northern District of South Carolina, concentrated on the American Legion, while Meriwether, with help from Easterby, rounded up the historical and professional organizations. Both worked on
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207 Meriwether to Easterby, Feb. 4, 1948, Meriwether Historical Commission File, South Caroliniana Library; manuscript act No. R788. For Meriwether and Easterby’s efforts to gain the support of Charleston Senator Oliver Thornwell Wallace, see Meriwether to Wallace, Feb. 22, 1948, and Easterby to Wallace, Feb. 23, 1948, Meriwether Historical Commission File.
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209 Journal of the Senate of the Second Session of the 87th General Assembly of the State of South Carolina (Columbia: Printed under the Direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, 1948), p. 285; Columbia Record, Feb. 26, 1948, p. 6A. For Pruitt and Mays, see Bailey, Morgan, and Taylor, Biographical Directory of the South Carolina Senate.
210 Columbia Record, March 5, 1948, p. 13. See also, Anderson Independent, March 3, 1948.
211 Columbia Record, March 17, 1948, p. 5.
politicians.

The Executive Committee of the South Carolina Historical Association wrote Representative Gaines about the importance of causing “South Carolina to cease to be the State of the Original Thirteen with the smallest amount of its records published,” and argued, “No one person, regardless of how competent . . . should be given . . . all the duties and responsibilities of preserving the records of a State so rich in history as ours.” Two weeks later the association’s newly elected president, Professor Lillian Kibler of Converse College, joined the presidents of the South Carolina Historical Society and the Social Studies Department of the South Carolina Educational Association in a statement deploiring South Carolina’s slowness in publishing its colonial records and noting “the other types of historical work which are equally in need of attention.” In a private letter to Meriwether, Kibler wrote that if she had been on the Historical Commission her “inclination would have been to turn him [Salley] off 10 years ago.”

Meriwether also gained the support of the South Carolina Women’s Council for the Common Good and the South Carolina Division, American Association of University Women.

The House Education Committee was already won over by the time of its Wednesday, March 24, 1948, hearing on the bill abolishing the commission, but the appropriations bill with the provisos intact went to Governor J. Strom Thurmond’s desk that same day and his veto message was scheduled to go out on Saturday. The state commander of the American Legion and delegations from the Historical Commission, the Historical Society, the Historical Association, the American Association of University Women, and the Social Studies Department of the South Carolina Educational Association left the committee hearing and “marched . . . into the governor’s office.” Thurmond made no promises but urged the group to work on the legislative delegations over the weekend to get them to back up his veto. Meriwether handed Thurmond draft veto messages that he and Doyle had hastily composed as well as signed statements from the various organizations.

The history departments of Wofford and Winthrop Colleges, the Beaufort County Historical Society, the history teachers of the Columbia senior high schools, and several individuals joined the organizations who came in person in sending written materials to the governor’s office.

---
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215 Historical Commission Incoming File, Folder 314, Incoming Correspondence of Governor J. Strom Thurmond, Strom Thurmond Gubernatorial Papers, Clemson University Libraries (microfilm at the South Carolina Department of Archives and History).
Thurmond, who had been elected on an anti-Barnwell-Ring platform, told Meriwether that Salley’s friends had learned of the proposed veto and “were already after him.” The governor, however, stuck to his guns and vetoed the provisos. After an acknowledgement of Salley’s “signal service . . . to his State,” “his insistence on accuracy,” and “his remarkable fund of detailed information,” he argued that it was “against the public interest to strip the Historical Commission of practically all of its responsibility and functions.” Listing organizations urging him to veto the provisos, he claimed, “Their views are entitled to great weight.” Thurmond, who would himself serve in the United States Senate until a few months before his death at age 100 in 2003, wrote that it was “unfair to compel retirement generally and then use the Appropriation Act to make exceptions.”

Despite efforts with a number of legislative delegations, the veto was overridden in the House of Representatives on March 31 by a vote of 75 to 33. Representative B.M. Gipson of Greenville defended “a grand old man of South Carolina” by reading a tribute by the author of the state’s multi-volume history, David Duncan Wallace. In an “impassioned appeal,” Representative W. Lewis Wallace of York said, “If you force him to retire, his retirement will be paid in death.” Representative J. Perrin Anderson of Greenville, supporting the veto, admitted, “We all know there is a feud between Dr. Meriwether and Mr. Salley,” but argued there was “nothing personal in the matter” and cited Salley’s age. The next day the issue again made the front page of the Columbia Record. Reporting that the Senate vote of 19 to 14 was short of the two-thirds needed to override the veto, the newspaper noted the matter was still up in the air because of a motion to reconsider the vote.

The crux of the matter now was whether the veto of the provisos meant Salley would retire at the end of the current fiscal year in June 1948 or whether he would continue to June 24, 1949, as specified in the previous provisos and agreed to by the commission. Easterby reported he could make himself available a year early, but the politics of what Meriwether called “a hell of a fight” were far from settled. By April 6 a conference between Senator Brown and Governor Thurmond seemed to settle the matter if Salley would agree to step down in 1949. The motion to reconsider the Senate vote was dropped and the veto stood.

Senator Jefferies had also met with the governor and suggested the compromise of letting Salley stay in office for the year. Thurmond proposed to Meriwether that the commission meet in the governor’s office with Salley present to settle the matter. The governor advised that if Salley would not agree to step down in a year, then the commission should declare the office vacant on July 1 and “elect his successor immediately.” Thurmond agreed with Meriwether that for the next year Salley had to cease his opposition to the commission’s powers. At noon on April 23, 1948, the commission met and signed two resolutions. The backup resolution declaring the position vacant and appointing Easterby was not needed because late that afternoon in the governor’s office with the commission present Salley signed the resolution.

---
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218 Easterby to Meriwether, March 27, 1948, and, for the quote, the Easterby part of Meriwether to Doyle with added note to Easterby, March 26, 1948, Meriwether Historical Commission File; Columbia Record, April 6, 1948, p. 1. In the same March 26 report Meriwether also wrote Easterby referring to Salley, “The man is, as you know, insane, and there is no telling what he will do.”
committing himself not “to make any other attempt at legislative action to extend his term of office.”

Attorney General John M. Daniel, a 65-year-old Greenville lawyer who had been in office since 1925, would continue to muddy the waters. During the Senate fight over the veto, Daniel was quoted in the newspapers as stating that Salley was “irrevocably” in office until 1949. In the debate the question of dual office holding was also raised against Oscar Doyle, who had strongly seconded Meriwether in the retirement battle despite heightened family responsibilities because his wife was in an Augusta hospital. An opinion by Daniel forced Doyle to resign from the commission, but Doyle did manage to arrange the nomination of Calhoun A. Mays, who had supported them in the fight, as his replacement as the American Legion representative.

In early April 1948 Governor Thurmond, then only 45, recommended that Meriwether try to avoid involving Attorney General Daniel. Daniel, Thurmond said, “is getting old and sympathizing with Alex on retirement.” In August, in response to a letter from Salley, an attorney in Daniel’s office issued an opinion challenging the commission’s resolution of the previous December pledging to elect Easterby when the position became vacant.

Salley obtained this opinion in response to an attempt by Easterby to smooth the transition. Easterby explained in a letter to Salley that he had accepted the position upon Salley’s pending June 24, 1949, retirement and was “fully aware of [its] heavy responsibilities.” He told Salley that he wanted to get “to know the members of the staff with whom I am to have the pleasure of working” and volunteered to come “to Columbia at almost any time that will be convenient to you.” Salley’s only reply was to obtain the opinion and mail a copy to Easterby.

Not only was there the threat of the attorney general in the background, but Senator Brown and Salley at the end of 1948 were trying to secure the state historian position for Francis Butler Simkins. Simkins, an Edgefield, South Carolina, native with a Columbia University Ph.D. and author of a biography of Ben Tillman, was interested. Brown reported to a relative of Simkins that the Budget Commission strongly disapproved of Easterby because of his involvement “in the controversy between the Commission and Mr. Salley.” But in the end Simkins bowed out, and Senator Brown

---
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221 Meriwether to Easterby, April 20, 1948, and J. Monroe Fulmer, Assistant Attorney General, Aug. 26, 1948, to Salley (negative photocopy), Meriwether Historical Commission File.

222 Easterby to Salley, August 9 and August 30, 1948, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives. The first letter has a note in Salley’s hand that he mailed the “Opinion of the Attorney General” the day after it was issued. Easterby’s second letter reported receiving the opinion in an envelope addressed in Salley’s hand and offered to return it if it was not intended as the reply to his earlier letter.

was tiring of Alexander Salley. In January 1949 Meriwether received a report of a confrontation in which Brown told Salley, “He was being stubborn in fighting longer in a lost cause.” When Salley went off “in a huff,” Brown reportedly said, “He was through with the whole business.” After the battle was over, Brown wrote a friend that he had “been trying for years to get my dear friend, Alex Salley, to put on a better staff . . . . Alex does things in his own good way and during his tenure, never did get around to doing the job as it ought to have been done.” The last skirmish was at hand.

On June 23, 1949, the commission met at the South Caroliniana Library and adopted a resolution confirming Easterby’s appointment. They then went over to the World War Memorial Building and had Salley record the resolution in the commission’s minute book. Salley produced an opinion from Attorney General Daniel declaring that by terms of the proviso to the 1945 appropriations act Salley’s successor had to be confirmed by the Senate. The commissioners then went to the attorney general’s office, where Daniel told them Salley would have to stay in office until that time. But Salley’s last entry in the minute book said nothing of the opinion, and the next afternoon, June 24, 1949, Salley left the building for the last time. J. Harold Easterby, who had been waiting with his son in a drug store across the street, went to the World War Memorial Building at about a quarter to five. Francis Marion Hutson handed him the keys. What Meriwether called “the Alexandrian epic” had come to an end.

Despite the circumstances, Salley’s friends paid tribute. Chapman J. Milling, whose book on South Carolina Indians had been published
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by the University of North Carolina Press, wrote the retirement spread for the Columbia Sunday newspaper magazine. Milling told of his timidity when as a young physician he initially approached the man whose “favorite diet consisted of professional historians with an occasional amateur for an appetizer.” Despite the time he dislodged a hornet’s nest over Salley’s head in the commission’s State House quarters, they remained friends. “The present collection housed in the handsome World War Memorial,” Milling wrote, “will remain his most imperishable monument.” An editorial by “Billy” Ball in the Charleston News and Courier pleased Salley. “He believes that history is worth preserving,” Ball wrote, “and with inflexible faithfulness to accuracy, he has preserved it for his state.”

Mary C. Simms Oliphant, granddaughter of William Gilmore Simms, author of a long-used school textbook, and the grand dame of South Carolina historians, published a bibliography of her friend’s publications. David Duncan Wallace contributed an introduction lauding Salley’s “prodigious achievement.”

The many others Salley had helped over the years meant that he had his advocates. Offered honorary doctorates, Salley refused. When the Duke University historian Robert H. Woody addressed him in a letter as “Dr.” in 1940, Salley responded:

You must not “Dr” me. I have never accepted an honorary title and I fear that I would be more persecuted than I am now if I permitted friends and correspondents to give me a title that I do not bear.

Salley deeply felt that he was mistreated. In July 1949 he wrote to a friend of the “poison which Meriwether, Doyle, Mays, Way, Easterby, and a few others have injected into me by their falsehoods.” His “nervous system,” he wrote, “has not yet fully recovered from the shock.”

Alexander Salley had played a key role in establishing a separate state agency responsible for the government’s records and had kept it alive against formidable odds. Victim of the professionalization of history, the passing years, and the unfortunate aspects of his own personality, Salley went into retirement.

Meriwether immediately stepped down as chair of the University of South Carolina History Department. For two years he had remained titular chair, turning the duties and extra stipend over to someone else, in order to retain his seat on the Historical Commission and lead the fight. Now, as he wished, he could turn more of his attention to the South Caroliniana Library.

Until the very end, the victory had not been certain. Without the campaign, South Carolina might have followed the path of Alabama. Alabama’s state archives had served as Salley’s model in the beginning, but by mid-century it was “a hollow shell” of the program it once had been.

Both Thomas Owen’s widow Marie Bankhead Owen and their protégé Peter A. Brannon each

226 News and Courier, June 26, 1940, p. 4a; Salley to Paul Quattlebaum, July 12, 1949, Quattlebaum Papers, Clemson University Libraries.
228 Salley to Woody, Jan. 29, 1940, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives; Salley to Paul Quattlebaum, July 12, 1949, Quattlebaum Papers. In 1948 Salley had agreed with State Auditor Jim Smith that Quattlebaum would be his ideal successor as state historian. Salley to Quattlebaum, April 17, 1948, Quattlebaum Papers. Salley did accept an honorary doctorate from The Citadel in June 1959; the diploma is in the Salley Papers, South Caroliniana Library.
229 Carbon of letter to Stoney with added note to Gregorie and Surles, July 5, 1949, Anne King Gregorie Papers.
successively stayed on as director there until they died in office at age 85.\textsuperscript{230}

Salley, despite the dire prediction on the floor of the House of Representatives, lived on for nearly twelve more years until he died in 1961 at age 89. In his retirement years he continued his role as genealogist/historian for the Colonial Dames and, for a fee, prepared applications for membership in that organization and the Daughters of the American Revolution using his extensive library.\textsuperscript{231} His death was front-page news in Columbia, and editorials noted that he “knew and loved his South Carolina as few men have” and had in his head “more information about South Carolina than ever was collected in any volumes.” Salley himself in replying early on to a genealogy query about prominent families had said, “I know all of these people and their present day descendants quite well on paper, in ball rooms, in their homes, both on the walls and around their firesides.”\textsuperscript{232} In a laudatory obituary the director of the American Antiquarian Society (Clifford K. Shipton) opined, “By 1950, when he retired, the South Carolina Historical Commission was so far ahead of the Yankees as to be out of sight.” Shipton’s predecessor, the great newspaper bibliographer Clarence Bigham, had become Salley’s good friend through mutual interest in William Gilmore Simms, of whose works Salley had what Shipton called “the largest collection.”\textsuperscript{233} By 1961 both Meriwether and Easterby were also dead and the battle long past. In 1962 with appropriate ceremonies the Colonial Dames presented an oil portrait of Salley to hang in the then new Archives Building.\textsuperscript{234}
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\textsuperscript{235} Chapman Milling gave the address. Mary C. Simms Oliphant presented the portrait on behalf of the Greenville Committee of the Colonial Dames. Calhoun Mays, who had been an ally of the Meriwether camp in the late 1940s, was now chairman of the Archives Commission and accepted the portrait. Printed program, Record Set of Agency Publications, Series 108081, Box 15, S.C. Archives.
Part II: The Easterby Years

Planning a New Program

James Harold Easterby, Salley’s successor, served only eleven years before his death in December 1960. But in those years the Historical Commission was transformed into a modern archival agency, housed in a new building, with an ambitious reworked publications program. Both Salley and Easterby were already prominent in the national historical community when they assumed office, but with the passage of time that community had changed considerably. The men themselves were also quite different.

Although Easterby was a proud member of the St. Andrews Society, a two-century-old Charleston organization of those of Scottish descent, he was of more modest background and social pretensions than Salley. Known as Harold to acquaintances, Easterby was born in 1898. His father was a Charleston salesman who lived with his in-laws. Easterby was one of seventeen boys to graduate from the High School of Charleston in 1916. Voted the “most influential” and “most popular,” he was editor of the high school annual *The Argus* and manager of the baseball team. Since he was the editor, someone else had to write the comments under his picture. A young teacher who would later be a College of Charleston professor sang his praises. All seventeen young men stayed on the honor roll month after month throughout their senior year. The annual also reported Easterby’s hobby as dime novels and his favorite expression as “Oh crap.”

A scholarship student at the College of Charleston, Easterby was “turned on” to history as a freshman in 1917. The only entrant in an essay contest sponsored by the Daughters of the Confederacy, he shared the stage on Jefferson Davis’s birthday with the college’s history professor Nathaniel Wright Stephenson. “Stevie,” as Easterby came to call him, became his mentor. Easterby characterized the Ohio-born novelist, journalist, and historian as “a northern man who had the courage to live in Charleston and write four books about Abraham Lincoln.”

Easterby graduated with honors in the spring of 1920. Stephenson “pulled the strings” to have Easterby hired for the next academic year as his successor, initially as an acting professor of history. Another scholarship allowed Easterby to earn

---
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a masters degree in 1922 from Harvard, where Stephenson had also done graduate work. Easterby became a full professor of history at the College of Charleston in 1923 at age 25, a position he would hold for more than a quarter century. In 1935 he published the sesquicentennial history of the college.239 A few years later Easterby aided another College of Charleston undergraduate of a younger generation, George C. Rogers, Jr., in becoming a leading historian of South Carolina.240

Easterby evidenced a passion for documentation that echoed Salley's. In the 1930s while working on one of nineteen sketches of South Carolina figures that he wrote for the Dictionary of American Biography, he discovered that the youngest daughter of antebellum Governor Robert F.W. Allston still possessed many trunks containing “a treasure of family papers.” Easterby obtained the papers for the South Carolina Historical Society and began going through them with the idea of an eventual biography. Finding that the chief strength of the collection was for the history of South Carolina rice plantations, Easterby obtained the support of the Albert J. Beveridge Memorial Fund of the American Historical Association for a published edition with that focus. As he began the edition, he was awarded a Rosenwald Fellowship for graduate study at the University of Chicago. Under the supervision of Avery Craven, The South Carolina Rice Plantation as Revealed in the Papers of Robert F.W. Allston became Easterby’s 1945 Chicago Ph.D. dissertation.241 Later Easterby also meticulously edited a small cache of Colleton family papers that had been acquired by the South Caroliniana Library. Wadboo Barony: Its Fate as Told in the Colleton Family Papers, 1773-1793, appeared in 1952.242

Easterby had been active in state historical affairs since the beginning of the 1930s. When Robert L. Meriwether’s dream of a new organization for the “promotion of historical studies in the State of South Carolina” was achieved with the first annual meeting of the South Carolina Historical Association in 1931, Easterby was a member of the group’s executive committee. He edited its Proceedings for the first three years, and became its president in 1935. The group’s objectives also stressed “the preservation of historical records,”243 and, as we have seen, Easterby joined Meriwether and Gregorie in the strategizing for what became the Historical Records Survey. In 1937 Easterby added the directorship of the College of Charleston’s library to his history duties.244

Easterby served as president of the South Carolina Historical Society in 1940 and 1941. In the latter year when Mabel L. Webber died, he became the third editor of the South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine. Webber, the
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242 (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1952). The little volume, a part of the South Caroliniana Series, summarized the 11 documents from the collection that were not printed and included an excellent scholarly introduction.
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magazine’s editor for more than three decades since Alexander Salley gave up that post in 1909, had also served as the society’s secretary, treasurer, and librarian until shortly before her death. Easterby became instead a separate salaried editor. Modernizing the journal’s format, he added a “Notes and Reviews” section. In 1946 he arranged for the College of Charleston to sponsor reprinting that section to make it “available to those individuals and organizations who, though not members of the Society, desire to be informed of activities in the field of South Carolina history.” South Carolina History Notes and Reviews was available for “fifty cents per annum” until Easterby turned over the editorship of the magazine to Anne King Gregorie in 1948.

Given his background and his recent publication of a documentary edition, Easterby must have seemed a logical choice when Meriwether pushed him forward as Salley’s successor in late 1947. But the battle was not entirely over when he crossed Sumter Street and walked in the door of the World War Memorial Building on the afternoon of June 24, 1949. The threat of the attorney general’s opinion still hung in the air, and, even worse, an adequate salary for Easterby was not assured.

Salley at the end of his tenure was making only $4,200 a year, but the Historical Commission had committed to asking the legislature for a $6,000 salary for Easterby. Edgar Brown, as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, not only opposed Easterby’s appointment and schemed to get the post for Francis Butler Simkins but also opposed the higher salary for Easterby as “a reflection upon Mr. Salley.” Easterby, who had a wife and two teenage sons, made do with the $4,200 in fiscal year 1949-1950 even though it was less than he had been making at the College of Charleston. The next fiscal year the Budget and Control Board enabled the commission to cobble together the $6,000 with a grant of $1,000 from the Civil Contingency Fund. Governor Thurmond personally called Easterby to report the decision, noting that this was “the one and only case in which he had departed from his pledge not to increase salaries through action of the Budget Agency” and expressing “a desire to help in any way within his power to carry forward the plans of the Commission.”

Easterby still had his leave of absence from the College of Charleston to fall back on. In a January 1950 “S.O.S. letter” to a number of prominent historians seeking support for an increased appropriation, he wrote that he was “tired out by the struggle and would like to retire to the quiet of academe.” By September of that year he had “pledged himself to return to the College of Charleston at the opening of the fall

---
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session in 1951.”^249 After a massive lobbying effort by the Historical Commission, the salary issue was resolved with an appropriated salary of $6,600. Then the commissioners lent their voices to an equally difficult campaign to have the College of Charleston’s trustees release Easterby from his contract.^250 The energetic reshaping of the Historical Commission that had already begun under Easterby’s leadership could continue.

Writing to a fellow WPA supervisor in another state in 1939, Anne King Gregorie complained, “No program of any kind has ever been formulated” for the care of the state’s records.^251 Systematic planning was a hallmark of J. Harold Easterby’s years as director of the agency. Meriwether had failed in getting a state appropriation to pay Easterby to work on a “comprehensive” plan during the summer of 1948, but Easterby went on a tour of East Coast archives that summer anyway “with the express purpose of preparing myself for my work here in this department.”^252 Before the end of the year, he was already revising “A Program for the Historical Commission of South Carolina” for a legislative committee.

During the heat of the retirement fight in April 1948, the General Assembly created a joint legislative committee “to study data on file in the archives of the State Historical Department and recommend . . . ways and means of bringing about early recordation and publication in permanent form of such matters of historical interest and importance as are available.” Although Meriwether knew nothing of the concurrent resolution creating the committee, Salley saw this as his opponent’s effort “to have the department investigated.” One of the sponsors of the measure lost the next election, and the state senator who chaired the committee, J. Morris Lyles of Fairfield County, was one of Salley’s advocates. Salley thought that “the investigation proved a dud,” but in late 1948 Meriwether and the other members of the Historical Commission were already relying on Easterby to codify their “program” to meet the challenge of the Lyles Committee and revamp the Historical Commission.^253

Months before he took office, Easterby was already advocating a General Assembly sanctioned policy for the regular “transfer to the Commission of the records of all central agencies as they cease to be of current use” and the completion of the Historical Records Survey of “county and other local records” with microfilming of the more
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^249 J.H. Easterby to Henry S. Commager, Charles S. Sydnor, Fletcher M. Green, Avery O. Craven, and Christopher Crittenden, Jan. 20, 1950, Archives Department File, Series S108076, Correspondence of the Director; Minutes of the meeting of September 23, 1950, Minutes of the Historical Commission. From 1949 to 1965, when a new file scheme was implemented for the department, correspondence with the commission and other key material relating to the administration of the department were kept in a separate subset of the director’s correspondence that came to be called “Archives Dept. File.”

^250 Annual Report of the Historical Commission of South Carolina 1951-1952 (Columbia: Printed under the Direction of the Budget and Control Board, [1953], p. 7; Minutes of the Meeting of March 13, 1951, Minutes of the Historical Commission. For the lobbying effort, see Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director. A phone call from Senator Edgar Brown during the trustees’ meeting “had a decisive influence” according to a copy of an April 6, 1951, letter from Granville Prior to Calhoun Mays.

^251 Anne K. Gregorie, October 25, 1939, to Charles H. Lyman, Asst. Supervisor, State-wide Projects, Montana State College, Bozeman, Mt., In Correspondence, 1936-1946, Office Records, Box 2, South Caroliniana Library. I am indebted to the research notes of Kathryn Graham for this reference. Gregorie also complained that many of the Historical Commission members, because they were professors from out-of-state, “have no interest of any kind in the state records.”

^252 Typescript of talk at Staff Conference, July 6, 1949, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director. Easterby reported that he had “visited the N.C. Historical Commission, the Maryland Hall of Records, National Archives, and various other archival institutions in Philadelphia and New York.”
important of them. Worded slightly differently, these issues became the second and fourth items in a nine-point plan that the commission issued immediately after they regained control from Salley. But this emphasis on archival and records management concerns was stymied by lack of space and staff. As he put it in a later printed report, in 1949 with its “small resources” the commission decided to concentrate on its publications program even though “other needs were more basic.”

The nine-point program included procuring “copies of all additional public documents relating to South Carolina that are to be found in depositories outside of the State,” preparing finding aids to “facilitate the use of all records or copies of records in the state archives,” advising “when called upon, regarding the disposition of records of dubious value,” and encouraging “the excavation and study of historic sites and their proper marking.” Two of the three points relating to publications were slated for immediate attention. The commission hoped to eventually publish “such reference books as a Dictionary of South Carolina History and a Dictionary of South Carolina Biography.” Among documentary editions, publication of “all the legislative journals down to the year 1831” had highest priority and was to be completed “within the next few years.” Publication of “a guide to the study of state history” for “teachers of history” was to be completed “at once,” and later “copies of basic documents” were to be supplied.

---

253 Journal of the Senate of Second Session of the 87th General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, Being the Regular Session Beginning Tuesday, January 13, 1948 (Columbia: Printed under the Direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, [1948]), pp. 1208, 1291-92, 1398, and 1458; Salley to Paul Quattlebaum, [June 1951], Quattlebaum Papers; Meriwether to Harold [Easterby], Nov. 17, 1948, Meriwether Historical Commission File, South Caroliniana Library. At the November 17, 1948, meeting of the Lyles Committee Salley, according to Meriwether, rambled on defending himself until the members of the committee were practically glassy-eyed, but in 1951 Lyles saw to it that Salley was named State Historian Emeritus with a laudatory joint resolution. A copy of the Lyles Committee report of March 15, 1949, in Easterby's Reorganization Report file shows that it said nothing other than that “adequate financial support be furnished to permit the Commission to function with the greatest efficiency.”

Easterby’s quarter century as a history professor gave him a head start. As early as 1929 he had become president of the history teachers’ department of the South Carolina Teachers’ Association. Since the completion of his dissertation in 1945, Easterby had obtained financial support from the Charleston Scientific and Cultural Educational Fund and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching for part-time and summer work on a bibliography of printed sources and monographic literature on South Carolina history. Before the end of 1949 what had started as a syllabus for his students became Easterby’s first publication for the Historical Commission, *Guide to the Study and Reading of South Carolina History: Topical Lists.*

The next year the commission issued his comprehensive *Guide to the Study and Reading of South Carolina History: A General Classified Bibliography.* Easterby asked the state’s libraries to annotate copies of the bibliography with their holdings so that scholars could be informed of availability. He planned to include location symbols in the next edition to form a union list. The announced intention was to update the bibliography every five years, but other demands on Easterby’s time defeated that goal. More than a half century later, his volume is still the only such large-scale South Carolina bibliography. After his death, a slight update was added for a 1975 reprint.

Easterby put his staff to work on *A Checklist of South Carolina State Publications,* which began with those issued during the 1950-1951 fiscal year. The department continued to publish this annual list until 1968, but the South Carolina State Library took over compilation work for the serial in the early 1960s. A fourth bibliographic title by an English professor with Charleston roots, *Articles in Periodicals and Serials on South Carolina Literature and Related Subjects, 1900-1955,* appeared in 1956.

Other resources for teachers were also high in Easterby’s priorities. Easterby matured in an era when preparatory and high school faculty and college professors were not yet as distinct from each other as they were to become. At its beginning in 1930-1931, the South Carolina Historical Association was composed of a mixed group of “members of the faculties of the universities, colleges, high schools and preparatory schools of the State.” In addition to the bibliographies, the commission began to issue inexpensive copies of Basic Documents of South Carolina History for this mixed audience. These leaflets included brief introductions “regarding [their] origin and meaning, and a list of references.” Easterby himself prepared *The Constitution of 1776* in 1949. The constitutions of 1778, 1790, and 1865 all followed in the next few years. Each edited by a college professor in the state, the leaflets featured carefully collated texts and

---

255 Easterby continued to serve as president of the history teachers’ department at least until his sketch for the *History of South Carolina: Biographical Volume* was prepared in 1934 or 1935. An announcement of his plans appeared in the *News and Courier,* August 12, 1949. Easterby initially intended to send the full bibliography to the printer in the fall of 1949 but apparently published the short *Topical Lists* when the *General Classified Bibliography* took longer to complete. For the union list, see Easterby to Virginia A. Rugheimer, Librarian, Charleston Library Society, May 16, 1951, Alphabetical File, 1949-1961, Correspondence of the Director. Rugheimer was tardy in sending back the annotations for the Library Society.

256 For details see the bibliography of the department’s publications. Hennig Cohen, who prepared the literature bibliography, was then at the University of South Carolina but went on to a distinguished career at the University of Pennsylvania.

257 Easterby’s minutes of the first meeting also note that there were also present “several persons who are not engaged in teaching.” *Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association,* 1931, p. 1. In the early years the members and their affiliations were listed at the back of each issue of the proceedings.
as well as solid introductory materials. Easterby projected a parallel series of Illustrated Topics of South Carolina History with selections from sources and illustrations. He served as editor for the first of these, *Transportation in the Ante-Bellum Period*, issued in 1951. The South Carolina Council for Social Studies funded the printing of two of the educational leaflets, but both the basic documents and the illustrated topics were casualties of other priorities. None were issued after 1953.\(^\text{258}\)

Within months of his taking office in 1949, Easterby submitted plans to the State Budget Commission for the first volume in a new series, *The Colonial Records of South Carolina*. In a subsequent hearing, Governor Thurmond “placed [the commissioners] on the clouds by asking Dr. Easterby if he would not like to have as much as $2500.00 immediately to assist us with our publications.” The golden age of American documentary editing was then at its beginning. Julian P. Boyd had his first volume of *The Papers of Thomas Jefferson* in press. Easterby consulted with Boyd and other leading historians of the day and came up with a version of what became the standard “expanded method” of editing historical documents. Instead of Alexander Salley’s literal transcriptions, clerical symbols and abbreviations were spelled out and punctuation added for clarity. Salley’s myriad tiny volumes usually had no introductory matter whatsoever, but Easterby added explanatory and introductory prefaces. Unlike Boyd’s profuse annotation, Easterby limited his notes to textual matters.\(^\text{259}\)

The journals of the Commons House of Assembly were given first priority. Salley had published a number of these journals prior to 1736, so Easterby began in that year, planning after he reached the American Revolution to go back and cover the earlier period in the new format. In 1951 he published his first volume, a fat 764-page book covering the whole of the assembly that met between 1736 and 1739. In each of the next five years a further substantial volume appeared. Yet this high rate of productivity came nowhere near meeting the goals Easterby set for the commission. In an announcement for the first volume, he projected following on after the Commons House journals with “the journals of the Council, the documents on file in the British Public Record Office, the papers of the Commissioners of the Indian Trade, and so on until all the more significant documents of the colonial period have been printed.” A 1952 announcement projected publishing four volumes of the Commons House journals a year,\(^\text{260}\) but his seventh volume reaching 1747 did not appear until 1958. The texts, but not the indexes and front matter, of two further volumes reaching 1750 had been printed when Easterby died in 1960.

A lengthy campaign for a new archives building, as we shall see, drained Easterby’s time and energy, but delegation of tasks allowed continued production of documentary publications. Alexander Salley had done all the editorial work himself. Easterby instead trained other staff to do the routine transcription, proofreading, and personal name indexing on the Commons House journals, reserving the more complicated subject indexing and historical introductory matter for himself.\(^\text{261}\) In 1950 a

\(^{258}\) Quote from *List of Publications of the South Carolina Archives Department, February 1, 1957*. This booklet contains valuable descriptions of all the department’s earlier publications and of its plans for the future.

\(^{259}\) Calhoun Mays recalled the boost given by Thurmond in an exchange when Mays was reappointed to the commission; Mays to Thurmond, Oct. 13, 1952, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director. In his “Series Preface” Easterby also credits Verner W. Crane, Richard B. Morris, and Paul R. Weidner for assistance in rules of style.

\(^{260}\) Copies of printed publication announcements and lists of publications are available in Series S108081, Record Set of Agency Publications.

\(^{261}\) The foreword to the 1748 *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly*, one of the volumes that was in preparation at the time of Easterby’s death, and the acknowledgments in other volumes make the division of labor clear.
staff resignation allowed him to hire a male University of South Carolina graduate student as an editorial assistant. When the student went part-time to devote more time to his education in 1952, Easterby hired an Emory University M.A. history graduate, Wylma Anne Wates. Although Easterby felt that he “very much need[ed] a man in this position,” he found Wates’s training made her “the best person we can find.”

That same year University of South Carolina graduate student William L. McDowell, Jr. joined the staff part-time. By fiscal year 1954-1955 Easterby reported that Wates and McDowell had “sufficient experience to do independent editorial work” under his direction.  

From 1955 to 1957 Wates published three further volumes of the *Stub Entries to Indents Issued in Payment of Claims Against South Carolina Growing Out of the Revolution*. Wates followed Salley’s basic editorial style for this series but supplied an introductory preface and reconstructed missing stub entries from other records. In 1955 McDowell began a new subseries of *The Colonial Records of South Carolina* by publishing the first of the famous “Indian Books,” the *Journals of the Commissioners of the Indian Trade, September 20, 1710-August 29, 1718*. A larger second volume covering 1750-1754 followed in 1958.

Two years earlier in 1956 a second major new documentary series, *The State Records of South Carolina*, was begun with the publication of *Journals of the South Carolina Executive Councils of 1861 and 1862*. The volume was an exception in that its chief editor was a Wofford College professor. The staff had done much of the routine work. Easterby reported that they devoted 60 percent of their time in fiscal year 1953-1954 to publications. The Wofford professor’s coming “to the rescue” as this volume’s scholarly primary editor, however, was a necessity if the “hard pressed” commission was going to be able to complete it.

As with the Colonial Records, the State Records would place initial primary emphasis on lower house journals. As a prelude to these, Easterby was able to see work on *Extracts from the Journals of the Provincial Congress, 1775-1776*, completed before his death. Because the manuscript Provincial Congress journals do not survive, the volume had to be compiled from official condensed texts printed contemporaneously by authorization of the congress. The publishing of the Provincial Congress volume was, in a roundabout way, a byproduct of another collaboration of Robert L. Meriwether and J. Harold Easterby. Its chief editor, W. Edwin Hemphill, was by then also Meriwether’s successor as editor of *The Papers of John C. Calhoun*.

In 1950 Philip Hamer, executive director of the National Historical Publications Commission, had urged a modern Calhoun edition as a high national priority. The University of South Carolina agreed to supply an editor and library facilities, but Hamer indicated that there had to be sponsorship by “a state agency or agencies.” Easterby discussed

---

262 Annual Report of the Historical Commission to the General Assembly of South Carolina at the Regular Session of 1951 (Columbia: Printed Under the Direction of the State Budget and Control Board, 1952), pp. 4-5; Easterby to Granville T. Prior, July 19, 1952, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.


264 The editor, Charles Edward Cauthen, had published his 1937 University of North Carolina dissertation as *South Carolina Goes to War, 1860-1865*, and was then a member of the Archives Commission. There is a biographical sketch of Cauthen in Dubose, *South Carolina Lives*, p. 103. Annual Report . . . 1953-1954, p. 25, and (quotes) draft annual report for 1955-1956, p. 2, Series S108004, Annual Report Drafts, 1948-1970. The executive councils volume was left uncompleted when Lowry P. Ware, who worked for Easterby as a graduate student, left the commission’s staff.
the matter with State Auditor J.M. Smith, a staunch advocate of Easterby’s ambitious program for the Historical Commission. Smith agreed that a Historical Commission request for a $900 allotment to the commission from the Civil Contingent Fund to help support the project with clerical assistance would not endanger the commission’s own appropriations. Easterby ran a draft request for the funds by his commission in December 1950. The draft contained a reference to Meriwether as the “logical choice” for editor. With the long Salley-Meriwether fight still very much a contentious issue, the commissioners instructed Easterby that it was politically wise to leave out the reference to Meriwether. Although the $900 request was apparently not granted, the editing project went forward with Meriwether as editor. The project’s publication committee appointed Easterby as its “representative on questions of editorial procedure.”

The Calhoun Papers Project initially received the largest portion of its support from the University of South Carolina, but for fiscal year 1954-1955 the Budget and Control Board instead put nearly $9,000 for the project into the appropriation for the renamed South Carolina Archives Department. The addition was made without the knowledge of Easterby and his commission. An appropriation for the Calhoun Papers continued in the Archives Department budget for more than a quarter century until the department’s budget reductions forced its elimination at the end of fiscal year 1981-1982. Meriwether’s constant badgering of Easterby on minute editorial questions and the budgetary responsibility when funds were needed for other purposes, however, became a source of friction between long-time allies.266

The matter came to a head in 1957 when the Executive Committee of the University South Caroliniana Society agreed to help fund the project if all the sponsors of the effort formally agreed to support the project. The society was in a better position to help because of a substantial addition to their endowment from the State Rights Campaign Fund. At its November 2, 1957 meeting the Archives Commission endorsed a letter from Easterby refusing “a positive approval” because of the precedent it would set. Easterby argued that it was “the first, and probably the exclusive, duty of the Commission to publish the strictly public records.” While the commission wished the project well, it would continue to support the publication only “in the informal way that circumstances have opened up.”267 When Meriwether died in 1958 the question of his successor as editor and funding led to major contractual negotiations with the university. Easterby reported to the Archives Commission chairman that he had made clear to the University officials that the Archives Department desires to be relieved of all connection with the Calhoun Papers Project, but that rather than see it abandoned the department will cooperate in any way it can.

---


266 Easterby, Justification of Appropriation Request for fiscal year 1957-1958, Oct. 13, 1956, filed in Series S108004, Annual Report Drafts; and sources in the next note. The letter from Easterby states that the addition to the archives budget was made “with the approval of certain sponsors of the Calhoun Project.” The National Historical Publications Commission did not begin to make matching financial contributions to the project until 1965. My knowledge of the difficulties caused by Easterby's editorial advisory role comes from a telephone conversation with retired Archives and History Department Director Charles E. Lee in late 2007. Lee, then in Chicago, helped design the series format.

267 Minutes of meetings of Sept. 28, 1957 and Nov. 2, 1957, with attached letters from University South Caroliniana Society and Easterby of the same dates, Minutes of the Archives Commission; Memorandum from Calhoun A. Mays to the commission and director, Oct. 27, 1957, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.
The compromise agreement called for the project's editor to devote half of his time “to the editorial work for the Archives Department.”

At the beginning of 1959 Easterby hired W. Edwin Hemphill. Hemphill had earned his Ph.D. in history at the University of Virginia in 1937 and most recently had done editorial work as Director of the History Division of the Virginia State Library. In the half of his time devoted to Archives Department documentary editions, Hemphill, with assistance from Wylma Wates, worked on preparing Revolutionary War era records for publication in the new State Records of South Carolina series. In addition to the completed Provincial Congress volume, work was well advanced on two further volumes when Easterby died and a new director asked Hemphill to devote all of his time to the Calhoun Papers.

In the years Easterby was director, progress on rosters of the state's troops in the Civil War did not match the continued publication of records of the American Revolution. Soon after he took office, Easterby announced a new effort to publish a roster, but careful planning did not yield results. Noting that Salley's three volumes, the last of which had appeared twenty years earlier, had covered only seven infantry regiments, Easterby estimated that in that format it would require fifteen to twenty further volumes to complete the series. Instead of the regiment by regiment rosters, Easterby planned “an alphabetical roster of all the men who served in the various organizations” modeled on the roster that the state had published for World War I. He predicted that this revised format would require only three volumes. Francis Marion Hutson, Salley's assistant since 1936, was assigned the task of preparing the volumes. In his announcement of the new roster, Easterby praised Hutson's knowledge of the Confederate records. “No one,” he wrote, “is better prepared to arrange them for publication.” Staff oral history remembers “Mr. Hutson,” the son of a Confederate private who died in 1907 when he was seven, as “unreconstructed.”

Hutson summarized the service records of nearly 3,000 soldiers during the first year of the new regime and more than 5,000 in fiscal year 1950-1951. By the middle of 1954 Easterby had revised his estimate of the number of volumes that would be needed up to five and admitted in his printed annual report that the undertaking proved to be too difficult to be carried forward rapidly. Thus far only a part of the first volume has reached galley proof stage, and even this will require extensive revision.

With this published statement, South Carolina's long attempt to publish a Confederate roster disappeared from public view. Hutson also

---

268 Easterby to Calhoun A. Mays, Oct. 29, 1958, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.
270 There was a decade's hiatus in the department's documentary publications until R. Nicholas Olsberg was hired as editor of The Colonial and State Records. *The Journals of the General Assembly and House of Representatives, 1776-1780*, and *Journals of the Privy Council, 1783-1789*, were not completed until 1970 and 1971.
272 In 1960 Hutson showed a visiting Ohio reporter his father's Appomattox Court House parole. Clipping from *Cleveland Plain Dealer*, May 5, 1960, Series S108058, Scrapbooks of the Dept. of Archives and History.
273 *Report of the Historical Commission . . . to the General Assembly . . . 1951*, p. 15; *Report of the Historical Commission . . . to the General Assembly . . . 1952*, p. 15; and *Annual Report . . . 1954-1955*, p. 19. Hutson had gone to the National Archives in January 1951 and William L. McDowell in 1953 to try to determine if the photostats of muster rolls obtained by Salley were complete. McDowell was on his way to the Society of American Archivists meeting in Detroit. National Archives File, Alphabetical File, 1949-1961, Correspondence of the Director. After a lengthy list of missions in Richmond, Washington, and Detroit, Easterby told McDowell, then a young graduate student, “Have a good time, if the above permits.”
bore the burden of much of the routine reference work. His attempt to compile the roster from the photostats of muster rolls, the memory rolls, and other stray records that came to his attention came to naught. In early 1959 Easterby dispatched W. Edwin Hemphill to study the Confederate records at the National Archives. Both Hemphill and National Archives staff strongly argued that the compiled service records arduously produced by the War Department in the early decades of the twentieth century, not the muster rolls alone, should form the basis of any roster. Nothing had been published after ten year’s work, and Easterby thought it “unwise” to continue. Easterby transferred printing funds that were in excess of what the editorial work could use to acquire microfilm of the compiled service records. In early 1960, the Archives Commission officially authorized Easterby to discontinue the roster.274

The same workload that partially explains the end of the Confederate roster project also ended the publication of annual reports. In a preliminary report that Easterby delivered to his commission in September 1960 but did not live to complete, he regretted that “the duties of the staff were so heavy while the efforts to obtain a new building were in progress” that four printed annual reports had not appeared. Easterby had obtained permission from the State Division of Office Supplies and Printing to issue a combined report for those years and 1959-1960, but it was left undone. These reports, he wrote, were “the most effective means of securing financial support within the state and of gaining the respect and cooperation of archives agencies in other parts of the country.”275 Easterby’s earlier annual reports were a part of an arduous campaign for a modern archival program and an adequate building, but they are only one component of that story. The lapse in their issue continued after his death. The department issued no printed annual reports for the sixteen fiscal years 1955-1956 through 1971-1972.

The eight years of campaigning for a new building were such an “ordeal” for Easterby that he hoped that they could “soon be forgotten.” By fiscal year 1953-1954 the annual printing appropriation had been gradually increased to $20,000, but the ambitious publication schedules simply could not be met. Intending the documentary editions primarily for libraries, Easterby normally printed editions of only 500 copies. By fiscal year 1959-1960 six further volumes were in press but incomplete. In order that the $20,000 not revert to the state treasury, portions of that sum were regularly diverted to editorial assistance, printing of the Calhoun Papers, equipment for the new building, and the reprinting of older publications. In 1958 Easterby still projected completing the publication of the colonial records in 45 volumes by 1973. The initial plan to quickly “publish the public records of greatest research value” made what Easterby modestly called “a fairly good beginning” but came nowhere near reaching its goals.276
A Modern Archival Program

In a talk to the staff just days after he took over from Salley, Easterby reported the results of his investigations the previous summer:

Everywhere, and I mean literally everywhere, I was told that our archives department was the worst on the Atlantic Seaboard in which to work. When I asked why this was thought to be true, I was told that the building was cramped and poorly lighted; the records were in disrepair; quantities of material had not been filed; members of the staff frittered away their time, even sometimes engaging in knitting; and above everything else, there was noise—noise mainly of talking by members of the staff who insisted on giving too much help to the visiting scholar and not letting him pursue his own ends.

Easterby adroitly reassured the seven employees that there was no intention “to displace anyone on the staff.” Admitting that he was not “a trained archivist” and “must learn more before I can be satisfied with my own judgment,” he also emphasized his high goals of “a bigger building, an adequate reference library, modern equipment” and other aspects of the program ratified by the commission. Thanking them for “the kind way in which you received me,” Easterby set out to transform the staff and the institution.

Despite his reassurances to the existing employees, Easterby was a forthright manager. In March of 1951 he discussed personnel rules and a retirement policy for the staff with his commission and also had alerted them of his need to request the resignation of the last employee hired by Alexander Salley. In May he gained the commission’s approval for the firing by mail and later was relieved to report that he had not heard of “any reaction of any kind.”

The personnel rules and a resolution that “the age of seventy shall be the age of retirement of all members of the staff, the director included,” were adopted on September 22, 1951. At the next commission meeting in January 1952, two staff members who were already over seventy petitioned to continue their employment. Salley had hired Mrs. Susan R. Ball and Mrs. Susan S. Padgett almost a decade earlier in 1942. The State Retirement System allowed extensions until the age of 72. Mrs. Ball had not joined the system, thinking that would allow her to stay on after that age. Mrs. Padgett was going to be 71 by the end of the fiscal year. Easterby had consulted the secretary of the retirement system and recommended that both be allowed to stay on for one more fiscal year until June 30, 1953. The commission agreed but resolved that these two exceptions “do not alter” their rule “fixing the age of retirement at seventy years.” For years thereafter Mrs. Padgett was one of the persons to whom letter writers were directed when they needed to hire someone to do genealogical research beyond the minimal index-checking done by the staff.

One of the first external issues Easterby had to face was a sensitive question of access to records. Just months after he took office, an African American applied “for the privilege

277 Typescript of talk at Staff Conference, July 6, 1949, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.
278 May B. Meetze had been hired sometime between early 1948 and Feb. 2, 1949. James E. Hunter, Jr., and Inez Watson, editors, Legislative Manual, 1948 and 1949, (Columbia: Printed for the House of Representatives by The State Commercial Printing Co., 1948-1949), pp. 260 (1948), 251 (1949), and title pages. Copies of letters from Calhoun A. Mays to the other commissioners and Easterby, May 17, 1951; R.H. Wienefield to Granville T. Prior, chairman, other members of the commission, and Easterby, May 20, 1951; Carl L. Epting to Prior, other members of the commission and Easterby, May 18, 1951; and (quote) Easterby to G.T. Prior, July 9, 1951, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.
of consulting the records.” Easterby learned that the commission had always denied such access because of the lack of “space for separate accommodations.” In 1939 the historian John Hope Franklin had, in his own words, “created a panic and an emergency among the administrators” when he was the first African American to apply to use the North Carolina State Archives. A decade later, however, most Southern state archives had set up separate tables “for negro students.” At its October 8, 1949, meeting the Historical Commission “directed [Easterby] to make suitable arrangements for the admission of bona

fide Negro scholars,” and staff began to clear an alcove in the stacks.\footnote{281 During the 1948 veto fight Leonardo Andrea, the leading South Carolina genealogist, made suggestions to Governor Thurmond that included setting up a table “for negro students” to avoid a law suit and “a lot of unpleasant publicity.” He reported that it has already been done “in Raleigh and Richmond and all of the states I have worked in save Miss.” Andrea was an Edgefield native. Andrea to Thurmond, March 25 and 26, 1948, and enclosure, Historical Commission Incoming File, Folder 314, Incoming Correspondence of Governor J. Strom Thurmond. Minutes of the Historical Commission, Oct. 8, 1949.}

At the November Budget Commission hearing, Governor Thurmond was so impressed with the commission’s plans that he sent for Easterby the next day. Thurmond volunteered to help the commission “in any way that he could” including supporting “additional funds if the need was imperative.” By December money for shelving and boxes to clear the alcove was exhausted and work stopped. Easterby satisfied the wants of both the first African-American applicant and a second “without actually admitting” them as readers. Nonetheless he used the problem as his first argument in a lengthy letter to Thurmond seeking slightly over $1,000 from the Civil Contingent Fund to see the commission through the end of his first fiscal year. Easterby thought there would not be many Black applicants as readers but noted “that one refusal to serve a Negro can do us a great injury.” With Thurmond’s support, the Budget Commission approved the request, including $514 for shelves and filing boxes to complete clearing the separate alcove.\footnote{282 Easterby to Calhoun A. Mays, Dec. 2, 1949; Easterby to Thurmond, Dec. 10, 1949; and Easterby to Austin I. Venable, Dec. 21, 1949, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.}

In an era when state archivists were a leading force in the Society of American Archivists, Harold Easterby lost no time in becoming active in that organization. His paper on the South Carolina situation, given as part of a session on “New Archives and Archivists” at the 1951 annual meeting, was printed in the \textit{American Archivist} as well as in the \textit{Columbia Record}. By 1954 Easterby was a member of the Committee on State Records, by 1955 a member of the editorial board of the society’s journal, and in 1958 was elected to the first class of fellows, the new honorary category of membership created the previous year.\footnote{283 \textit{Columbia Record}, Nov. 15, 1951; J.H. Easterby, “The Archives of South Carolina,” \textit{American Archivist}, 15 (1952): 241-47; “News Notes,” \textit{American Archivist}, 18 (1955): 86, 19 (1956): 178-79; 21 (1958): 98-99; and 22 (1959): 124.} As his \textit{American Archivist} obituary noted, “when he became an archivist, he remained an historian.” A member of the executive council of the Southern Historical Association, 1946-1949, and of the editorial board of the \textit{Journal of Southern History} from 1947 through 1949, Easterby was elected a member of the council of the Institute of Early American History in 1952 and served on the editorial board of the \textit{William and Mary Quarterly}. He frequently was called upon to critique manuscript monographs in South Carolina history.\footnote{284 Hemphill, “Easterby,” \textit{American Archivist}, 24 (1961): 160. The “Public and Professional Relations” sections of Easterby’s printed annual reports provide a window into his continued historical activities.} His national contacts informed his work as an archivist and historian.

In November 1954 the Southern Historical Association held its annual meeting in Columbia. The roughly 500 persons in attendance were more than twice as many as when the American Historical Association came to South Carolina’s capital city in 1913. There were other differences as well. Since 1949 when the historian C. Vann Woodward saw to it that John Hope Franklin presented a paper, the association had Black scholars in attendance. Prevailing segregation patterns made that attendance difficult. In 1953 the association’s council adopted a resolution that scheduled sessions that included meals should admit Blacks. The meeting presumably came to
Columbia because it was Francis Butler Simkins's presidential year, and the dining rule apparently was honored at the Columbia Hotel. Easterby served on the local arrangements committee and was the discussant at a joint session with the South Carolina Historical Association and the South Carolina Historical Society.\textsuperscript{285}

The headlines on the Columbia newspapers during the meeting concentrated on the pledge of seven Southern governors to continue to fight for segregated schools. In his presidential address Simkins railed against those who would judge the past by the standards of the present. He touted the “school of the plantation in which the barbarian captive from Africa was Anglicized . . . and perhaps better educated in the industrial arts than those Negroes who have lived since the time of Booker T. Washington.” He held that “the color line was created to sustain the most important fact in Southern history,” the maintenance of “integrity of blood” by the “ruling race.”\textsuperscript{286}

John Hope Franklin may not have been in the ballroom of the Columbia Hotel to hear Simkins on the evening of November 12, but Harold Easterby surely was. Perhaps tempered by his Northern mentor, Harvard, and the University of Chicago, it is hard to imagine Easterby giving quite the same address. In 1959 he diplomatically handled an anonymous note excoriating his new editor W. Edwin Hemphill for “loud nigger loving talk.” In Virginia Hemphill had been a member of a Presbyterian committee that took a principled stand against “compulsory discrimination between the races.” Hemphill’s views on the practical matter of integrating South Carolina’s still segregated schools were actually very conservative. Easterby was prepared to “rise to his defense.”\textsuperscript{287}

At the end of his first year Easterby reported that procedures for the transfer of non-current records did not exist. Except for the initial transfers in late 1905 and 1906 and a subsequent influx when the commission moved to the World War Memorial Building in 1935-1936, accretions had been “negligible.” The act of 1905 gave the commission “care and custody of all the official archives of the State not now in current use,” but authority for “what records the Commission will be required to preserve and what may be destroyed” had never been determined along with “a number of other matters of a similar nature.”\textsuperscript{288} The uncertainty of the legalities of Easterby’s own appointment, left over from the fight with Salley, meant that “the various objectional provisions in several of the general appropriation bills” needed to be repealed. Furthermore, only a little more than a month after Easterby took office, a new Reorganization Commission asked the Historical Commission for a thorough report on its functions and administration. Chaired by Hartsville businessman A.L.M. Wiggins, this commission’s reports led to the establishment of South Carolina’s unique legislative/executive Budget and Control Board in 1950.\textsuperscript{289}


\textsuperscript{287} Mays to Easterby enclosing carbon of typescript note, March 31, 1959, and Easterby to Mays, April 3, 1959, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.

\textsuperscript{288} Report of the Historical Commission . . . to the General Assembly . . . 1951, p. 9. This is the report for fiscal year 1949-1950, despite the misleading title.

\textsuperscript{289} A.L.M. Wiggins to Prof. Austin L. Venable, Chairman, Historical Commission, and to Easterby, Aug. 12, 1949, and (quote) Caleboun A. Mays to Easterby, Nov. 30, 1949, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director; \textit{Journal of the House of Representatives of the Second Session of the 88th General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, Being the Regular Session Beginning Tuesday, January 10, 1950} (Columbia: Printed under the Direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, 1950), pp. 23-32. Wiggins had managed David R. Coker’s various enterprises and was also a former under secretary of the United States Treasury; Dubose, \textit{South Carolina Lives}, pp. 653-54.
Austin L. Venable, a Winthrop College history professor, was chairman of the Historical Commission in 1949. Venable asked Easterby to prepare a draft report for the Wiggins Commission. In this and in most other important issues in the Easterby years the commission also heavily relied on former state senator Calhoun A. Mays, a Greenwood attorney who represented the American Legion on the commission. No legislation affecting the Historical Commission resulted from the Reorganization Commission's reports, but some of the issues that would be central to the Archives Act of 1954 were raised.

The members of the Historical Commission readily agreed with Easterby's summary of the situation, including such indictments as the “thousands of records, particularly those of the period since 1868, . . . still heaped in three great piles on the floor of the War Memorial Building” and the fact that of “all the thirteen original states South Carolina . . . is the only one which has not printed any large part of its colonial records.” Even though they were not questions with which the State Reorganization Commission was “directly concerned,” lack of space, lack of staff, and lack of modern equipment prevented the commission from fulfilling its mission and affected “all other state agencies.”

Easterby argued that “records cannot be allowed to accumulate endlessly in the offices in which they originate” and that “the best and most economical way of caring for them would be their concentration in a central depository, or archives, where they can be reduced in bulk, arranged in their proper relationship, and made to serve the purposes for which they were intended.” He also strongly affirmed that the commission “should continue to be an independent agency, prepared to serve all on the same basis and not under the control of any one.” Independence, Easterby argued, was the greatest of “the essential features of an effective archives department.”

In a flurry of correspondence, the commission expressed differing opinions on whether they should collect private records. Easterby argued against because “the vast amount of work to be done with public records makes it unlikely that much can be done [with private records] in the future.” He noted that there were other agencies “endeavoring to meet this need” and that the example of the Library of Congress and the National Archives illustrated “the trend elsewhere. . . toward separation of public and private records.” In a compromise that recognized that it was “not always easy to draw an exact line between the two types,” Easterby proposed a statement that stressed that the “primary duty is to provide for public records” but continued to allow “the custody of private records, especially if there is danger of such records being removed from the state.”

In Easterby's first draft he included an extensive discussion of the provisos affecting the appointment of the head of the agency, but both Mays and Venable thought it unwise to call attention to the recent political battle with Salley. Mays hoped a brief mention of the need to eliminate confirmation by the state senate would suffice to “make sure that this provision is repealed in any legislation suggested.” In their epistolary conversation the commissioners debated the names for the commission, agency, and its head and discussed adding to their membership.

292 Easterby to Venable, Sept. 8, 1949, summarizing comments of “all members of the Commission,” Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.
Easterby told the chairman that it was his “understanding that at times in the past the college representatives were exposed to political pressure and that until the present members courageously asserted their independence the attitude of certain members was influenced by this pressure.” He suggested the name South Carolina Department of Archives and History as a way of avoiding the impression the current name gave that “the Commission is a sort of luxury agency, catering to antiquarians and ancestor hunters.”

In April 1950 the Wiggins committee recommended that the Historical Commission be combined with the State Library, the State Public Library Association, and the two World War I memorial commissions into a South Carolina Archives and Library Board. Easterby quickly sleuthed out the background of the proposed consolidation. The State Public Library Association, fearing merger into the Department of Education, had proposed the union as a “lesser evil.” Prof. Raymond Uhl, “a newcomer to the state” at the University of South Carolina’s Bureau of Public Administration, had devised the details of the plan. Easterby reported to his commission chairman that he found Uhl’s “whole attitude . . . thoroughly stupid.” The chairman, who was still Prof. Venable of Winthrop University, feared that inclusion of the Memorial Commission for Negroes might raise the issue of “representation of the colored on the Historical Commission.”

Easterby solicited opinions from other state archivists. Morris Radoff of Maryland noted “that one state after another is attempting to reorganize its government following the Hoover Commission work with the Federal government” and lamented the incorporation of the National Archives into the General Services Administration. “On the other hand,” he continued, “a small independent agency unless its head is politically aggressive is very liable to be altogether forgotten by the legislature.” He disagreed with Easterby’s position that South Carolina has “an ideal governing body for an archival agency,” noting that “too many historians would prejudice any archival program.”

The archivist of North Carolina, Christopher Crittenden, strongly supported independence, citing his impression “that in Virginia and certain other states” where “the library and archives are combined . . . neither functions as effectively as it would do separately.” After extensive correspondence and a special meeting of the commission that adjourned early “to permit the members to confer with members of the General Assembly,” a lengthy reply went to Wiggins. Strongly arguing for continued independence and citing the differences between libraries and archives, the rebuttal enclosed copies of the replies from outside authorities and noted that consolidation would increase rather than decrease costs.

Nothing came of the Wiggins Committee proposal. Although the prospect of consolidation
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293 Mays to Easterby, Sept. 10, 1949, and Easterby to Venable, Sept. 8, 1949, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.
294 A.L.M. Wiggins to J.H. Easterby, April 18, 1950, Reorganization Plan File, Correspondence of the Director; The State (Columbia), April 14, 1950.
295 J.H. Easterby to Austin L. Venable, April 26, 1950, Reorganization Plan File, Correspondence of the Director.
296 Austin L. Venable to J.H. Easterby, May 5, 1950, and Easterby to Venable, May 11, 1950, Reorganization Plan File, Correspondence of the Director.
297 Venable and Easterby to Wiggins, May 12, 1950, signed in type by all members of the commission, enclosing copies of Crittenden to Easterby, April 19, 1950; Radoff to Easterby, April 17, 1950, and Louis R. Wilson, School of Library Science of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, to Easterby, April 19, 1950, Reorganization Plan File, Correspondence of the Director. Historical Commission Minutes, May 2, 1950. Wilson, former dean of the University of Chicago Library School, is extensively cited in the reply.
has been raised repeatedly in more recent years, the department has remained an independent state agency.

Publication of the 1952 *Code of Laws* finally prompted the still badly needed “revision of all laws relating to the Commission and public records.” Calhoun Mays was now commission chairman and in January 1953 asked Easterby to draft a bill for the consideration of the commission.298 Easterby secured copies of archives laws from other states to add to his file and quickly prepared the draft with some assistance from University of South Carolina History Department Chairman Robert H. Wienefeld.

Amended by the commission at a meeting on February 28, the bill rapidly passed the state senate in April 1953. Senator J. Carl Kearse, who had solicited “errors and omissions in the 1952 *Code*” on behalf of the Committee on Statutory Law, introduced the bill. The only issues in the senate were the names of the commission and agency. Easterby’s draft had proposed the name South Carolina Public Record Department in order to “emphasize its primary purpose, namely, to provide for the handling of all the public records after they cease to be needed in current business.” Kearse left the Historical Commission’s name unchanged and changed the name of the agency to South Carolina Historical Record Department. Easterby thought the latter “almost as bad [a name] as the one we have.” Senator Kearse was unable to expedite passage in the House that session, so the bill remained in the House Ways and Means Committee until the following year.299

Senator Kearse was not “so much concerned with the name as . . . correcting some of the archaic provisions of the law” and wrote the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee to that effect in January 1954. By the time the Archives Act passed at the end of March, the names had been altered again to the South Carolina Archives Commission and the South Carolina Archives Department. Two other changes weakened the act. Misdemeanor penalties of not less than one year or more than five years in prison or “a fine of not more than five thousand dollars, or both” for “all public officials” who disposed of public records in any way not prescribed in the act were eliminated as was a specific provision for transfer of “all State public records of a date prior to and including the year 1865.”300 These two deletions were the product of a serious miscalculation on Easterby’s part that probably taught him a political lesson.

Before the House Ways and Means Committee considered the bill in early February 1954, Secretary of State O. Frank Thornton had gotten to some of the committee’s members with heated objections to the provision that would have removed the many volumes of colonial and early state land records from his office. In a subsequent personal meeting with Easterby, he angrily interpreted the two clauses to mean, “a state official who did not transfer his records to the Historical Commission would be put in the penitentiary.” In South Carolina the secretary of state is an elected constitutional officer. Thornton, a Clover, South Carolina, lawyer and newspaper

298 Easterby to Mays, Jan. 7, 1953, (quote) and Mays to Easterby, Jan. 10, 1953, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.

299 Correspondence between Mays, Easterby, and Kearse, Feb. 19-May 4, 1953, and Jan. 8, 1954, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director; Minutes of the Historical Commission, Feb. 28, 1953; Archives Act of 1954, R No. 804, Series S165001, Acts, Bills, and Joint Resolutions. The signed acts in this series include bills and amendments leading to their enactment.

300 Copy of J. Carl Kearse to Hon. Charlie V. Verner, Chairman, Ways and Means Committee, Jan. 20, 1954, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director; Amendments to original sections 7 and 8, Archives Act of 1954, R No. 804, Series S165001.
editor, had served a part of one term in the House of Representatives before being elected to more than a dozen years as its reading clerk. Secretary of State since 1950, he would continue in that office until 1979.301

Thornton thought the commission had “tried to slip something over him.” On February 10, Easterby belatedly wrote Thornton explaining that the secretary “should have been consulted” earlier. He explained that he had not known until recently that the bill had made its way to the House of Representatives the previous year, but glossed over his lack of prior consultation. When Easterby, as suggested by Calhoun Mays, met personally with Secretary of State Thornton on February 24, Easterby, too, was not even tempered. He told Thornton that the commission would “abandon . . . efforts to get the bill passed but . . . [would] let it be known that [Thornton] was responsible.” The threat worked. Thornton “about faced” and with the elimination of the two troublesome clauses became a supporter of the bill.302

Other than adding a representative of the South Carolina Historical Association in place of the representative of the defunct United Confederate Veterans, the Archives Act of 1954 made no changes in the membership of the commission. A simple commission power “to elect an executive officer for the department to be known as the director” solved the legal difficulties left over from the fight with Salley. In one of several phrases that Easterby borrowed from the Society of American Archivist’s 1946 “Model Bill for a State Archives Department,” the director was required to have “at the time of his election . . . the qualifications of special training or experience in archival or historical work.”303

The act’s preamble highlighted Easterby’s concern with the effective management of public records.

Whereas, the preservation and orderly arrangement of public records is an essential of good government; and,

Whereas, the increasing demands upon the various offices and departments of the government of South Carolina make it difficult, if not impossible, for them to provide efficiently and economically for the large numbers of records that have accumulated and now have little, or no, current use; and,

Whereas, experience has shown that the problems involved in selecting for preservation records of permanent value, in disposing of those that are useless, in caring for those that have been marked for preservation, in promoting their study, and in publishing those of importance can best be solved by an independent department of State government.

The bulk of the new powers authorized by the act dealt with the orderly transfer or destruction of public records.

The act repealed the 1937 act allowing transfer of obsolete county records to the University of South Carolina and empowered county officers, “with the consent of the governing body of the county and the county delegation in the General Assembly,” to transfer records “not needed in the current business of his office” to the South Carolina Archives Department. The department’s space problem was recognized in the phrase “provided the necessary space is available in the building, or buildings, assigned to the Archives Department.” The act also decreed that the commission “shall not solicit private records, but if

301 Easterby to Mays, Feb. 24, 1954, marked “Confidential,” Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director; Thornton sketch in Dubose, South Carolina Lives, p. 605.

302 Correspondence between Easterby, Mays, Thornton, and Senator Kearse, Feb. 10-24, 1954, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director. The key personal meeting is described in the “Confidential” letter from Easterby to Mays, of Feb. 24.

its services are necessary to safeguard such records it may accept, either as a gift or deposit, collections offered by their legal owners or custodians."

304

A full-fledged records management program would have to wait until the large expansion of staff in the late 1960s, but the Archives Act provided mechanisms for such a program. “Unless otherwise directed by law, all records” of defunct state agencies were ordered transferred to the Archives Department. Although the requirement for transfer of pre-1865 records was eliminated from Easterby’s bill, the act empowered state agency heads to transfer “such records as are not needed for the transaction of the current business of his office.” The qualifying phrase about having space for them had to be included until “a more suitable building can be provided.” The act also established an Archives Council, consisting of the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and the State Auditor. The council, on recommendation of the director (for records in the archives) or a state officer (for records in his custody) and after approval by the Archives Commission, could authorize the destruction of records “found to have no significance, importance, or value.”

305

The need for revision of statutory provisions for transfer of records had already been proven. In early 1952 Samuel Gaillard Stoney suggested that the South Carolina Historical Society be designated as the depository for the colonial and Charleston District Court of Chancery/Court of Equity records. Stoney, famous as a historical raconteur omnipresent around Charleston on his bicycle, was a stalwart of the society and was then serving as its president. Easterby strongly opposed the transfer. Fearing a precedent that “might result in the transfer of similar records to less responsible organizations,” Easterby felt that “a very important principle [was] involved.” Public records did not belong “in the custody of a private organization.” Since they included records from “the period when there was only one equity court in the province,” these records belonged in “the state records office.” Members of Easterby’s commission agreed with him. But both the lack of space and the 1937 act authorizing the transfer of obsolete county records to the University of South Carolina presented problems.

306

Despite the problems, Easterby proceeded with negotiations with the Charleston County Clerk of Court and the county manager. The Charleston County authorities had such a space problem themselves that they were willing to consider transferring the colonial and antebellum court records to the Historical Commission. After Easterby examined the records in early February 1953, he reported that he had never “had the pleasure of reporting to the Commission a more important matter.” When the capitol moved to Columbia in 1790, the court records had been left behind in Charleston. In addition to the Chancery/Equity records beginning in 1700, the much more voluminous Court of Common Pleas records, starting in 1703, and the less complete records of the Court of General Sessions were to be included. In all, they comprised about seven

304 Robert L. Meriwether informed University of South Carolina President Donald S. Russell of the “stop-gap” nature of the earlier act due to the “failure of the Historical Commission to make any effort to salvage papers which from time to time were thrown out of these offices and destroyed.” Russell then sent Easterby a letter “enthusiastically” supporting Easterby’s bill. Meriwether to Russell, March 1, 1954, and Russell to Easterby, March 4, 1954, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director. Easterby gives a remarkably candid, in most regards, account of the passage of the act in his Annual Report . . . 1953-1954.


306 Easterby to Prior, Feb. 19, 1952; R.H. Wienefeld to Prior, Feb. 29, 1952; and Prior to Easterby, Feb. 26, 1952, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.
tons of records or one-fifth of the volume of the records in the custody of the commission at that time.  

Easterby said little in Charleston about any problems. He did not want to discourage an agreement that he "felt sure that Charleston would never be willing to accept." Easterby got the permission of Charleston County Council and a legal statement signed by Robert L. Meriwether authorizing him on the behalf of the University of South Carolina to accept the "obsolete" records in the long room of the courthouse. Easterby, young Will McDowell, and some temporary workers packed the records in March 1953. The legal agreement said that it was "understood that the said records [were] to be transferred to the custody of the Historical Commission" once the 1937 law was repealed. The records were at first stored in the basement of the university's Drayton Hall. When that building was slated for remodeling, they had to be divided between the South Caroliniana Library and the "auditorium" or "chapel" of the World War Memorial Building with its crypt-like monument.

The transfer did not include the records in the Probate Court, which began with volumes of the Miscellaneous Records of the Secretary of the Province dating back to the late seventeenth century. Some of these were "rapidly going to pieces" and, Easterby feared, "would soon be completely disintegrated." The probate judge of the early 1950s opposed a transfer, but the appointment of a new probate judge in 1955 changed the situation. By early 1957 Easterby had gotten Judge Gus H. Pearlman's agreement for a transfer if the proposal came from the Archives Department, not the judge. In April 1959 Easterby reported that opposition in Charleston centered on four professional genealogists "more interested in the money they make than in the welfare of the records." With a new archives building and microfilm for continued local access to the most heavily used records, the Charleston probate records through to the Reconstruction Era were transferred in early 1960.

Pressed for space by his acquisition of the Securities Division in May 1960, Secretary of State O. Frank Thornton also finally agreed to the transfer of South Carolina's spectacular colonial and state grant and plat books to the Archives Department. Easterby told his commission that "the decision of the Secretary of State to place [these records] in our custody does more to increase the prestige of the Archives than any action taken by a state official since the passage in 1905 of the law which made the department an independent agency." South Carolina and Georgia were the only two of the original thirteen states that did not have effective county government in the colonial period and recorded all their records centrally. Before Easterby's death he had succeeded in gaining for the state's archives

---


308 Easterby to Senator Edgar A. Brown, Feb. 6, 1953; Easterby to State Auditor James M. Smith, April 9, 1953; and Easterby to Mays, May 1, 1953, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director; Undated agreement signed by Meriwether, Acquisition Control File, Dept. of Archives and History; Annual Report . . . 1953-1954, pp. 13-14. McDowell had only been working on a part-time basis for a few weeks, but his "temperament" particularly pleased Easterby.


all of the significant bodies of colonial records except the so-called “Charleston Deeds” from 1719 to 1785.\textsuperscript{311}

Preservation of records that were literally crumbling to bits was a key factor in the transfer of the early records from Charleston. To make matters worse, alum in the paste used to attach reinforcing silk to some of them during the Great Depression was hastening their destruction. William J. Barrow, the developer of the Barrow method of archival lamination, accompanied Easterby when he first examined the Charleston court records in early 1953. Barrow thought the records “represent[ed] the biggest job of restoration that he knows of in the United States today.” Barrow had adapted a process of the National Archives that used pressure and heat to fuse cellulose acetate sheets to reinforce documents. Barrow used a two-bath method of first a solution of calcium hydroxide and then a solution of calcium bicarbonate to deacidify and buffer the paper before fusing a thin tissue of modern paper to the document with the cellulose acetate. By 1942 Barrow had sold his patented lamination equipment to the Delaware, Maryland, and Georgia state archives and did “considerable work for the state of Virginia.”\textsuperscript{312}

Senator Edgar Brown, when he found the 1776 Constitution in 1940, had sent a questionnaire to all the original states asking about their first constitution and methods for “preservation of old documents.” The resulting survey of the status of conservation in East Coast state archives shows that many of them were still pasting silk or crepeline to deteriorated documents. It is unclear whether they recognized, as North Carolina did, that they had “not adopted the latest methods of repairing manuscripts and records because our appropriation has been inadequate to purchase the necessary equipment.” Alexander Salley, too, reported that he had “a bolt of silk crepeline on hand and I have done all the repairing heretofore except one job I gave to a woman about ten years ago.” But Salley had also heard that lamination was a superior method. With state funding provided by Brown, Salley sent South Carolina’s first surviving record book, 1671-1675; five Commons House Journals; the Constitution of 1776; the 1766-1767 plans for The Exchange; and other early records to Barrow’s Virginia laboratory for this method of treatment beginning in 1944. He hoped to buy a laminator when World War II restrictions on their manufacture were lifted.\textsuperscript{313}

From the beginning of his tenure Easterby had tried to organize a Division of Preservation and Duplication, but the commission had no equipment. He began the application of leather dressing to the many leather bindings in the holdings, but otherwise could do little. Even though records had to be carted to Capitol City Photo Copy Company on Lower Main Street to be photostated and there also was no microfilm camera, Easterby placed priority on acquiring Barrow lamination equipment. In the spring of 1952 the General Assembly appropriated the necessary $10,000 in the next fiscal year’s budget.

\textsuperscript{311} Two marriage bond books form another exception. The volume for 1732-1733 is at the New York Historical Society and the volume for 1743-1744 is at the Charleston Library Society. Both have at least partially been published or abstracted and the department has microfiche of the 1743-1744 volume.


\textsuperscript{313} Correspondence and returned questionnaires, June-September, 1940, in Edgar Brown folder, Correspondence of the Secretary, S.C. Archives; \textit{Report of the Historical Commission . . . to the General Assembly . . . 1945}, p. 5; and \textit{Report of the Historical Commission . . . to the General Assembly . . . 1946}, p. 5. All the original states except Georgia are represented in the file. For the 1944 $5,000 appropriation for “reconditioning of old documents and records” see Statutes at Large 43:1555. Salley to Barrow, May 12, 1944, Correspondence of the Secretary.
After an unsuccessful tussle to gain one of two offices in the World War Memorial Building used by the American Legion Auxiliary, existing space had to be juggled to make room for the laboratory. Barrow came to South Carolina for installation and training in late 1952 and early 1953.  

Mrs. Louise J. Caughman, whose brother was still a very powerful state senator, was unhappily filing documents from the late nineteenth century in a less-than-useful arrangement scheme. In an inspired move, Easterby had Barrow train her in his restoration procedures. Beginning with
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314 “Preservation and Duplication” sections in Report of the Historical Commission . . . to the General Assembly . . . 1951 and 1952, and in Annual Report of the Historical Commission 1951-1952; “Preservation and Repair” section in Annual Report of the Historical Commission 1952-1953. Easterby to Prior and other members of the commission, Aug. 16, 1952, with enclosed copies of letters to the American Legion Auxiliary; Easterby to Mrs. Irvine F. Belser, Aug. 18, 1952; and Easterby to Prior, Sept. 30, 1952, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director. When I came to the department in 1975 there were still large glass containers of leather dressing left over from the Easterby era; they contained benzene and had to be disposed of.
legislative journals and the Revolutionary War
audited accounts, Mrs. Caughman and a part-time
assistant, in less than a year, were handling more
than a thousand sheets of records a month. An
extensive article on the “lamination shop” appeared
in the Columbia evening newspaper, and Easterby
published an “Information Circular Number 1”
touting the method and noting that it was also in
use by the Library of Congress “and the national
archives of France, Belgium, and Brazil.”

By 1959 when a new archives building was at
last under construction, Easterby asked Barrow
about the cost of the larger laminators he was
then selling, but the department was not able
to purchase its second machine, manufactured
by a different company, until 1971. In the mid
1970s, before the department began to phase out
Barrow lamination, six full-time staff members
were treating an average of 65,000 sheets a year,
including many volumes for county officials.

Unfortunately the increased criticism of the hard-
to-reverse procedure that developed at that time
may have been prophetic. A few of the first records
in the department’s holdings to be laminated,
including the earliest surviving record book, are
now again acidic and have the characteristic odor
that is called “vinegar syndrome” when applied to
deteriorating cellulose acetate microfilm.

That “best practices” develop and change over
time is also illustrated by Easterby’s microfilm
program. Even though he had no microfilm
camera, Easterby began to implement a part of
the commission’s fourth goal: “encourage the
microfilming of all local records of outstanding
value.” Private enterprise had already opened this
field, and Easterby quickly reached an agreement
with Mormon genealogists for a more extensive
program at no cost to the state.

In 1948 the Southern Microfilm Company
opened for business out of a headquarters in
Stateburg, a village near Sumter, South Carolina.
The firm convinced local governments of the need
for security microfilming of essential records, a
measure that Anne King Gregorie’s Committee
on Conservation of Cultural Resources had
recommended in 1942. When the Charleston
County Legislative Delegation approached
Easterby about housing the negatives of the
land, assessment, probate, and other records
that Southern Microfilm had filmed for them,
Easterby eagerly began a security deposit program
for microfilm. The Charleston delegation also
provided a locked microfilm cabinet, and, on the
morning of March 15, 1950, the secretary of the
dlegation began to arrange the first 500 reels
of deposit microfilm. In the deposit agreement

315 What were called “Mrs. Caughman’s blue boxes” were finally resorted prior to the move to the Archives and
History Center in 1998. They had been filed, ten items to a folder, without regard to creating agency and with only
the beginning and end dates noted on each folder. Retired staff member Wylma Wates once told the author that it was
like “a light bulb being turned on in Dr. Easterby’s head” when he came up with idea of training Mrs. Caughman to do
lamination. The annual reports that were published through fiscal year 1954-1955 give details of what was laminated,
quantities, and cost estimates. Copies of the information circulars are in Record Set of Agency Publications. Columbia
Record, Dec. 9, 1952, p. 11B.

316 Easterby to Barrow, March 9, 1959, and Barrow to Easterby, March 12, 1959, Alphabetical File, 1949-1961,
Correspondence of the Director. The second laminator was purchased from the Arbee Company of Barnardsville, New
File, South Carolina Department of Archives and History. The North Carolina state archives also acquired Barrow
equipment and was one of the last to abandon lamination.

317 Difference in supplies used rather than the passage of time might be involved in the more advanced deterioration
of some of the earliest lamination. See Barrow’s contribution to the “Lamination Symposium” cited above. Figures and
lists of laminated records are available in Dr. Gietschier’s report, which was prompted by alarm over acid migration
into laminated documents from housing that was or had become acidic, and in the annual reports that resumed
Easterby worked out, the Historical Commission had “the right to use the films for purposes of research provided that precautions are taken to prevent damage” and the right to have positive copies made from the negatives for deposit elsewhere.\textsuperscript{318}

In a state subject to natural disasters and increasingly conscious of the danger of the “mushroom cloud,” off-site storage of security microfilm made a strong argument. Southern Microfilm Company camera negatives were soon coming in from a number of other counties and the City of Charleston. Use of camera negatives on readers is forbidden in more recent preservation standards. By 1960 the South Carolina security deposit agreements had changed to include making a “duplicate, or positive, copy . . . for its own collection” if “more than occasional use becomes desirable.”\textsuperscript{319} From these modest beginnings, the department’s security deposit system for microfilm has grown to a current total of nearly 300,000 reels.

Within months of taking office Easterby was in negotiations with the Genealogical Society of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (now the Genealogical Society of Utah). Because of their belief in the efficacy of baptism of the dead, Mormons have a special interest in genealogy. The society had already microfilmed pre-1865 county court house records of genealogical value in Maryland and Delaware and was at work in North Carolina, Virginia, Connecticut, and Pennsylvania. The society’s practice was to gain the assistance of “State Archivists, Secretaries of State, and Historical Societies or Commissions” and to provide one free positive copy to the custodian of the records. If county or state officials did not want to deposit these positive copies with the state archives, then another copy could be provided “at the nominal charge of 3¢ per foot.” Easterby arranged that copies of microfilm made in South Carolina that were going to be retained locally went there through the Historical Commission, strengthening the commission’s role in encouraging and arranging the filming.\textsuperscript{320}

On September 11, 1950, the society’s “photographer” William Koehler began work on “the first films made by the Genealogical Society in this state,” the Marriage Settlements, 1785-1889, at the World War Memorial Building. Before the end of the fiscal year on June 30, 1951, records from eleven counties, the grant and plat books in the Secretary of State’s office, and further records in the custody of the Historical Commission had been filmed for a total of 260 reels.\textsuperscript{321} The Mormon photographer was content to microfilm Depression-era typescripts of colonial probate records still in Charleston. Noting that the transcripts were “very imperfect,” Easterby insisted that the silked original manuscripts also be filmed. Although these volumes required “special effort,” this filming preserved the images of some portions of original recordings that no longer survive in the original books. By June 1954, when the Utah filming was discontinued for a time, over 700 reels of microfilm had been acquired in this

\textsuperscript{318} Easterby to Calhoun A. Mays, March 15, 1950, Archives Department File, and Easterby to Hon. Lionel K. Legge, House of Representatives, April 5, 1950, Charleston Microfilm Project folder, Alphabetical File, 1949-1961, Correspondence of the Director.

\textsuperscript{319} Receipts of security film through 1955 are noted in the annual reports and include, in addition to Charleston, Bamberg, Hampton, Newberry, Orangeburg, Spartanburg, Sumter, and Williamsburg counties; Easterby to R.D. Blanding, Clerk of Court, Sumter, March 4, 1960, Microfilming of Local Records folder, Alphabetical File, 1949-1961, Correspondence of the Director.

\textsuperscript{320} Archibald F. Bennett, General Secretary, to J.H. Easterby, Oct. 21, 1949 (quotes), and Easterby to James M. Black, Film Editor, March 23, 1953, copies in Acquisition Control File, South Carolina Department of Archives and History.

\textsuperscript{321} Annual Report of the Historical Commission . . . 1952, pp. 7-10; quote from Easterby to James M. Black, July 3, 1950, Acquisition Control File.
way. Filming resumed at the end of 1955 for a few years as it did again in the early 1960s and yet again from 1998 through 2006. In this way large quantities of records that would not otherwise be available centrally in Columbia were secured, and the images of some records that are now missing were preserved.

Easterby was proud of his microfilming efforts and used them to his advantage. When he invited the Budget and Control Board to have their meeting in the World War Memorial Building on October 31, 1950, the commission did not even have a reader. Easterby borrowed one for the occasion. At the meeting he used microfilm as an entrée to discuss “the whole problem of records management” and the need for “a suitable building.”

Coordinating the Mormon microfilming took considerable effort. Before the home rule constitutional amendment of 1973, South Carolina counties were run by their legislative delegations. Not only was it convenient to deal with the delegations in Columbia, it provided useful legislative contacts. When Easterby went to the Barnwell County Court House in October 1950 “to check up on the microfilm work in progress there,” he made a point of visiting Senator Edgar Brown. Brown was already a strong proponent of microfilming his county’s records, but Easterby left his office encouraged by friendly support for his program.

In 1951 the commission purchased a microfilm reader and began to use microfilm as a research tool as well as a preservation tool. Information Circular No. 2, issued in 1953, provided a careful preliminary inventory, arranged by provenance, of the film then available in Columbia. The commission had acquired microfilm of the 1830, 1850, and 1870 federal population censuses from the National Archives and the Census Bureau and would continue to add film of other essential federal records. The circular included the negative security deposit film, noting the permission “to use the films for research.” It marked with an asterisk positive film of records physically in the custody of the commission and noted that this film could “be borrowed by institutions in which they will be of service in forwarding serious research projects.” The previous year’s annual report had announced a plan to issue other inventories of groups of records in the holdings. The loan program for microfilm proved impractical and was discontinued in a little more than three years.

Promised updated inventories of microfilm, indeed further inventories of any sort during the Easterby years, were casualties of a workload that did not allow fulfillment of ambitious goals.

In 1953 the commission acquired its own microfilm camera. Easterby planned to use microfilm to publish “records that may be said to have high research value but are too voluminous to be printed and also . . . those records which are scheduled to be printed but cannot be issued in the near future.” The State Library had transferred the manuscript federal agriculture, industry, social statistics, and mortality census schedules,

322 Easterby to James M. Black, Film Editor, May 8, 1952, Acquisition Control File. Easterby’s published annual reports give detailed listings of the filming through 1954. The Acquisition Control File includes work reports and transmittals through the 1960s. Archives and History staff brought the records to Columbia for the most recent work, as opposed to the on-site filming done earlier. Genealogical Society of Utah volunteers also did some arrangement work during the recent effort, primarily estate files from 1865 to 1916 and marriage records from 1911 to 1950. The society is now going digital in its record collecting.

323 Easterby to J.M. Smith, State Auditor, Oct. 20, 1950; Easterby to Granville T. Prior, Oct. 25, 1950; and Easterby to Gov. J. Strom Thurmond, Nov. 1, 1950, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.

324 Easterby to Prior, Oct. 18, 1950, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.

325 Annual Report of the Historical Commission . . . 1952, pp. 6-7; List of Publications of the South Carolina Archives Department, February 1, 1957, p. 5.
1850-1880, to the commission in 1950. William L. McDowell, Jr. started filming these schedules in late 1953 and completed them the following year.

Easterby then had McDowell film the thirty-one volumes of the British Public Record Office transcripts that Salley had not published in lithographic facsimiles. Easterby planned to issue the latter in letterpress volumes. In his September 1955 preface to the microfilm he noted, “the rapid development of microphotography” made “it feasible to collate the handwritten copies with the originals before their publication in permanent form.” Easterby’s preface also referred the user to A Manual to Accompany the Microfilm Edition for “more detailed analysis and description.” Neither the manual nor the letterpress edition of the transcripts ever materialized. For a time the department was willing to rent copies of the microfilm of the special census schedules and the transcripts of British records to other institutions. In the early 1970s both of these groups of records were microfilmed a second time as the first two of the more formal microcopies published by the department.326

Sometimes the value of a project for research outweighed Easterby’s emphasis on public records. The prime example was a joint project for the microfilming of South Carolina’s colonial newspapers. The Charleston Library Society’s holdings of eight South Carolina newspapers, 1732-1782, were unmatched anywhere. The society made arrangements to borrow originals from the State Historical Society of Wisconsin and obtain photocopies or microfilm from other institutions to fill in missing issues. Easterby agreed to supply McDowell’s services as microfilmer and the use of the department’s camera. The society met all the other costs, including McDowell’s travel expenses; did all the detailed bibliographic checking; and supplied one copy of the resultant 12-reel microfilm publication at a reduced price. For two years beginning in August 1954 McDowell and the department’s camera made intermittent trips to Charleston. A mass of correspondence marked the complications of this joint project, but Easterby wrote in a draft annual report, “It is doubtful that the department will ever be associated with a more important project.”327

Inter-institutional efforts to make records available, however, had not always struck Easterby so positively. When he took office, Easterby did not know of the microfilming that had been done by the Illinois Historical Survey and the William Sumner Jenkins project. When in the fall of 1949 he found out that this microfilm was going to be offered for sale, he was quite upset. Reflecting the then-more-prevalent view that repositories should control access to their holdings, Easterby unsuccessfully tried to intervene. As a service to scholars Easterby was soon noting the availability of the Jenkins film through the Library of Congress, but he still considered the Commons House journals a South Carolina priority. Despite the fact that they were already available from the Library of Congress, in 1955 he turned the department’s microfilming efforts to the unpublished Commons House journals with the goal of making them available for sale or rent in that form while editing continued.328

---

326 List of Publications . . . February 1, 1957, pp. 5 (quote), 25-27; Information Circular No 3, Your State’s Records, p. 22. In a Nov. 21, 1959, letter to Mr. R.F. Schaupp, Chief Librarian, Eastern Illinois Library, Alphabetical File, 1949-1961, Correspondence of the Director, Easterby still promised a manual and wrote that it was “bad policy to issue any kind of publication before it is completed.” The Bureau of the Census had transferred the special census schedules to the State Library in 1919.

327 Preliminary annual report for 1955-1956, pp. 10-11, Annual Report Drafts; Charleston Library Society file, Correspondence of the Director.

328 Minutes of the Commission, Oct. 8, 1949; Easterby to Chairman Austin L. Venable and members of the commission, April 11, 1950, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director; Preliminary annual report for 1954-1955, p. 13; Preliminary annual report for 1955-1956, pp. 10. Easterby had obtained the Allston Papers for the South Carolina Historical Society with the provision that they would not be open to other researchers until he published his book.
A photostat machine was finally purchased in 1955 but had to be stored in the lobby until the overflowing World War Memorial Building could be juggled to accommodate it. At last in early 1956 the state’s records no longer had to be trundled through the streets to be photocopied for researchers. Easterby had begun keeping reference statistics when he took office. Although he recognized the fallible nature of the figures, he estimated that in the first six years of his tenure in-person research visits has quadrupled and mail queries had increased by over 40%. Easterby’s correspondence shows none of the exasperation with naïve “ancestor-hunters” reflected in Salley’s, but rather reflects an effort to make routines more efficient.

Revolutionary War and Confederate service records continued to comprise a large portion of the reference workload. Mary Belle Crawford had replaced Harriet Clarkson as the agency’s clerical worker in 1948 and would have a nearly quarter-century tenure. In addition to typing up floods of replies, Crawford also handled routine Revolutionary War queries that could be answered by way of the card file index prepared in the Salley era. The 1929 Confederate pension law required, as does the current code of laws, giving “full information as to the service in the Army or Navy of any soldier, sailor or militiaman as it appears on the Confederate rolls.” The Confederate service abstracts that Francis Hutson provided had come to have much more to do with genealogy and membership in the Sons of the Confederacy than widow’s pensions. To this day the department still provides free abstracts of Confederate service.

Continuity, as well as improvement through technology, is striking in the reference area. After Salley retired, the Depression-era typescripts of wills were quickly transferred to the commission from the South Caroliniana Library. Hutson provided brief abstracts of these heavily used will transcripts in addition to his abstracts of Confederate service. Easterby’s policy was to provide these abstracts for only a few wills per query, but the names and relationships in the abstracts were intended to aid researchers in deciding which of the transcripts they needed to have photostated. A half century later, the will transcripts are still heavily used. The Mormons had microfilmed the Charleston transcripts, but those for the other counties, which were separately indexed, became so tattered that a number of copies retained in counties had to be borrowed when the department produced a formal microfilm edition in the late 1970s. Today these transcripts are available digitally on the department’s website, linked to an every-name index.

The small staff could only look into a few readily searched indexes for most genealogical mail queries. Miss Crawford repeatedly typed and retyped names and addresses of genealogists who could be hired until form responses that included a duplicated list of genealogists were instituted in 1958. Initials at the bottom left of replies indicate

---

329 Annual Report . . . 1954-1955, pp. 7, 10, 17-18; Easterby to Miss Dorothy Sterling, April 5, 1956, Alphabetical File, 1949-1961, Correspondence of the Director. Easterby told Sterling, then working on her biography of Robert Smalls, that he would not charge her for the photostats he sent since they were just starting the use of the machine and had not established prices.

330 Crawford is listed in the Legislative Manuals from 1948 through 1972. The work of the various staff members, with photographs, was included in the coverage of the department in conjunction with its acquisition of the Barrow laminator in Columbia Record, Dec. 9, 1952, p. 11B.


332 Routine queries in the Alphabetical File, 1949-1961, Correspondence of the Director, have been heavily weeded out, but all items in the file for Sa-Sd were retained as a sample. On the will abstracts, see, for example, F.M. Hutson, to A.Y. Satterfield, Dec. 5, 1951; Brimelow and Wates, South Carolina Will Transcripts, p. 4.
that Easterby himself prepared a surprisingly large percentage of the answers to queries and did not simply sign responses prepared by others for his signature. The dismal state of arrangement of the records is also often cited in the outgoing correspondence. The lack of space in the World War Memorial Building prohibited doing much about that as it prevented much else.

**The Long Crusade for a New Building**

In a two-part television program about the Historical Commission in 1953, J. Harold Easterby estimated that he had to keep about half of the records already transferred to the commission “in dead storage.”\(^{333}\) Easterby used every opportunity that presented itself to publicize the commission’s program and needs, but the campaign for a new building was a protracted ordeal. The Archives Building, at the corner of Senate and Bull streets, was finally occupied in January 1960, a little less than a year before Easterby’s death.

The uncertain status of the World War Memorial Building and the possibility that the $100,000 appropriation made for it in 1919 could still be drawn upon clouded the beginning of Easterby’s crusade. At the end of his first fiscal year in office, Easterby recommended construction of “a warehouse in which to store the records that are causing the greatest congestion in the state office buildings.” Easterby thought that a thorough survey of “non-current records in the various state offices” and clarification regarding the World War Memorial would be needed before “definite plans” for “an adequate archives building” could be made. He hoped that it might be connected to the existing building so that the space there could be used.\(^{334}\) The efficiencies offered by records management would continue to be a central theme of the campaign for more space, but South Carolina did not acquire a records center for temporary off-site storage of modern records until 1964. The Division of General Services, not the archives department, operated the state’s records center until 1973.\(^{335}\)

The World War Memorial Building did not even have thermostats and thus was badly overheated in winter. “Air conditioning” consisted of opening windows facing two dusty, busy streets. Although thermostats were installed in 1950, the building had not been well maintained. The attorney general’s opinion of April 1, 1952, that the Columbia World War Memorial Commission was defunct and that the Historical Commission had full control of the building allowed serious planning to proceed. In September 1952 Easterby mailed a questionnaire about records management needs to ninety-four state agencies. Analyzing the replies that were received from thirty-six state agencies, Easterby concluded “that a building capable of housing 40,000 cubic feet of records would, without additions, meet the records needs of the state for a period of five years.”\(^{336}\)

---

\(^{333}\) The programs were presented on Television Station WNOK on Oct. 29 and Dec. 19, 1953. The script was then printed as Information Circular No 3, *Your State’s Records*. Quote at p. 19.


\(^{335}\) Report of the State Budget and Control Board, Division of General Services, to the General Assembly of South Carolina For the Period Ending June 30, 1967 (Columbia: Printed under the Direction of the State Budget and Control Board, [1968?]), pp. 32-34. The state’s Central Microfilm Unit was also initially operated by the Division of General Services until it was transferred to the Department of Archives and History in 1974.

\(^{336}\) Easterby, Report on the World War Memorial Building and the Need for a New Records Building, November 1952, pp. 10-11, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director. Copies of the questionnaire (which had “Basic Rules of Records Management” and “Advantages of a Records Management Policy” on its verso); floor plans and illustrations of the Memorial Building; floor plans of the proposed building; and Easterby’s Bulletin No. 13, *The Study of South Carolina History*, were included with the report.
Easterby visited the National Archives, the Virginia State Library, and “the two recently constructed state archives buildings in Maryland and Delaware” and consulted noted South Carolina architects J. Carroll Johnson and Albert Simons. He then prepared a lengthy report for his commission to submit to the Budget and Control Board. Easterby's sketches of floor plans for a new building, which resemble the building that was eventually built, consisted of a core of five levels of records storage stacks surrounded by three levels of office, storage, and work areas. One wonders if there are not echoes of the Cold War in the “maximum of protection” provided by the interior location of the archival stacks. Storage areas in the exterior of the building were apparently to serve the function of the warehouse that had not been built. The site, Easterby argued, should be “within reasonable distance of the State House, the state office buildings, and the University” and sufficiently large for expansion of the building. The building itself “should not be of the monumental type.” Easterby estimated that the building and its fixtures would cost $350,000.

Easterby's report was submitted to the Budget and Control Board in November 1952 and printed in the Permanent Improvements section of that board’s January 1953 budget report to the General Assembly. Much of its prose was incorporated into the commission's annual report for fiscal year 1951-1952 and repeated again with photographs in the report for the following year. In early February 1953, Easterby used the occasion of the negotiations over the major transfer of records from Charleston to call the report and the need for a building to the attention of Senator Edgar Brown. “I can find temporary storage space somewhere,” he wrote, “but to allow these records to remain long in storage will be worse than to leave them in Charleston.”

A few days later Easterby noticed in the newspaper that Richland County Representative George H. Davis had proposed a committee to study providing more space for the Confederate Relic Room, then housed in the State House, and to possibly turn it into a more general museum. With Historical Commission Chairman Calhoun A. May’s approval, Easterby quickly asked the House Ways and Means Committee Chairman to consider combining the needs “to provide more ample quarters for the Confederate Collection with that for a larger building to house the state's records.”

Easterby’s attention to Senator Brown resulted in an unexpected hearing before the Senate Finance Committee on March 10, 1953. A horrible example from the deteriorated Charleston records that Easterby brought with him captivated the committee. Brown told Easterby and Chairman Mays that they “could not expect a building this year, but that something would be done about it in the near future.” Mays, as he always did when he came to Columbia from Greenwood, lobbied a variety of other legislators. The new building would ultimately include the Confederate Relic Room, but “the near future” became seven more

---


338 The South Carolina State Budget For the Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1954, Submitted by the State Budget and Control Board (Columbia: Printed under the Direction of the State Budget and Control Board, 1953), pp. 490-95. Easterby to Brown, Feb. 6, 1953 (quote); Brown to Easterby, Feb. 12, 1953; and Easterby to Brown, Feb. 13, 1953, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.

339 Easterby to Mays, Feb. 19, 1953; Mays to Easterby, Feb. 21, 1953; Easterby to Charles F. Verner, Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Feb. 24, 1953; and Easterby to Davis, Feb. 24, 1953, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.

340 Easterby-Mays Correspondence, March 8-14, 1953, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director. Quote from March 13 letter from Easterby to Mays.
years. In the meantime the friendly support of the state auditor briefly offered hope of immediate action.

James M. (Jim) Smith had been state auditor (and ex-officio chair of the Budget Commission) since the office was created in 1933. He gained additional power in the 1950 reorganization of state government that created the Budget and Control Board. In addition to directing the Finance Division of the board, Smith served as the board’s secretary. Easterby’s successor as archives director, Charles E. Lee, regarded Jim Smith as “the single most powerful man in state government” because of “his intimate knowledge of how things worked.”

In February 1952 Governor James F. Byrne’s wife was preparing a folder on the history of the Governor’s Mansion. Easterby consulted State Auditor Smith about records of purchases. In the course of conversation “the care of recent records naturally came up.” Smith complained of the problem of finding records and “said that steps were being taken to build additional storage rooms in the basement of the State House.” Easterby immediately latched onto this to promote the Historical Commission as the proper agency “to solve the problem.” Easterby met with Col. Wyndham M. Manning, former de facto head of the moribund World War Memorial Commission, to promote the plan of expanding the World War Memorial Building using the 1919 appropriation. Although the attorney general’s opinion a few months later killed the expansion idea, State Auditor Smith became an advocate of the Historical Commission.

In June 1953 Smith approached Easterby to inform him that one million dollars was available to convert the basement of the State House to a parking garage and erect a building for the state’s records, including those stored in the State House basement. Easterby told Calhoun Mays that the information was highly confidential, but reported that State Treasurer Jefferson B. (Jeff) Bates had already gained the endorsement of Governor Byrnes. State Auditor Smith advised Easterby that the Historical Commission should “look at once into the matter of a site for the new records building.” Calhoun Mays, a former state senator, remembered that the senator who had initiated the parking proposal had not spoken of “underneath the State House but underneath the State House grounds.” “Nevertheless,” he wrote, “with a million dollars lying around, it is a mighty good time to present our needs for a new records building.”

With Mays’s blessing, Easterby and University of South Carolina History Department Chairman Robert H. Wienefeld quickly settled on the southwest corner of Senate and Bull streets, then a residential property, as an ideal site. They then met with State Auditor Smith, who now cautioned, “We still had a long campaign ahead of us in order to gain approval by the General Assembly.” In November Easterby met with State Treasurer Bates to get his advice on how to most effectively present the case for a new building to the legislature. Bates confirmed that he had suggested to Governor Byrnes that “$500,000 of the earnings on state investments now in the state treasury” be committed to an archives building and that the governor was interested. Bates planned to get others “who had influence with the Governor” to remind him of the matter. The “confidential” plan included inviting Governor Byrnes to deposit the papers of his long career with the commission.


342 Easterby to Mays, June 5, 1953, and Mays to Easterby, June 6, 1953, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.
Bates was “using the argument with the Governor that a handsome records building would be a memorial to his administration.” Byrnes sent a polite noncommittal reply to Easterby’s invitation to donate his papers. The plan to have Byrnes propose the new building to the 1954 legislature came to naught. Help supplied to the next governor with records in the State House basement would be a factor in the eventual success of the protracted campaign for a new archives building. The underground parking idea would lie dormant until the late 1960s.

Treasurer Bates urged Easterby to “do as little as possible in the next few months to solve the problems created by lack of space . . . [and] to emphasize the impossible situation that we face.” Actually the situation had gotten worse, not better, in the months before the conference with Bates. The basement of the Wardlaw Building at the University of South Carolina had proven unsuitable for storage of the Charleston court records, and renovation plans for that building required their immediate removal. Easterby could think of no other solution than stacking many of these records in the window alcoves of the memorial chapel. The American Legion Auxiliary, which had been using the two offices on that floor since the American Legion moved its offices out to the Woodrow Wilson house, strongly objected to the placement of the records and questioned its legality. In an August 28, 1953 opinion Attorney General T.C. Callison confirmed the Historical Commission’s authority over use of the building. Screens that Easterby had built to hide the records palliated the auxiliary.

Easterby had been reluctant to completely take over the chapel but that eventually had to be done even though the effort was “only a makeshift, for the space acquired is only a small fraction of what is needed.” In December 1955 and January 1956 the interior of the World War Memorial Building was given a badly needed coat of paint; a booklift was added; and electrical wiring, shelving, and furniture put in the chapel. The chapel became “a much more comfortable” reading room, and “great numbers of records formerly stored in the South Caroliniana Library” could now be stored in the building. Almost three months of staff time, however, was lost in the shifting of records. “Many records [were] still stored in other places, [and] many in the building [were] virtually inaccessible.” Easterby wondered if the “temporary expedient” was worth the $6,000 and staff time spent on it.

In the midst of these renovations on December 22, 1955, Easterby gave the annual banquet address of The New England Society of Charleston, S.C. Held on the anniversary of the day that the Pilgrims landed at Plymouth, he ended his address with an agenda for South Carolina history. The agenda’s first item was a proper archives building, but the little speech did much more. Easterby used a quote from William Bradford as his title: One Small Candle May Light A Thousand. He began by asking whether South Carolina’s founders were worthy forebears “in advancing the great principles on which this country is organized.

343 Easterby to Mays, July 11 and Nov. 6, 1953; Easterby to Byrnes, Nov. 7, 1953, and Byrnes to Easterby, Nov. 9, 1953, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director. Many of Byrnes’s papers as governor are now in the state archives, but the bulk of the documentation for his long career is at Clemson University. Bates, who had been State Treasurer since 1940 and would serve in that office until his death in 1966, had previously served in both the House of Representatives and state Senate. Biographical Directory of the South Carolina Senate, Vol. I, pp. 107-9.

344 Easterby to Mays, July 11, 1953, and subsequent correspondence with commissioners, the American Legion Auxiliary, and Attorney General Callison, through to an Oct. 25, 1953, letter from auxiliary department president Hazle G. Gorman stating that it “is an honor to have these priceless records and Documents stored in the lovely Shrine and chapel, which we are permitted to use,” Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.

today.” He did not gloss over a number of hard questions in his eloquent brief summary of the colony’s early history. Slavery, he said, “may justly be called their one great mistake.” Despite “their faults,” he argued, “the founders of this state were fit to light a candle.”

The address raised the issue of why the state’s history had been neglected and suggested beginning “at once” to plan for the state’s tricentennial in 1970. More immediately, the address could be used to promote better housing and care for the state’s public records, which, “in contrast to our private papers, are numerous and, it may be added, of exceptionally good quality.” Printed in the Congressional Record, the address was also published as an elegant small pamphlet with funds provided by the College of Charleston. Julian Boyd, the editor of The Papers of Thomas Jefferson and a South Carolina native, thought so highly of the pamphlet that he gave one to Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter. Frankfurter thought Easterby “shrewdly because unobtrusively . . . preached understanding and therefore reason to his fellow South Carolinians.”

Easterby planned a special exhibit and reception for the “redecorated” World War Memorial Building as another step toward a proper archives building. The exhibit was partly to counteract “word [that was] getting about that we have solved our building problem.” Easterby wanted to demonstrate the positive things that were being done and to use the now even-more-packed first floor to demonstrate the terrible problem of lack of space. Individual invitations for “The Great Documents of South Carolina History” were placed on the desks of all the members of the General Assembly and mailed to the governor and other state officials, copies of the New England Society address were mailed to the members of the General Assembly, and endorsements from the South Carolina Historical Association and other organizations were gained. Plans included introducing in the legislature the following day a resolution to create a Tricentennial Commission and a “bill to appropriate funds for a new building.” The exhibit went forward on the evening

---

346 J.H. Easterby, One Small Candle May Light A Thousand (Charleston: Published by the College of Charleston for The New England Society of Charleston, S.C., 1956). The pamphlet is not paginated. On slavery he also wrote: “But, in spite of their fears and contrary to their better judgment, they continued to import the Negro and thereby compel men of different races and different levels of civilization to live together. In so doing, despite the incidental good that may have been accomplished, they created such a problem for both races that its solution is still the greatest concern of their descendants.”

Representative Burnet Rhett Maybank, Jr., and eleven co-sponsors introduced the Tricentennial resolution as planned on February 22, but the initiative for a new building was again postponed. Twelve days before the exhibit opening, State Treasurer Bates informed Easterby that he had consulted “several members of the Senate Finance Committee” and all advised against trying to get General Assembly approval of “appropriation of his surplus for a records building” at that time. As “the need for money is so great this year,” they feared that if the hush-hush surplus was “brought to light, it will be taken for another purpose.” Treasurer Bates was willing, however, to do what Commission Chairman Mays and Easterby thought best. While Easterby was still inclined to think that the commission could make its need evident, Mays and Clarence Legerton, who represented the South Carolina Historical Society on the commission, thought it best to take Bates’s advice. Legerton, the owner of an old book, stationery, and office equipment firm in Charleston, had good political connections and was then vice-chairman of the commission.349

Easterby thought it important to at least go forward with the Tricentennial Commission, feeling that the “whole affair is going to be a fizzle if we do not propose definite action of some kind.” He hoped that the next year the Tricentennial Commission would report, “a building is greatly needed.” Representative Maybank, son of the former Charleston mayor, governor, and United States Senator, had been in the audience for the New England Society address. He was elected lieutenant governor two years later in 1958. Easterby’s address had included a six-point plan for promoting the state’s history before 1970, but the Tricentennial Commission itself had been Maybank’s idea. With amendments, his joint resolution passed in March 1956.350

In addition to the archives building, some other items on Easterby’s agenda would eventually come to pass such as a state archeologist, the study of the site of the first permanent English settlement at Old Charleston, and publication of the papers of Henry Laurens. Others like completion of “the publication of our colonial and state public records in accordance with plans now in progress” and a multi-volume history of the state were not fated with success. The Tricentennial Commission authorized in 1956 had at least one meeting in September of that year, elected Maybank chairman, and announced that it would be active in support of a new archives building. It then fizzled. After the commission was finally activated under the terms of an amendment passed a decade later in 1966, the Archives Department and Easterby’s successor as

348 Easterby to Mays, Jan. 23, 1956 (first quote), and undated Order of Events (second quote), Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director. Easterby also consulted Treasurer Bates on the plans in a Feb. 1, 1956, letter. At that point he thought he could obtain Archivist of the United States Wayne C. Grover for the event. The Sumter Daily Item of Feb. 23, 1956, published a lengthy description of the items exhibited. Newspaper coverage for this period can be conveniently consulted in Series S108058, Scrapbooks of the Dept. of Archives and History, 1949-1999.

349 Journal of the House of Representatives of the Second Session of the 91st General Assembly (Columbia: Printed under the Direction of the State Budget and Control Board, 1956), p. 463 (House Bill 2130); Easterby to Mays, Feb. 9, 1956; Mays to Easterby, Feb. 11, 1956; and Legerton to Easterby, Feb. 11, 1956, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director. Legerton had also been a textile engineer. He died at age 76 on August 22, 1958. Obituaries can be found in the News and Courier (Charleston) and The State (Columbia).

350 Easterby to Maybank (greeted as “Dear Burnet”), Feb. 17, 1956 (quotes) and Easterby to Mays, March 15, 1956, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director. Maybank, Jr., is in Biographical Directory of the South Carolina Senate, Vol. II, pp. 1085-86. While he served in the House of Representatives from Greenville, he moved back to Charleston after his defeat for governor in 1962.
director, Charles E. Lee, would play a central role in its activities.\textsuperscript{351}

A Confederate War Centennial Commission brought more immediate action. Union County Senator John D. Long and Aiken County Representative John Amasa May were leaders in establishing the commission. Formed by a joint resolution of the legislature in February 1959, May became its chairman and chief driving force. Elected vice-chairman, Easterby quickly saw to the publication of a list of \textit{Military and Naval Operations in South Carolina, 1860-1865}, that Nora Davis had compiled during her historical marker work more than a decade earlier. Preoccupied with his building campaign, Easterby’s role in the centennial commission seems to have been largely limited to rendering advice.\textsuperscript{352}

Easterby suggested the name for the commission and told Senator Long that although South Carolina should cooperate as much as possible with the national Civil War Centennial Commission, “Civil War” was “a name which many of us do not approve.” He noted the “deplorable situation” of the Confederate Museum and Relic Room and the failure “to persuade the custodian that modern methods of exhibiting should be adopted.” To avoid the moribund condition of the Tricentennial Commission, he recommended a small paid staff and favored an emphasis on publication, archival, and museum work that would have “permanent value” rather than an excess of ephemeral celebrations. Mrs. Joan Reynolds Faunt, daughter of the state librarian, became the commission’s secretary. With Representative Mays, she published brief biographical sketches of members of the South Carolina Secession Convention in a volume that also reprinted key secession texts. At the commission’s opening “state-wide assembly” and luncheon in the Jefferson Hotel in June 1959, Senator Long defended segregation. Easterby did not live to see the difficulties and negative publicity that policy would cause when the national commission met in Charleston in 1961.\textsuperscript{353}

The 1956 exhibit brought few direct results, but the next year at last saw legislative authorization for a new archives building. When Governor George Bell Timmerman, Jr., strode into a joint legislative session at noon on January 9, 1957, he carried a text that placed an archives building first on his list of recommended construction projects. Timmerman began what we now call the “State of the State” address with illustrations of the bright hope that atomic energy brought for the future. He held up a slug of uranium and a year-old steak preserved solely by exposure to radiation to extoll the Atomic Age. The Savannah River Project had supplied both props.

But the state also had “contrasting dark-age conditions.” The first of these on his list was the “inadequate housing” for the state’s rich archives. Citing the state treasurer, he assured the legislature that the state could safely spend

---


\textsuperscript{352} Joint Resolution No. 313, \textit{Statutes at Large}, 51:587-91. Long had been instrumental in hanging the Confederate battle flag in the Senate chamber two years earlier. May, an ardent neo-Confederate, had served in the House from Aiken County since 1935. For a biographical sketch of Long see Bailey, Morgan, and Taylor, \textit{Biographical Directory of the South Carolina Senate}, Vol. II, pp. 949-50.

Timmerman’s advocacy had its origins a year and a half earlier. On July 1, 1955, Charles H. Wickenberg, Jr., a journalist who was now Governor Timmerman’s executive secretary, wrote Easterby about the records in the Governors’ Office storage rooms in the State House basement. Easterby and Will McDowell joined Wickenberg in touring the two storage rooms the next day and then “had a long and pleasant talk” with the governor. Wickenberg believed the rooms were a serious fire hazard. On Easterby’s recommendation, old newspapers, obsolete stationery, and other junk were thrown out, clearing enough room to box and arrange the records. In less than two weeks Easterby could report to his commission

We have made considerable progress in arranging the records in the Governor’s Office. Col. [Wyndham] Manning [long-time head of the Central Correctional Institution] has assigned us two prisoners to help with this work. One is a former Commander in the United States Navy and the other has had service in the General Assembly and as a Master in Equity. They are therefore well qualified for the work, and thus far have shown great interest in it. I might add that as they committed their crimes in Charleston, I find that I, personally, have much in common with them.355

The timing for the opportunity to make a case with the governor couldn’t have been worse. State Auditor Smith had granted a month’s extension in using up the department’s current printing account, but Easterby felt he had to demonstrate the need for a central records repository. The storage rooms were found to contain records of all the governors from 1911 (Blease) through Byrnes. Timmerman officially transferred the records to the Archives Department, but they had to “remain in their present quarters until space is provided in an archives building.”356

State Treasurer Bates was the key figure behind the scenes in turning this work into a gubernatorial endorsement. It must have helped

---

354 Journal of the House of Representatives of the First Session of the 92nd General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, Being the Regular Session Beginning Tuesday, January 8, 1957 (Columbia: Printed under the Direction of the State Budget and Control Board, 1957), pp. 75-76, 80-81. Timmerman noted that the World War Memorial had been built without state funds. See also The State (Columbia), Jan. 11, 1957.

355 Wickenberg to Easterby, July 1, 1955; Easterby to Wickenberg, July 5, 1955; Easterby to Mays, July 6, 1955 (first quote); and Easterby to Mays, July 15, 1955 (block quote), Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director. The Wickenberg Papers are at South Carolina Political Collections, University of South Carolina. Herbert J. Hartsook, director, kindly forwarded the draft finding aid, which includes a good biographical sketch.

that Easterby’s secretary and bookkeeper Mary Belle Crawford was Bates’s long-time “girlfriend.” In preparation for the 1957 legislative session, Easterby and Commission Vice-Chairman Clarence Legerton consulted Bates. At the commission’s Budget and Control Board hearing on November 12, 1956, Bates reported that he would ask the House Ways and Means Committee to report out a bill to use the Bonded Debt Sinking Fund surplus to build an archives building. Charles Wickenberg consulted with Easterby, and Treasurer Bates had a personal conference with Governor Timmerman.357 With the governor’s endorsement, Bates’s plan to use the surplus moved forward. Easterby and Mays had supplied Representative Martha T. Fitzgerald of Richland County with a draft bill. Without their knowledge, Representative Fitzgerald added a provision that the Confederate Relic Room also be quartered in the building. The day after the governor’s address, she and twenty-seven co-sponsors introduced a bill to “erect an Archives Building to house the Archives and Confederate Relics of the State.”358

Easterby and his commission did not want “to be saddled with the Confederate Relic Room” but thought it unwise to voice opposition. Easterby attended a meeting of the officers of the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) two weeks after the bill’s introduction. Instead of the expected vote of appreciation for not opposing their inclusion in the bill, the officers “delivered an ultimatum to the effect that they would support the Bill only if we agreed that the Relic Room should have the amount of space which they considered necessary.” Representative Fitzgerald, the first woman elected to the House of Representatives and herself a member of the UDC, tried to reassure Easterby. “She said,” Easterby reported, “These women give me a hell of a time.” Treasurer Bates, who also thought the commission had “to go along with the Relic Room proposal,” told Easterby that it might be possible to increase the amount of the appropriation so as to not cramp the archives.359

Easterby, Mays, Legerton, and other commissioners mounted a massive campaign in support of the bill. A flood of letters to historical and patriotic organizations, state legislators, newspaper editors, agency heads, and others went out. Editorials and an endorsement by the Archivist of the United States were printed in the Columbia newspapers, and many in-person contacts brought positive results. The House Education and Public Works Committee quickly sent the proposal out as a committee bill with a unanimous vote. The bill passed the house without opposition. Treasurer Bates successfully appealed to the Senate Finance Committee for amendment upward from $350,000 to $400,000. Governor Timmerman signed the bill into law on March 14, 1957.360

Unfortunately, $400,000 was not enough. A committee composed of Bates, Easterby, and University of South Carolina President Donald Russell to look into a site for the building had been in place since 1955, but President Russell missed

---

357 Correspondence between Easterby, Mays, Legerton, and Bates, Sept. 18-Dec. 27, 1956, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director. See also Easterby to Wickenberg, Dec. 5, 1956, and Jan. 7, 1957, Alphabetical File, 1949-1961, Correspondence of the Director. I have found no documentation for the relationship between Bates and Crawford, but several retired staff members have told me about it.


360 Items from Jan. 1 through March 12, 1957, especially Easterby to Mays, Jan. 17 and March 1, 1957, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director; The State (Columbia), Jan. 31 and March 1, 1957; Columbia Record, Jan. 28, 1957; Statutes at Large, 50:131; Manuscript Act No. R176 (H1131), Acts, Bills, and Joint Resolutions.
a scheduled meeting in early 1956 and failed to respond to messages left with his staff. With their vague hope of university land dashed, costs rose. Within weeks of the passage of the Fitzgerald bill, the commission was in negotiation for a lot at the corner of Senate and Bull Streets, the same site that Easterby and Professor Wienefeld had selected in 1953. On March 30, 1957, Chairman Mays appointed Vice Chairman Legerton, Easterby, and Wienefeld as the building committee with powers to continue negotiations for the site and to select an architect.

On the opposite corner from the Columbia Museum of Art, the selected site had for many years been occupied by the large home of E.L. Wingfield, a pharmacist. Used as the temporary quarters of the Richland County Library from 1950 to 1952 while their new building was being constructed, by 1957 the Wingfield home had been torn down. The lot was now used for parking. Just at this time the Columbia Planning Commission was touting the Senate Street area as a civic center for expansion of “governmental, educational, and cultural activities.” Although narrow, the site was less than a block from the University of South Carolina and two blocks from the State House. The commission also acquired the property behind the Wingfield corner to allow room for expansion. At a total of $89,000, the site cost about three times what Easterby had expected to pay. In April 1957 the commission ratified the building committee’s choice of Columbia architect G. Thomas Harmon. When Harmon presented plans to the commission in September, his estimate of costs was $464,490. The commission resolved to refer the plans to the Budget and Control Board and ask them for a supplemental appropriation.

Neither Easterby nor Mays particularly liked Harmon’s design for the exterior of the building. As Easterby told Harmon, in architecture he had “a conservative outlook which favors the traditional.” Harmon’s almost Soviet-modern design also required setting the building back forty feet from the sidewalk to provide “the proper perspective,” sacrificing some of the space for expansion. But Easterby had given Harmon considerable “free rein.” Time was also of the essence. Though not finally approved, the plans were used at a hearing before the Budget and Control Board on October 31, 1957. Although initially reluctant, the board voted to recommend the additional $200,000. Easterby had told Harmon that he would leave the final decision on the building’s design to the Archives Commission. At a November 2 meeting the commission carefully considered the plans and a model and approved them. They delegated the details to Easterby.

---

361 Mays to Easterby, Jan. 24, 1956; R.H. Wienefeld to Easterby, Jan. 26, 1956; Easterby to Mays, Jan. 27, 1956; Charles L. Anger to Easterby, Jan. 28, 1956; and Easterby to Mays, Jan. 30, 1956, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.
362 Minutes of the Archives Commission, March 16 and April 6, 1957.
365 Minutes of the Archives Commission, April 27 and Sept. 28, 1957; The State (Columbia), Nov. 3, 1957.
366 Easterby to Mays, Oct. 2, 1957; Easterby to Harmon, Oct. 28, 1957, and Easterby to Legerton, Nov. 9, 1957, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director; Minutes of the Archives Commission, Nov. 2, 1957. Before the Sept. 28 commission meeting, Easterby had shown the preliminary plans to State Treasurer Bates and State Auditor Smith, and both “were apparently very much pleased”; Easterby to Mays, Sept. 11, 1957.
In one of the addenda to his annual message, Governor Timmerman threw his support behind the additional $200,000, which was included by unanimous vote in the House Ways and Means Committee appropriation bill. A part of a bond issue that also covered other items, the provision stayed in the bill without difficulty. By early April 1958 the General Assembly had passed the next fiscal year’s appropriation, and the commission was assured of the additional funding.\(^{367}\)

A further eight months would pass before dirt was “flying fast at the corner of Senate and Bull Streets.” Easterby had consciously tried “not to be stubborn about the design of the building,” but felt that too much emphasis had been placed “on the esthetic features” rather than the function of the building. Easterby was deeply frustrated by the impediments to necessary work imposed by “the almost useless monument” in which the archives was located and the energy that had to be put into the long battle to acquire an adequate building. Harmon wanted to clad the building in pink marble, but Easterby feared it would “be dubbed ‘the marble hall’ in the same spirit that has caused the War Memorial to be called ‘the tomb.’”\(^{368}\)

Despite assistance from his associate William J. Keenan, Tom Harmon did not meet the July 15 deadline for submitting the final plans to State Engineer D.F. Frick. By August 14 Easterby was so angry that he wrote Mays suggesting that “we take steps toward cancelling our agreement with Mr. Harmon” if the plans were not complete in a few days. The plans arrived at the State Engineer’s Office the next day. When bids were opened at the end of September, the low bid from Atlantic Building Corporation of Columbia was too high to allow the bidding alternatives that included marble for the exterior, and limestone was substituted. State Auditor J.M. Smith and the state engineer approved the other downward adjustments that were needed. In the end, Easterby felt they had “lost nothing essential in the building” and gotten “rid of a number of frills that would have hurt us.” Auditor Smith looked out for the archives in other ways. By the time excavation started at the end of October 1958, the Budget and Control Board had bought a third property behind the building site for a parking lot and eventual expansion of the building.\(^{369}\)

Fourteen months would pass before the state engineer accepted the building as “substantially complete” on December 30, 1959. Easterby’s handling of the details of construction proved something of a nightmare. He realized he was probably “causing many headaches by watching daily the work on the archives building but I just can’t keep away from it.” State Auditor Smith allowed the use of almost $22,500 from the regular 1958-1959 and 1959-1960 appropriations for equipment purchases, freeing the building money for change orders in the construction. Finding “a little money here and a little there,” Easterby reported, “is a maddening undertaking.” It was the cause, he admitted, of “much ill feeling” with the architect and contractor. He might have added “with the interior designer.” Jack Scoville’s selection of Danish modern for most of the furniture doubtless was not exactly consistent with

---

\(^{367}\) Timmerman’s message as printed in the Columbia Record, Jan. 15, 1958; Legerton to Easterby, Jan. 16, 1958, and Easterby to members of the commission, April 7, 1958, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.

\(^{368}\) Handwritten draft of Easterby to Harmon, [late March or early April, 1958], Series S108321, Notes and Correspondence Concerning the New Archives Building; Easterby to Mays, Nov. 4, 1958, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director (dirt is flying).

\(^{369}\) Easterby to Mays, Aug. 14, Aug. 16, Oct. 7 (quote), Oct. 29, and Nov. 4, 1958, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director. The State (Columbia), Sept. 24, 1958. Easterby consulted the Charleston sculptor Willard Hirsch about the window grills and other decorative elements, but many of them were eliminated due to cost and Hirsch was not hired. The architectural firm provided the design for the palmetto tree window grills. Easterby to Hirsch, Aug. 12 and Oct. 1, 1958, and Hirsch to Easterby Aug. 13 and Sept. 25, 1958.
Easterby’s taste. It is telling that commissioners had to “urge strongly” that the architect and his wife be included in the receiving line at the reception in the new building for Governor Fritz Hollings, former Governor Timmerman, the legislature, and other officials held on April 19, 1960.⁷⁷⁰

The Confederate Relic Room did not begin its move into the building until June 30, 1960, and still was not complete and open to the public nearly six months later. Chairman Mays had some hope in 1957 that the United Daughters of the Confederacy (UDC) might prefer the World War Memorial Building. Easterby talked with Mrs. J.S. Land, the custodian of the relic room, who confirmed that although her salary was paid by the state, the collection belonged to the Wade Hampton Chapter of the UDC. In her entry in the Legislative Manual Mrs. Land noted that the relic room on the third floor of the State House was particularly interesting to “the soldiers of Fort Jackson, who show a great deal of interest
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⁷⁷⁰ Easterby to Mays, Jan. 2, 1960, and Feb. 11, 1960, C.E. Cauthen to Mays, with copy to Easterby, March 28, 1960, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director; Easterby to Daniel F. Frick, State Engineer, April 24, 1959 (“causing many headaches”), Notes and Correspondence Concerning the New Archives Building; Preliminary annual report for 1959-1960, p. 7.
in the uniforms and guns.” Nothing came of the idea of placing the collection in the World War Memorial Building until it was moved there from the Archives Building when the Archives Building was doubled in size in 1970-1971. 371

One large room on the main floor of the Archives Building was assigned to the relic room. The responsibility for preparation of the space and moving the collection fell on Easterby and his staff. Easterby called upon his friend Milby Burton, director of the Charleston Museum, to design the exhibits and arranged for a Tapps Department Store designer to install the items in the cases. Easterby felt there was “little hope” that the relic room would be “effectively administered unless its management is placed definitely in the hands of the [Archives] Department.” In December 1960 after Easterby was seriously ill, Will McDowell and others worked evenings to complete the installation. 372

An End and a Beginning

The staff began to move the state’s records into the South Carolina Archives Building in January 1960. Starting with a station wagon and the records in the World War Memorial Building, the move would take many months. After a time the Boineau Moving Company largely supplanted the station wagon. Records in the custody of the department were housed in a dozen different places, none of them air-conditioned and many of them grossly unsatisfactory. Because they could not get the fumigating cabinet to work, “a method of fumigation recommended by the Health Department” was used. By September the majority of the public records stored in the South Caroliniana Library; the colonial and antebellum records from Charleston Probate Judge’s Office; the George Bell Timmerman gubernatorial papers and the governors’ records, 1911-1955, in the two store rooms in the State House basement; the legislative acts, 1927-1946, and miscellaneous records in the Office of the Secretary of State; and the Burnet R. Maybank Papers in the College of Charleston gymnasium had joined the records that had been crammed into the World War Memorial Building in the new building on Senate Street. The state’s unmatched collection of land records in the Secretary of State’s Office was next on the list and already prepared to be moved. 373

When Easterby wrote his September 1960 report on the movement of records into the new building he was already quite ill. Will McDowell would have to be in charge of the remainder of the move. Records of the State Treasurer in the State House basement, cancelled bank notes and other State Treasurer’s records on deposit at the Citizens and Southern Bank in Columbia, and the records in an old warehouse at the corner of Lincoln and Lady Streets followed the land records to Senate Street. Two different seafood firms had used the warehouse before it was acquired by the state in 1940. The records of the South Carolina Dispensary, which had been turned over to Alexander Salley in 1913, were among the records moved out of the “Fish House.” Proud as he was that he had “doubled, possibly trebled” the archives holdings with the recent transfers, Easterby knew they required a massive amount of work if they were to be ready for “effective use.” 374

Among all these records, nearly two hundred cubic feet of senatorial and personal papers
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371 Mays to Easterby, March 19, 1957 and Easterby to Mays, March 21, 1957, Correspondence of the Director; Legislative Manual, p. 281.
372 W.L. McDowell, Jr., to Mays, Dec. 17, 1960, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director; Preliminary annual report for 1959-1960, p. 10.
373 Easterby to Mays, Feb. 11, 1960, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director; Preliminary annual report for 1959-1960, pp. 3-4.
of Burnet Rhett Maybank were something of an exception. Easterby, with the permission of Chairman Mays and other commissioners, had begun negotiations with Maybank’s son about these papers in early 1957. College of Charleston President George Grice had asked Easterby’s help after it became clear that the college could not adequately house or care for them. Easterby argued that the papers were “virtually public records” and endangered. The acceptance of the papers of such a prominent public official, Easterby thought, might also “increase support of our building campaign.” In 1979 the Archives and History Department transferred the non-gubernatorial Maybank Papers back to the College of Charleston, which by then had a special collections department and a professional archivist.³⁷⁵

Less than five months into Easterby’s tenure as director, the Rev. William Way wrote his friend to congratulate him on the “real progress” Easterby was making. Way, who represented the South Carolina Historical Society on the Historical Commission, cited Easterby’s accomplishments and emphasized, “Do not work yourself to death.” Unfortunately Easterby almost literally did work himself to death. A planner who set very high goals and also set high quality standards, he never had sufficient staff to do all the work that needed to be done. In November 1958 when construction of the Archives Building had at last begun and a variety of other problems had been solved,

³⁷⁵ Easterby to Mays, Feb. 5, 1957 and subsequent replies from commissioners, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director. For the 1979 transfer, handled by the author of this history, see the Acquisitions Control File. The Maybank Papers also included 27 cubic feet retrieved from the garage of the Maybank home in Flat Rock, North Carolina, after Easterby’s death.
Calhoun Mays wrote a congratulatory letter to Easterby. Mays wrote,

You are an accomplished diplomat and lobbyist as well as archivist. I am sure that I was put on the Commission because of my supposed qualifications as a lobbyist. From that standpoint, I am no longer needed, since I must take second place to you in that respect.376

Although Easterby took pride in the new Archives Building, he was worn out. In the fall of 1959 his commission gave him a two-month leave of absence with pay on the advice of his physician “that he was much in need of rest.” In spite of Chairman Mays's instructions to Easterby’s secretary Mary Belle Crawford, “If you see Dr. Easterby hanging around, please tell him for me to get out,” he took little of the vacation. Bad weather drove Easterby and his wife Winnie home from the mountains, and he was soon back in the office.377 By the end of September 1960, however, Easterby’s health had declined to the point where he had no choice. At their meeting on September 24 the commission renewed the offer of leave with pay and appointed William L. McDowell, Jr., acting director during his absence and assistant director on his return. Easterby’s physician sent him to the hospital six days later, where he was diagnosed with an ulcer.378

Easterby himself had talked about the appointment of McDowell with J.M. Smith in his role as Secretary of the Budget and Control Board after the September 24 commission meeting.

Smith promised to try to get Budget and Control Board approval of McDowell’s appointment. Easterby had advised McDowell not to accept the position without an increase in salary. If McDowell was not promoted, Easterby planned to resign and return to the College of Charleston. Earlier in the year the college had given him an honorary doctorate. Easterby told his secretary, on whom he relied, “The doctor tells me I cannot get rid of the ulcer until I have changed my habits of work and worry. There is no use dragging around the department and accomplishing nothing.” For a time Easterby stayed with a childhood friend on Folly Island while his wife tended to her sister, who was at death’s door in North Charleston. By the middle of October he told Miss Crawford he was beginning to feel better and thought, “If I could throw away the medicine and smoke a couple packs of cigarettes I would be all right.”379

Chairman Mays and Will McDowell could rely on “our friend, Mr. Smith,” who had cleared McDowell’s appointment as acting director. Mays told McDowell that he was pleased with the way he kept things “well in hand.” In early November Easterby was still preparing appropriation request materials for Miss Crawford to type, but later in the month he was back in the hospital for more x-rays. Mrs. Easterby reported, “The very mention of the Archives problems makes ‘Harold’ panicky.” By December 15 Dr. Miller reported to Chairman Mays that Easterby was “not doing well.” Within a week of a diagnosis of cancer, Easterby died on December 29, 1960, at the age of 62.380

376 Way to Easterby, Nov. 12, 1949, and Mays to Easterby, Nov. 5, 1958, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director. Way expressed the identical sentiment about work to Easterby Sept. 5, 1949.
378 Mays to J.M. Smith, Secretary, State Budget and Control Board, September 30, 1960, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director. Easterby kept the commission’s minutes and apparently never prepared them for the September 24 meeting.
379 Easterby to Mays, Sept. 29, 1960, Easterby to Mary Belle Crawford, Oct. 11 and Oct. 18, 1960, Archives Department File, Correspondence of the Director.
The obituary in the *Columbia Record* called Easterby a “modest, even shy man,” but lauded “the Archives building with its records in order and safety and his publications of records” as the “monuments” he left behind. William D. Workman, then the capital correspondent of the *Charleston News and Courier*, noted Easterby’s “dry wit and dogged determination.” Governor Hollings, who referred to Easterby’s election as a fellow of the Society of American Archivists, called him “one of our most dedicated public servants.” The tributes poured in. The Archives Commission ended its own resolution with the Latin “si monumentum requiris, circumspice.” The epitaph of Sir Christopher Wren in St. Paul’s Cathedral in London, this translates as “If you seek his monument, look around.” Alexander Samuel Salley, Jr., and J. Harold Easterby were very different men in very different times, but both men built their monuments out of the public records of South Carolina.\(^\text{381}\)

---

\(^{381}\) Obituaries in the *Columbia Record*, Dec. 29, 1960; *The State* (Columbia), Dec. 30, 1960; and (by William D. Workman) the *News and Courier* (Charleston), Dec. 30, 1960. Other tributes can be found in Scrapbooks of the South Carolina Department of Archives and History and the minute book of the commission. A concurrent resolution of the General Assembly, introduced by Representative John Amasa May, passed on Jan. 25, 1961.

J. Harold Easterby’s successor as director, Charles E. Lee, erected a substantial edifice on the foundations that had been laid by his predecessors. Appointed in 1961, Lee served as director for 26 years until his retirement at age 70 in 1987. Unlike Salley and Easterby, Lee was not a native South Carolinian, but his Asheville, North Carolina, family were close friends of the Meriwethers. At a time when his North Carolina birth was probably a liability, Lee truthfully could jest that he had been conceived in South Carolina during a visit by his parents. He also had earned his bachelors and masters degrees in history from the University of South Carolina and had worked as an editor at the University of South Carolina Press in the early 1950s. Lee served in the navy during World War II, completed all but his dissertation for a Ph.D. at the University of Chicago, and was working for the Chicago publisher Henry Regnery and Company at the time of his appointment.

The South Carolina Archives Department had only thirteen employees in 1961. The late 1960s and early 1970s brought spectacular growth. A full-fledged records management program for both state and county records was one focus of that growth. Initially the department’s records managers did the inventorying and scheduling while the General Services Division of the Budget and Control Board managed a records center and a microfilming operation for modern state agency records. The latter functions were transferred to the department in 1973 and 1974. Although it was only a decade old, the Archives Building was doubled in size in 1970-1971. Pre-1900 records from many of the state’s forty-six counties were centralized in that expanded building in the 1970s. Faced with local resistance to further transfers, at the end of that decade more emphasis was placed on microfilming the earliest records still in the state’s courthouses. The Public Records Act of 1973 as amended in 1990 and 1995 authorizes general schedules for common record series and increases penalties for unlawfully removing or damaging government records.
The department became more involved with state-wide historical matters with the founding of the Confederation of South Carolina Local Historical Societies in 1964. It staffed many of the confederation's efforts, including its annual Landmark Conference held in varying locations around the state, and also played a major role in the state's tricentennial celebration and the bicentennial of the American Revolution.

The federal historic preservation program authorized by the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 was added to the department in 1969. A decade later the historic preservation staff at the department numbered sixteen and brought in as much as a million-and-a-half dollars a year in federal funds for preservation. In these early years of the program, preservation planners in each of the state's ten regional councils of government were supported with a part of the federal funds.

To reflect its expanded role, in 1967 the agency's name was changed to the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, and two governor's appointees were added to its governing commission. Governor Richard W. Riley used the latter provision to appoint the first African American to the commission in 1979. 1985 legislation added the chair of the Department of Political Science and History at predominately Black South Carolina State College to the commission as the fifth ex-officio member representing state-supported colleges and universities.

Except for continued support for *The Papers of John C. Calhoun* and completion of two Commons House journals that were already in press when
Easterby died, documentary editing lapsed in the early 1960s. With the appointment of a young Ph.D. candidate as editor of the Colonial and State Records Series in 1968, this publication work resumed. A series of formal microfilm editions with separate printed pamphlets modeled on the microcopies of the National Archives was added, and, beginning with the report for fiscal year 1971-1972, publication of annual reports also resumed. In 1967 the department expanded the hours the reference room was open to seven days a week, including evenings.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s major resources were devoted to item-level indexing of heavily used or particularly valuable record series. Using the SPINDEX software developed by the National Archives, the department prepared computer output microfilm indexes to the spectacularly rich loose papers of the antebellum legislature, to plats for colonial and state land grants, to colonial court records, to transcripts of antebellum wills, to Confederate pension applications, and to a variety of other records. At that time this labor-intensive, item-level work was considered archival heresy. In recent years this descriptive data, converted to on-line software, has been the backbone on which the department has provided world-wide access to digital images of some 60,000 documents in the archival holdings.

When the department's records managers, records center, and microfilm services moved to new quarters in a renovated warehouse on Blanding Street in 1977, twenty records analysts were working with state agencies and counties in inventorying and scheduling records. Six additional staff members processed and microfilmed local government records, and a further eight employees provided micrographics services to state agencies. A further portion of the Blanding Street warehouse was dedicated to records center storage in 1986, doubling capacity to 100,000 cubic feet. The department's much-reduced cadre of records managers and microfilm services are now housed with the rest of the staff at the Archives and History Center. The records center itself now has a staff of only three persons, but it and the other records management programs still save the state some $800,000 a year in cost avoidance measures.

In his years as director, Charles Lee was active on the national scene. The only person who has ever served as president of both the Society of American Archivists and the National Association of State Archives and Records Administrators (now the National Association of Government Archives and Records Administrators) as well as the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, he was instrumental in the campaign to add a grant program for records work to the National Historical Publications Commission. Lee spoke of himself as a “cultural politician.” In 1974 the Society of American Archivists, of which he was a fellow, awarded the department its highest institutional award, the Distinguished Service Award. At that time the department's staff included 117 state-funded positions.

The budget reductions that have troubled the last two-and-a half decades began before Lee retired. By necessity, they have led to the elimination of some programs and less labor-intensive procedures in other areas. The department's support for The Papers of John C. Calhoun project was terminated at the end of June 1982 in a state appropriation reduction. Training others to do work once done by department staff and changed tactics like general records schedules for common records have at least partially alleviated the effects of a drastically reduced staff. Federal grants through the National Historical Publications and Records Commission and the National Endowment for the Humanities have allowed the department to address new challenges like records that have to be maintained in electronic formats.

Closing the reference room on Mondays in 1991 still left the department with the most reference access hours of any state archives, but further reductions have been more harmful. Ten forced downsizings since 1990 caused the end of a nearly century-old documentary editing program in 1995, the elimination of all evening and weekend reference hours in 2002, and ever-increasing reliance on...
earned and federal funds to keep essential programs operating. Grants from the South Carolina State Library and reallocation of existing resources have allowed a digitization program for archival records since 2002. Two additional reference staff positions included in the 2007-2008 state appropriation temporarily allowed the restoration of Saturday reference hours, but further reductions again forced their elimination in January 2009.

A successful campaign to obtain the twenty-and-a-half million dollar Archives and History Center was the high point of George L. Vogt’s eight years as the department’s director. Selected as Charles Lee’s successor by the Archives and History Commission in a nationally advertised search, Vogt came to the department in 1987 with a Ph.D. in history from the University of Virginia and previous service as director of the records program of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC). During Vogt’s years as director, the department emphasized outreach programs including document packets for use in the schools, illustrated historical booklets aimed at a broad audience, and an active State Historical Records Advisory Board. The board, the state arm of the NHPRC, makes subgrants to repositories of private records and to local governments and seeks to improve a broad range of the state’s historical documentation.

The Archives and History Foundation, a private fund-raising organization established as part of the drive for a new building, raised two million dollars toward equipping the Archives and History Center. The center, for the first time in three centuries, provides fully adequate temperature and humidity controls for the storage of the state’s archival records and allows all of the department’s staff to work in one location except for the staff manning the records center. A 1992 National Endowment for the Humanities grant began the process of creating series level catalog entries in the standard MARC format for the holdings. An eighth-month intensive effort in 1997-1998 to prepare the records for moving to the new Archives and History Center gained series and container level control for the entire holdings. This catalog data is now available on the department’s website in Re:Discovery software.

Dr. Vogt left the department in 1996 while the new building was under construction to become director of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. In early 1997 Rodger E. Stroup became the agency’s fifth director. A University of South Carolina Ph.D. historian, Stroup brought the National History Day program with him from his former position as Director of Collections and Interpretation at the South Carolina State Museum. In May 1998 the new Archives and History Center on Parklane Road, eight miles north of city center, was opened. Since then, the education role of the department has further expanded. In 2001 the first of several federal Teaching American History grants brought a program to train middle and secondary school teachers under the wings of the department.

The department’s role has significantly expanded since the death of J. Harold Easterby in 1960. With half the staff it had at its peak in the late 1970s, the department still has reason to celebrate its achievements. One of the best sets of government records of any state is under remarkably better physical and intellectual control; the state’s rich heritage of historic sites is increasingly well-cataloged and protected; and the department is a participant in a major inter-state cooperative effort to preserve “born digital” electronic records.

The department marked its centennial in 2005 with a three-day jointly-sponsored conference on the state’s history. The South Carolina Historical Society, which was celebrating its sesquicentennial, had been a leading force in the establishment of the department. The South Carolina Historical Association, founded by the same historians that were behind the modernization of the department six decades ago, was 75 years old. Under a general title of “To Collect and Preserve,” papers by leading historians were given. Most of those historians had long worked in the records in the state archives, the Palmetto State’s memory which the staff proudly seeks to preserve.
Publications of the South Carolina Department of Archives and History

**Documentary Editions**

**Legislative, Constitutional, and Executive Journals**

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Journal of the General Assembly of South Carolina, March 26, 1776-April 11, 1776* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1906)


A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Journal of the Grand Council of South Carolina, April 11, 1692-September 26, 1692* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1907)

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina for the Four Sessions of 1693* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1907)

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina for the Session Beginning January 30, 1696, and Ending March 17, 1696* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1908)

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Journal of the General Assembly of South Carolina, September 17, 1776-October 20, 1776* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1909)

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina for the Session Beginning November 24, 1696 and Ending December 5, 1696* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1912)

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Journals of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina for the Two Sessions of 1697* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company; 1913)

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Journals of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina for the Two Sessions of 1698* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1914)


A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina for the Session Beginning October 30, 1700 and Ending November 16, 1700* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1924)

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina for the Session Beginning February 4, 1701 and Ending March 1, 1701* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1925)

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina for the Session Beginning August 13, 1701 and ending August 28, 1701* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1926)
A.S. Salley, Jr. indexer, *Journal of the Convention of South Carolina Which Ratified the Constitution of the United States, May 23, 1788* (Atlanta: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by Foote & Davies Company, 1928) [Facsimile of original manuscript; reprinted, without the index, 1988, for the United States Constitution Bicentennial Commission of South Carolina]

A.S. Salley, indexer, *Journal of His Majesty's Council for South Carolina, May 29, 1721-June 10, 1721* (Atlanta: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by Foote & Davies Company, 1930) [Facsimile of transcript]

A.S. Salley, editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina for 1702* (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1932)

A.S. Salley, editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina for 1703* (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1934)

A.S. Salley, editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina, March 6, 1705/6-April 9, 1706* (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1937)

A.S. Salley, editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina, November 20, 1706-February 8, 1706/7* (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1939)

A.S. Salley, editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina, June 5, 1707-July 19, 1707* (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1940)

A.S. Salley, editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina, October 22, 1707-February 12, 1707/8* (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1941)

A.S. Salley, editor, *Journal of the Senate of South Carolina, January 8, 1782-February 26, 1782* (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1941)

A.S. Salley, editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina, November 20, 1695-November 28, 1695* (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1943)

A.S. Salley, editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina, June 2, 1724-June 16, 1724* (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1944)

A.S. Salley, editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina, For the Session Beginning February 23, 1724/5 and Ending June 1, 1725* (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1945)

A.S. Salley, editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina, November 1, 1725-April 30, 1726* (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1945)

A.S. Salley, editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina, November 15, 1726-March 11, 1726/7* (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1946)


A.S. Salley, editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina, November 8, 1734-June 7, 1735* (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1947)

A.S. Salley, editor, *Journal of the Commons House of Assembly of South Carolina, January 8, 1765-August 9, 1765* (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1949)
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Charles E. Cauthen, editor, *Journals of the South Carolina Executive Councils of 1861 and 1862* (Columbia: South Carolina Archives Department, 1956)

J.H. Easterby, editor, and Ruth S. Green, assistant editor, *The Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, September 10, 1746-June 13, 1747* (Columbia: South Carolina Archives Department, 1958)

William Edwin Hemphill, editor, and Wylma A. Wates, assistant editor, *Extracts from the Journals of the Provincial Congress, 1775-1776* (Columbia: South Carolina Archives Department, 1960)

J.H. Easterby, editor, and Ruth S. Green, assistant editor, *The Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, January 19, 1748-June 29, 1748* (Columbia: South Carolina Archives Department, 1961)


William Edwin Hemphill, Wylma Anne Wates, and R. Nicholas Olsberg, editors, *Journals of the General Assembly and House of Representatives, 1776-1780* (Columbia: Published for the South Carolina Dept. of Archives and History by the University of South Carolina Press, 1970)

Adele Stanton Edwards, editor, *Journals of the Privy Council, 1783-1789* (Columbia: Published for the South Carolina Dept. of Archives and History by the University of South Carolina Press, 1971)

R. Nicholas Olsberg, editor, *The Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, 23 April 1750-31 August 1751* (Columbia: Published for the South Carolina Dept. of Archives and History by the University of South Carolina Press, 1974)

Terry W. Lipscomb and R. Nicholas Olsberg, editors, *The Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, November 14, 1751-October 7, 1752* (Columbia: Published for the South Carolina Dept. of Archives and History by the University of South Carolina Press, 1977)

Theodora J. Thompson, editor, and Rosa S. Lumpkin, assistant editor, *Journals of the House of Representatives, 1783-1784* (Columbia: Published for the South Carolina Dept. of Archives and History by the University of South Carolina Press, 1977)

Lark Emerson Adams, editor, and Rosa Stoney Lumpkin, assistant editor, *Journals of the House of Representatives, 1785-1786* (Columbia: Published for the South Carolina Dept. of Archives and History by the University of South Carolina Press, 1979)

Michael E. Stevens, editor, and Christine M. Allen, assistant editor, *Journals of the House of Representatives, 1787-1788* (Columbia: Published for the South Carolina Dept. of Archives and History by the University of South Carolina Press, 1981)

Terry W. Lipscomb, editor, *The Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, November 21, 1752-September 6, 1754* (Columbia: Published for the South Carolina Dept. of Archives and History by the University of South Carolina Press, 1983)

Michael E. Stevens, editor, and Christine M. Allen, assistant editor, *Journals of the House of Representatives, 1789-1790* (Columbia: Published for the South Carolina Dept. of Archives and History by the University of South Carolina Press, 1984)

Michael E. Stevens, editor, and Christine M. Allen, assistant editor, *Journals of the House of Representatives, 1791* (Columbia: Published for the South Carolina Dept. of Archives and History by the University of South Carolina Press, 1985)
Terry W. Lipscomb, editor, *The Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, November 12, 1754-September 23, 1755* (Columbia: Published for the South Carolina Dept. of Archives and History by the University of South Carolina Press, 1986)

Michael E. Stevens, editor, *Journals of the House of Representatives, 1792-1794* (Columbia: Published for the South Carolina Dept. of Archives and History by the University of South Carolina Press, 1988)

Terry W. Lipscomb, editor, *The Journal of the Commons House of Assembly, November 20, 1755-July 6, 1757* (Columbia: Published for the South Carolina Dept. of Archives and History by the University of South Carolina Press, 1989)


Other Government Records of the Proprietary Era


A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Warrants for Lands in South Carolina, 1680-1692* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1911)

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Warrants for Lands in South Carolina, 1692-1711* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Co., 1915)

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Commissions and Instructions from the Lords Proprietors of Carolina to Public Officials of South Carolina, 1685-1715* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1916)


A.S. Salley, editor, *Records of the Secretary of the Province and the Register of the Province of South Carolina, 1671-1675* (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1944) [Paperback reprint, 1958]


A.S. Salley and R. Nicholas Olsberg, editors, *Warrants for Land in South Carolina, 1672-1711* (Columbia: Published for the South Carolina Department of Archives and History by the University of South Carolina Press, 1973) [Reprint of three earlier volumes with an introduction and a new index]

Documents Relating to the American Revolution

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Documents Relating to the History of South Carolina During the Revolutionary War* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1908)

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Stub Entries to Indents in Payment of Claims Against South Carolina Growing Out of the Revolution, Books L-N* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1910) [Hardbound and paperback reprint, 1959]

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Journal of the Commissioners of the Navy of South Carolina, October 9, 1776-March 1, 1779* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1912)

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Journal of the Commissioners of the Navy of South Carolina, July 22, 1779-March 23, 1780* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1913)
A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Stub Entries to Indents Issued in Payment of Claims Against South Carolina Growing Out of the Revolution, Books O-Q* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1915) [Hardbound reprint, 1960]

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Stub Entries to Indents Issued in Payment of Claims Against South Carolina Growing Out of the Revolution, Books R-T* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1917) [Hardbound reprint, 1960]

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Stub Entries to Indents Issued in Payment of Claims Against South Carolina Growing Out of the Revolution, Books U-W* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1918) [Hardbound reprint, 1960]

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Captain Tollemache’s Journal of the Proceedings of H. M. S. Scorpion, June 21, 1775-September 18, 1775* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1919)


A.S. Salley, editor, *Accounts Audited of Revolutionary Claims Against South Carolina, Volume II* [Allison-Arnet] (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1938)

A.S. Salley, editor, *Accounts Audited of Revolutionary Claims Against South Carolina, Volume III* [Austin-Barnet] (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1943)

Wylma Anne Wates, editor, *Stub Entries to Indents Issued in Payment of Claims Against South Carolina Growing Out of the Revolution, Books G-H* (Columbia: South Carolina Archives Department, 1955)

Wylma Anne Wates, editor, *Stub Entries to Indents Issued in Payment of Claims Against South Carolina Growing Out of the Revolution, Book K* (Columbia: South Carolina Archives Department, 1956)

Wylma Anne Wates, editor, *Stub Entries to Indents Issued in Payment of Claims Against South Carolina Growing Out of the Revolution, Book C-F* (Columbia: South Carolina Archives Department, 1957)

**Documents Relating to Native Americans**

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Journal of the Commissioners of the Indian Trade of South Carolina, September 20, 1710-April 12, 1715* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1926 [1929; printing began in 1926, but the volume was not published until 1929])
A S. Salley, editor, *Journal of Colonel John Herbert, Commissioner of Indian Affairs for the Province of South Carolina, October 17, 1727, to March 19, 1727/8* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1936)


William L. McDowell, Jr., editor, *Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, May 21, 1750-August 7, 1754* (Columbia: South Carolina Archives Department, 1958) [Paperback reprint, 1992]

William L. McDowell, Jr., editor, *Documents Relating to Indian Affairs, July 22, 1754-May 21, 1765* (Columbia: South Carolina Archives Department, 1970) [Paperback reprint, 1992]

Marriage and Death Notices and Other Non-governmental Records


A S. Salley, Jr., compiler and editor, *Death Notices in The South Carolina Gazette, 1732-1775* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1917) [Reprinted 1954 and 1965 under the same title, A S. Salley and Mabel L. Webber, editors, and including 30 pages of death notices 1766-1774 left out in 1917 “due to the carelessness of the printer in losing the copy of notices taken from the intervening years of the Gazette.” Webber originally printed the missing notices in volume 34 (1933) of the South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine.


A S. Salley, Jr., editor, *Minutes of the Vestry of St. Helen’s Parish, South Carolina, 1726-1812* (Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1919) [Paperback and hardbound reprint, 1958]

A S. Salley, editor, *Some Letters of Robert Mills, Engineer and Architect* (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1938)

W. Edwin Hemphill, editor, *The Papers of John C. Calhoun, Vol. I, 1801-1817* (Columbia: Published by the University of South Carolina Press for the South Caroliniana Society, 1959) [printed with funds appropriated to the South Carolina Archives Department and copyrighted by them]

W. Edwin Hemphill, editor, *The Papers of John C. Calhoun, Vol. II, 1817-1818* (Columbia: Published by the University of South Carolina Press for the South Caroliniana Society, 1963) [Copyrighted by the South Carolina Archives Department]

W. Edwin Hemphill, editor, *The Papers of John C. Calhoun, Vol. III, 1818-1819* (Columbia: Published by the University of South Carolina Press for the South Caroliniana Society, 1967) [Copyrighted by the South Carolina Archives Department]

W. Edwin Hemphill, editor, *The Papers of John C. Calhoun, Vol. IV, 1819-1820* (Columbia: Published by the University of South Carolina Press for the South Caroliniana Society, 1969) [Copyrighted by the South Carolina Department of Archives and History]

W. Edwin Hemphill, editor, *The Papers of John C. Calhoun, Vol. V, 1820-1821* (Columbia: Published by the University of South Carolina Press for the South Carolina Department of Archives and History and the South Caroliniana Society, 1971)

W. Edwin Hemphill, editor, *The Papers of John C. Calhoun, Vol. VI, 1821-1822* (Columbia: Published by the University of South Carolina Press for the South Carolina Department of Archives and History and the South Caroliniana Society, 1972)


W. Edwin Hemphill, editor, *The Papers of John C. Calhoun, Vol. VIII, 1823-1824* (Columbia: Published by the University of South Carolina Press for the South Carolina Department of Archives and History and the South Caroliniana Society, 1975)
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W. Edwin Hemphill, editor, The Papers of John C. Calhoun, Vol. IX, 1824-1825 (Columbia: Published by the University of South Carolina Press for the South Carolina Department of Archives and History and the South Caroliniana Society, 1976)

Clyde N. Wilson and W. Edwin Hemphill, editors, The Papers of John C. Calhoun, Vol. X, 1825-1829 (Columbia: Published by the University of South Carolina Press for the South Carolina Department of Archives and History and the South Caroliniana Society, 1977)

Clyde N. Wilson, editor, The Papers of John C. Calhoun, Vol. XI, 1829-1832 (Columbia: Published by the University of South Carolina Press for the South Carolina Department of Archives and History and the South Caroliniana Society, 1978)

Clyde N. Wilson, editor, The Papers of John C. Calhoun, Vol. XII, 1833-1835 (Columbia: Published by the University of South Carolina Press for the South Carolina Department of Archives and History and the South Caroliniana Society, 1979)

Clyde N. Wilson, editor, The Papers of John C. Calhoun, Vol. XIII, 1835-1837 (Columbia: Published by the University of South Carolina Press for the South Carolina Department of Archives and History and the South Caroliniana Society, 1980)

Clyde N. Wilson, editor, The Papers of John C. Calhoun, Vol. XIV, 1837-1839 (Columbia: Published by the University of South Carolina Press for the South Carolina Department of Archives and History and the South Caroliniana Society, 1981)

Clyde N. Wilson, editor, The Papers of John C. Calhoun, Vol. XV, 1839-1841 (Columbia: Published by the University of South Carolina Press for the South Carolina Department of Archives and History and the South Caroliniana Society, 1983)

Confederate Rosters

A.S. Salley, Jr., editor, Tentative Roster of the Third Regiment, South Carolina Volunteers, Confederate States Provisional Army (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1908)

A.S. Salley, Jr., compiler, South Carolina Troops in Confederate Service, Volume I [the three First Infantry Regiments] (Columbia: The R.L. Bryan Company, 1913)

A.S. Salley, Jr., compiler, South Carolina Troops in Confederate Service, Volume II [the 2nd, 3rd, and 4th Infantry Regiments] (Columbia: The State Company, 1914 [1919; printing began in 1914 but the book was not published until 1919])

A.S. Salley, compiler, South Carolina Troops in Confederate Service, Volume III [5th Infantry Regiment] (Columbia: Printed for The Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Company, 1930 [1931; not completed and published until that year])

Roll of the Dead: South Carolina Troops in Confederate Service (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1994) [A facsimile of a roll prepared by the Survivors Association in 1870 from data collected at state expense by Prof. William J. Rivers and of a list by Rivers of names needing checking. There was also a limited edition of 500 copies in 1994 and a second trade edition, with an introduction, in 1995]

Bulletins of the Historical Commission of South Carolina

No. 1 A.S. Salley, Jr., The Jackson Vase (Columbia: Printed for the Commission by The State Company, 1915)

No. 2 A.S. Salley, Jr., The Flag of the State of South Carolina (Columbia: Printed for the Commission by The State Company, 1915) [Reprint, 1957]

No. 3 A.S. Salley, Jr., The Mace of the House of Representatives of the State of South Carolina (Columbia: Printed for the Commission by The State Company, 1917)

No. 4 A.S. Salley, Jr., George Hunter’s Map of the Cherokee Country and the Path thereto in 1730 (Columbia: Printed for the Commission by The State Company, 1917)

No. 5 A.S. Salley, Jr., Parris Island, The Site of the First Attempt as a Settlement of White People Within the Bounds of What is Now South Carolina (Columbia: Printed for the Commission by The State Company, 1919)

No. 6 A.S. Salley, Jr., The Introduction of Rice Culture into South Carolina (Columbia: Printed for the Commission by The State Company, 1919) [Reprint, 1955]
No. 7  A.S. Salley, Jr., *The Methods of Raising Taxes in South Carolina Prior to 1868* (Columbia: Printed for the Commission by The State Company, 1925)

No. 8  A.S. Salley, Jr., *The Origin of Carolina* (Columbia: Printed for the Commission by The State Company, 1926) [Reprint, 1957]

No. 9  A.S. Salley, Jr., *Delegates to the Continental Congress from South Carolina, 1774-1789, With Sketches of the Four Who Signed the Declaration of Independence* (Columbia: Printed for the Commission by The State Company, 1927) [Reprint with corrections, 1958]

No. 10  A.S. Salley, *The Boundary Line Between North Carolina and South Carolina* (Columbia: Printed for the Commission by The State Company, 1929) [Reprint, 1959]

No. 11  A.S. Salley, *The Independent Company from South Carolina at Great Meadows* (Columbia: Printed for the Commission by The State Company, 1932) [Reprint, 1955]

No. 12  A.S. Salley, *President Washington’s Tour Through South Carolina in 1791* (Columbia: Printed for the Commission by The State Company, 1932) [Reprint, 1955]

No. 13  J.H. Easterby, *The Study of South Carolina History* (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by The State Commercial Printing Company, 1951) [The dinner address at the twentieth annual meeting of the South Carolina Historical Association, reprinted from *The Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association, 1950*

**Similar Free Booklets**

A.S. Salley, Jr., *The Seal of the State of South Carolina* (Columbia: Published by The State Company, 1906) [Reprints, 1957, 1965]

A.S. Salley, *The State Houses of South Carolina, 1751-1936* (Columbia: Printed for the Joint Committee on Printing, 1936) [Reprint, 1957]

A.S. Salley, *The Lords Proprietors of Carolina* (Columbia: Printed under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, General Assembly of South Carolina, 1944)

John Peyre Thomas, Jr., *Thomas Walter, Botanist* (Columbia: Historical Commission of South Carolina, 1946)

Peter Walne, *The Royal Great Seals Deputed of South Carolina* (Columbia: American Revolution Bicentennial Commission, 1982) [Copyright, South Carolina Department of Archives and History; reprinted, 1988]

**Microfilm Editions**

Dates given are for the printed pamphlets, which sometimes appeared many years after the microfilm was made available.

Microcopy No. 1  Helen Craig Carson, editor, *Records in the British Public Record Office relating to South Carolina, 1663-1782*. 12 reels and a descriptive pamphlet (1973)


Microcopy No. 3  *Records of the Public Treasurers of South Carolina, 1725-1776*. 2 reels and a descriptive pamphlet by Newton B. Jones (1969)

Microcopy No. 4  *Records of the South Carolina Treasury, 1775-1780*. 6 reels and a descriptive pamphlet by Robert S. Lambert (1969)

Microcopy No. 5  R. Nicholas Olsberg and Helen Craig Carson, editors, *South Carolina Treasury Ledgers and Journals, 1783-1791*. 4 reels, a descriptive pamphlet, and a printed *South Carolina: General Index to Ledgers, 1783-1791* (1973)

Microcopy No. 6  R. Nicholas Olsberg and Helen Craig Carson, editors, *Duties on Trade at Charleston, 1784-1789*. 1 reel and a descriptive pamphlet (1970)

Microcopy No. 7  *South Carolina Treasury Ledgers and Journals, 1791-1865*. 12 reels and a descriptive pamphlet (1970)


Microcopy No. 9  Judith M. Brimelow and Wylma A. Wates, editors, *South Carolina Will Transcripts, 1782-1868*. 31 reels and a descriptive pamphlet


Microcopy No. 12  Judith M. Brimelow and Joel A. Shirley, editors, *Memorials of Seventeenth and Eighteenth-Century South Carolina Land Titles*. 7 reels, a descriptive pamphlet, and a 5-reel computer output microfilm index (1984)


Microcopy No. 14  Judith M. Brimelow, editor, *South Carolina Court of General Sessions, 1769-1776*. 1 reel, a descriptive pamphlet, and a 1-reel computer output microfilm index (1990)


**South Carolina Bibliographies**

No. 1  J.H. Easterby, *Guide to the Study and Reading of South Carolina History, Topical Lists* (Columbia: The Historical Commission of South Carolina, 1949) [Reprint, 1954, with one page of added references to *South Carolina: A Short History* by D.D. Wallace and two pages of “Selected List of Books Published Since 1949”]


No. 4  Hennig Cohen, *Articles in Periodicals and Serials on South Carolina Literature and Related Subjects, 1900-1955* (Columbia: South Carolina Archives Department, 1956)

**Basic Documents of South Carolina History (Leaflets)**


**Illustrated Topics of South Carolina History (Leaflet)**

J.H. Easterby, editor, *Transportation in the Ante-Bellum Period* (Columbia: The Historical Commission of South Carolina, 1951) [Reprint, 1957]

**Topics in African American History (Booklets)**

No. 1  Benjamin F. Hornsby, Jr., *Stepping Stone to the Supreme Court: Clarendon County, South Carolina* (Columbia: South Carolina Dept. of Archives & History, 1992)

No. 2  J. Tracy Power, *I will not be silent and I will be heard: Martin Luther King, Jr., the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and Penn Center* (Columbia: South Carolina Dept. of Archives & History, 1993)
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**No. 3 Steven D. Smith, Whom We Would Never See:**
*History and Archaeology Recover the Lives and Deaths of African American Civil War Soldiers on Folly Island, South Carolina* (Columbia: South Carolina Dept. of Archives & History, 1993)

**Booklets for a Broad Audience**

- Terry W. Lipscomb, *South Carolina Becomes a State: The Road from Colony to Independence, 1765-1776* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1976) [A bicentennial project with a matching grant from the South Carolina American Revolution Bicentennial Commission; reprinted, 1988]
- Lawrence S. Rowland, *Window on the Atlantic: The Rise and Fall of Santa Elena, South Carolina’s Spanish City* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1990)
- David C.R. Heisser, *The Seal of the State of South Carolina: A Short History* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1992)
- Terry W. Lipscomb, *South Carolina in 1791: George Washington’s Southern Tour* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1993)

**Monographs**

Many in Cooperation with Other Organizations or Individuals

- W.A. Clark, *The History of Banking Institutions Organized in South Carolina Prior to 1860* (Columbia: Printed for the Historical Commission of South Carolina by the State Co., 1922)
- Emily Bellinger Reynolds and Joan Reynolds Faunt, *Biographical Directory of the Senate of the State of South Carolina, 1776-1964* (Columbia: South Carolina Archives Department, 1964) [Compiled under the direction of the Senatorial Research Committee]
- Michael E. Stauffer, *South Carolina’s Antebellum Militia* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1991)
- Suzanne Cameron Linder, *Historical Atlas of the Rice Plantations of the Ace River Basin-1860* (Columbia: Published by the South Carolina Department of Archives and History for the Archives and History Foundation, Ducks Unlimited, and The Nature Conservancy, 1995)
- Patrick McCawley, *Selected Civil War Bibliography* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1997)
Alexia Jones Helsley, *South Carolina's African American Confederate Pensioners, 1923-1925* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1998)

Jason H. Silverman and Judith M. Andrews, editors, *South Carolina Then and Now* (Nashville, Tenn.: Publication Management Associates, Inc. in cooperation with the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 2001)

Suzanne Cameron Linder and Marta Leslie Thacker, *Historical Atlas of the Rice Plantations of Georgetown County and the Santee River* (Published by the South Carolina Department of Archives and History for the Historic Ricefields Association, Inc., 2001)


**Facsimile Portfolios**


*Diplomats in Red and White: Treaties between South Carolina and the Cherokee Indians, 1759-1777: A Portfolio Reproduced from Four Original Treaties* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1992) [Limited edition of 300]

*The Ordinance of Secession: A Facsimile Reproduced from the Original Ordinance* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1993) [Reprint, 1996]

**Guides to the Holdings**


Patrick J. McCawley, *Artificial Limbs for Confederate Soldiers* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1992)


Charles H. Lesser, *Sources for the American Revolution at the South Carolina Department of Archives and History* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 2000)

**Historical Marker Guides**

*Official South Carolina Historical Markers: A Directory* (Columbia: Confederation of South Carolina Local Historical Societies in Cooperation with the South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1978)

Judith M. Brimelow, editor, *South Carolina Highway Historical Marker Guide* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1992)


**Document Packets**


No. 2 Roberta VH. Copp, *Jones: Time of Crisis, Time of Change* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1989) [Reprint, 1991]

No. 3 *The Spanish in South Carolina: Unsettled Frontier* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1989)

No. 4 *The Civilian Conservation Corps in South Carolina, 1933-1942* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1990)
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No. 5 Roberta VH. Copp, *Heritage Education* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1990) [Revised edition, 1991]

No. 6 Roberta VH. Copp, *South Carolina African Americans in the Civil War: Two Sides to a Story* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1990) [Reprint, 1991]

No. 7 Roberta VH. Copp, *Community as Classroom: An Oral History Resource Publication* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1991)

No. 8 Herbert J. Hartsook and Alexia Jones Helsley, compilers, *The Changing Face of South Carolina Politics* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1993)

No. 9 Alexia Jones Helsley, *Unsung Heroines of the Carolina Frontier* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1997)

No. 10 Alexia Jones Helsley, *Silent Cities: Cemeteries and Classrooms* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1997)

No. 11 Alexia Jones Helsley, *South Carolina Secedes: A Drama in Three Acts* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1998)

No. 12 Alexia Jones Helsley, *The Many Faces of Slavery* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 1999)

No. 13 Alexia Jones Helsley, *South Carolinians in the War for American Independence* (Columbia: South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 2000)