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REPORT

To the Members of the Society:

I submit herewith my Report as Secretary and Treasurer for the year 1941. This Report and the Minutes of the 1941 meeting were read and approved at the sixth meeting of the Society, March 10, 1942.

MINUTES OF THE FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING, 1941

The fifth annual meeting of the Society was held in the Wade Hampton Hotel, February 27, 1941, Chief-Justice M. L. Bonham, President of the Society, presiding. The one hundred and sixty-five members and guests were welcomed for the University by President J. Rion McKissick.

The annual address to the Society was made by Dr. E. Merton Coulter, Professor of History in the University of Georgia, followed by the report of the Secretary and Treasurer. The address and report were printed after the meeting and sent to the members.

The incumbent officers were re-elected. Under miscellaneous business Professor Henry C. Davis announced the gift by Dr. Abram L. Blanding of Fountain Inn of the portrait of his grandfather, Abram L. Blanding.

REPORT FOR 1941

The number of members of the Society is now 257, an increase of 17 over the previous year. Eight members have been lost by death during the year: Dr. C. M. Clark, Mr. W. T. Crews, Senator A. M. Lumpkin, Mrs. M. L. Parler, Dr. O. T. Porcher, Mr. John R. Sumter, Mr. J. C. Thorne and Mr. William Shand. Receipts from dues and additional contributions for the year were $540.25, $47.75 less than for 1940. With this amount the University has bought 80 South Carolina items.

All the books and papers given direct by members or purchased with their dues have been marked with the names of the donors. A list of the larger gifts, like the miscellaneous exhibit displayed here tonight, serves to show how varied are our acquisitions and therefore how representative of the State’s history and literature.
CHIEF ITEMS AMONG THE ACQUISITIONS

(The use of some of the manuscripts listed has been restricted by the donors.)

MANUSCRIPTS:

Adams, Margaret, nine letters to, while a student at Barhamville, 1832-1833,
By Miss Margaret Gist, York

Bateman, John M., notes on the life of William A. Courtenay, and an account book of the Columbia Ice House, 1866-1874,
By Mrs. J. M. Bateman, Columbia. (See also 28, 34, 39).

Blanding, Abram, thirty-two letters of the family of, 1838-1839,
By Mrs. W. H. White, Abbeville.

Cain, William, papers of the family of, including diploma from the South Carolina College and commencement program, 1812, South Carolina College Euphradian Literary Society diploma, 1812, certificate of election as Lieutenant-Governor, 1846 and three South Carolina College student notebooks, 1850-1858; Somerset plantation (St. John's Berkeley) account books, four volumes, 1870-1891; and the constitution and list of members of the Black Oak Calhoun Monument Association, 1853,
By the descendants of William Cain. (See also 32).

Clark, Micajah A., journals of trips from Mississippi to South Carolina, 1847 and 1857,
By his son, the late C. M. Clark, Washington, D. C.

Coker, Caleb, farm journal, 1856-1861,
By his son, E. C. Coker, Columbia.

Cook, Burrell, manuscript genealogy of the family of, Fairfield County, with biographical notes and photographs,
By Walter M. Cook, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Edgefield Farmer's Alliance, secretary's minute book, 1899-1890,
By C. A. Mays, Greenwood.
Gibbes, William Hasell and Robert Wilson, forty-four letters, 1775-1889, including letters from A. G. Magrath, F. W. Pickens, Wade Hampton I, Wade Hampton III, James Madison, Thomas Pinckney, Thomas Sumter, Pierce Butler and Charles Pinckney; 344 miscellaneous business papers, 1733-1920; including a signed statement by a King's Mountain veteran, 1829; an account book, 1840-1857; and about three hundred and sixty signatures of South Carolinians including Edward Rutledge, Christopher Gadsden, William Henry Drayton, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, Thomas Lynch, Sr., and Thomas Heyward, Jr.,

By J. Heyward Gibbes, Columbia.

Gibbes and Garlington families, 170 letters and business papers of, including a signature of Edward Rutledge, 1799-1900,

By Dr. and Mrs. R. W. Gibbes, Columbia.

Hammond, Elisha and his son, M. C. M. Hammond, three letters of, 1827, 1839, 1840,

By Mrs. Stella W. Blalock, Edgefield.

Higgins, Francis B., fourteen letters and miscellaneous pieces, 1830-1852,

By Mrs. J. N. Conover, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

(See also 29, 44).

Johnson Female University, diploma issued to Miss Eliza C. Edwards, 1856.

By Patterson Wardlaw, Columbia. (See also 33).

Lott, John, papers of the family of, including five diaries, 1914-1930, a Bible containing notes on family genealogy, and twenty-nine miscellaneous pieces, 1838-1911,

By Mrs. John C. Lott, Columbia.

McMaster, additions to the Fitz William McMaster Collection, thirty letters to and from F. W. McMaster, 1866-1899, and eight miscellaneous account books, 1850-1903,

By the Family of Fitz William and Mary Jane McMaster, Columbia. (See also 27, 38, 49, 50).

Moultrie, William, three hundred and twenty-one business letters and papers of the family of General Moultrie, 1700-1827,

By Francis E. Johnstone, Jr., Auburn, Alabama.

(See also 36).
Pickens, Governor Francis W., Proclamation of Secession, December 24, 1860,
By L. L. Babcock for the Buffalo Historical Society, New York. 17

Porcher, O. T., thirteen diaries, 1902-1940,
By the late O. T. Porcher, Bennettsville. 18

South Carolina Revolutionary papers, six photostatic copies of lists of South Carolina loyalists and whigs from originals in the William L. Clements Library, presented through Julian P. Boyd,
By Carl Van Doren, New York, New York. 19

South Carolina Revolutionary papers, thirteen photostatic copies, including returns of American prisoners at the fall of Charleston, lists of South Carolina loyalists and whigs and two military maps of Charleston, from originals in the William L. Clements Library, presented through courtesy of the William L. Clements Library,
By Julian P. Boyd for the Princeton University Library, Princeton, New Jersey. 20

Sumter, Thomas, Jr., and DeLage, Natalie, marriage contract, March 20, 1802,
By John R. Sumter, Sumter. 21

Willson, John, slave record, 1844-1862,
By Mrs. John O. Willson, Anderson. (See also 40). 22

NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS:
Charleston World, April 2, 1888-March 31, 1890 and the Southern Inventor, Charleston, Vol. 1, No. 1, January 15, 1858,
By H. C. Davis, Columbia. (See also 24, 30). 23

Examiner, Columbia, February 16, 1856 and seven other South Carolina newspapers, 1850-1880,
By H. C. Davis, Columbia. (See also 23, 30). 24

News and Courier, fifty-nine issues, 1853-1868, and sixteen issues of other Charleston papers and magazines, 1852-1886,
By Mrs. A. C. Carson, Columbia. 25

6
South Carolina, twenty-eight miscellaneous newspapers, 1860-1899,
By Miss Mary G. Sledge, Chester.

Southern Presbyterian Review, seventy-eight issues, 1847-1870,
By the Family of Fitz William and Mary Jane McMaster, Columbia. (See also 15, 38, 49, 50).

The State, Columbia, Vol. 1, No. 1, February 18, 1891,
and thirty-two South Carolina newspapers, 1866-1896,
By Mrs. J. M. Bateman, Columbia. (See also 2, 34, 39).

Tri-Weekly South Carolinian, Columbia, January 10, 13 and December 20, 30, 1851,
By Mrs. J. N. Conover, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. (See also 12, 44).

Weekly Flag, Greenville, Vol. 1, No. 1, January 10, 1879,
By H. C. Davis, Columbia. (See also 23, 24).

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS:

Aiken, D. W., memorial volume of twenty South Carolina College catalogs, orations and programs, 1847-1850,
By Mrs. D. W. Aiken, Chester, through W. S. Woods.

Cain, William, seventeen volumes from the library of (chiefly texts used by him at the South Carolina College) and Benjamin C. Yancey’s Speech on the Bank of the State of South Carolina (Hamburg, 1848),
By the descendants of William Cain. (See also 4).

Coker, Hannah Lide, Story of the Late War (Charleston, 1887),
By Patterson Wardlaw, Columbia. (See also 13).

Courtenay, W. A., thirty-nine South Carolina publications of,
By Mrs. J. M. Bateman, Columbia. (See also 2, 28, 39).

Hammond, additions to the Hammond Collection, two orations by James H. Hammond, Charleston, 1850,
By Judge H. C. Hammond, Augusta.

Huguenot Society, Transactions of, twenty numbers, 1897-1920, and South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine, sixty numbers, 1904-1924,
By Francis E. Johnstone, Jr., Auburn, Alabama. (See also 16).
Kirkland, Frederic R., *Letters on the American Revolution* (privately printed, 1941), presented through Julian P. Boyd,
By Frederic R. Kirkland, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. 37

McMaster, additions to the Fitz William McMaster Collection, fifteen volumes, addresses and other publications, 1853-1880,
By the Family of Fitz William and Mary Jane McMaster, Columbia. (See also 15, 27, 49, 50). 38

Magrath, Governor A. G., proclamation by, Spartanburg, February 27, 1865,
By Mrs. J. M. Bateman, Columbia. (See also 2, 28, 34). 39

Miller’s Planter and Merchants Almanac, Charleston, 1853, 1854,
By Mrs. John O. Willson, Anderson. (See also 22). 40

By Mrs. Hagood Bostick and Fant Thornley, Columbia. 41

South Carolina, eighteen legislative and departmental reports, 1920-1941,
By S. M. Derrick, Columbia. 42

South Carolina, sixty-one annual reports of church organizations, 1915-1941,
By Dr. Anne K. Gregorie, Mt. Pleasant. 43

South Carolina, eleven pamphlets, 1831-1880,
By Mrs. J. N. Conover, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. (See also 12, 29). 44

Wauchope, George Armstrong, two volumes edited by, and eight volumes of South Carolina poetry and essays presented to Dr. Wauchope, 1879-1941,
By G. A. Wauchope, Columbia. 45

**MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS:**

Blanding, Abram, portrait of,
By A. L. Blanding, Fountain Inn. 46
Brown, William Harper, Silhouettes of John C. Calhoun and Andrew Jackson (original edition),
By Mrs. Arney R. Childs, Mrs. William Elliott, Mrs. Walter F. Going, Miss Caroline Guignard, Miss Susan Guignard, Mrs. Louis Guion, Mrs. John C. Heslep, Mrs. J. Rion McKissick, W. Bedford Moore, Jr., W. B. Moore, 3rd, Mrs. W. Bedford Moore, Jr., J. B. Murphy, Miss Caroline Porcher, Mrs. John G. Prioleau, Mrs. Alice C. Seibels, Miss Caroline Swaffield, Mrs. Thomas Taylor, Mrs. Horace Tilghman, Mrs. C. C. Wilson

Farrar pitcher made by the Southern Porcelain Company, Kaolin, Edgefield District, about 1860,
By Mrs. A. F. McKissick, Greenville.

McMaster, additions to the Fitz William McMaster Collection, a locket presented to Mary Jane MacFie on the occasion of her graduation at Barhamville, 1850,
By the Family of Fitz William and Mary Jane MacFie McMaster, Columbia. (See also 15, 27, 38, 50).

McMaster, additions to the Fitz William McMaster Collection, a portrait of Colonel Fitz William McMaster,
By the Family of Fitz William and Mary Jane MacFie McMaster, Columbia. (See also 15, 27, 38, 49).

SUMMARY OF THE YEAR'S ACQUISITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Books and pamphlets: 1775-1941</td>
<td>596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspapers (single issues): 1849-1890</td>
<td>526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscripts (volumes of): 1803-1911</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuscripts (single): 1700-1941</td>
<td>1,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous items: 1822-1889</td>
<td>997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,578</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY

Abel, Miss C. Marguerite, 
Columbia

Ames, J. S., 
Baltimore, Md.

Appelt, Mrs. Clara H., 
Manning

Arthur, B. F., 
Winchester, Va.

Babcock, Miss Ferebe, 
Columbia

Babcock, Mrs. J. W., 
Columbia

Babcock, L. L., 
Buffalo, N. Y.

Baker, L. T., 
Columbia

Ball, W. W., 
Charleston

Barnwell, R. W., 
Florence

Barron, Mrs. C. W., 
Columbia

Baruch, B. M., 
New York City

Bate-man, Mrs. J. M., 
Columbia

Benet, Christie, 
Columbia

Black, E. O., 
Columbia

Blake, E. H., 
Greenwood

Blalock, Mrs. Stella W., 
Edgefield

Blanding, Dr. A. L., 
Fountain Inn

Bonham, M. L., 
Anderson

Bostick, Mrs. Hagood, 
Columbia

Boyd, J. F., 
Fort Mill

Boyd, Dr. W. A., 
Columbia

Bradley, F. W., 
Columbia

Brunson, Miss Margaret, 
Sumter

Burroughs, D. M., 
Conway

Burroughs, Mrs. D. M., 
Conway

Butler, Mrs. George, 
Edgefield

Cain, The Descendants of William, 
Columbia

Callcott, W. H., 
Columbia

Carothers, Mrs. Charles, 
Columbia

Carston, Mrs. A. C., 
Columbia

Cauthen, C. E., 
College Place

Chase, J. A., 
Columbia

Childs, Mrs. Arney R., 
Columbia

Clark, C. M., 
Washington, D. C.

Clippard, E. B., 
Columbia

Coker, C. W., Jr., 
Hartsville

Coker, E. C., 
Columbia

Coker, J. L., 
Hartsville

Collins, Mrs. Effie W., 
Columbia

Conover, Mrs. J. N., 

Cook, W. M., 
Brooklyn, N. Y.

Cooper, R. M., 
Columbia

Copeland, Mrs. M. L., 
Laurens

Corbett, Mrs. L. G., 
Tampa, Fla.

Cothran, F. H., 
Charlotte, N. C.

Covington, F. H., 
Bennettsville

*Cross, W. T., 
Laurens

Crook, Miss Frances, 
Columbia

Crow, O. F., 
Columbia

Culbertson, J. B., 
Greenville

Dalton, H. L., 
Charlotte, N. C.

Daniel, J. McT., 
Columbia

Danner, H. E., 
Beaufort

Dargan, G. E., 
Darlington

Dargan, Mrs. J. J., 
Sumter

Davis, Rev. E. W., 
Swansea

Davis, H. C., 
Columbia

Davis, Miss Nora M., 
Columbia

*Deceased.
MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY—Continued

Davis, R. B.,
Columbia
DePass, S. C.,
Columbia
Derrick, S. M.,
Columbia
DuBose, Mrs. Louise J.,
Columbia
Dudley, J. S.,
New York City
Duke, Mrs. C. H.,
Columbia
Easterby, J. H.,
Charleston
Elliott, William,
Columbia
Ellis, Mrs. R. L.,
Columbia
Epting, C. L.,
Clemson
Evans, J. G.,
Spartanburg
Ferrell, C. M.,
Columbia
Finley, D. E.,
Washington, D. C.
Fitch, Mrs. F. B.,
Columbia
Foran, W. A.,
Columbia
Gambrell, E. S.,
Atlanta, Ga.
Gambrell, W. H.,
New York City
Gary, F. B., Jr.,
Columbia
Gaston, A. L.,
Chester
Gayden, Miss Joyce,
Eastover
Gibbes, Dr. J. H.,
Columbia
Gibbes, Mrs. J. H.,
Columbia
Gibbes, Dr. R. W.,
Columbia
Gibbes, Mrs. R. W.,
Columbia
Gilland, Flinn,
Columbia
Gilland, Mrs. Nell F.,
Columbia
Gist, Miss Margaret,
Columbia
Gittman, J. T.,
Columbia
Glenn, L. C.,
Nashville, Tenn.
Goodwin, Mrs. G. M.,
New York City

Green, E. L.,
Columbia
Gregorie, Miss Anne K.,
Columbia
Groves, Mrs. Earl,
Gastonia, N. C.
Guignard, Miss Caroline,
Columbia
Guignard, Miss Susan,
Columbia
Hall, W. E.,
Anderson
Hallman, E. B.,
Spartanburg
Hammond, F. C.,
Augusta, Ga.
Hammond, J. H.,
Columbia
Hanahan, J. R.,
Charleston
Hare, L. M.,
Leesville
Haynsworth, H. C.,
Sumter
Hazel, W. G.,
Bennettsville
Hendley, W. S.,
Columbia
Hendley, Mrs. W. S.,
Columbia
Hennig, Mrs. Helen K.,
Columbia
Hennig, H. W.,
Darlington
Herbert, R. B.,
Columbia
Heslep, Mrs. J. C.,
Columbia
Heyward, D. C.,
Columbia
Heyward, Miss Katherine B.,
Columbia
Holmes, Calvin,
Nashville, Tennessee
Holmes, J. G.,
Columbia
Holmes, Mrs. J. G.,
Columbia
Holmes, Miss Madeline,
Columbia
Hough, Mrs. Ben C.,
Lancaster
Hughes, J. G.,
Union
Hutson, F. M.,
Columbia
Jackson, J. B.,
Columbia
Jervey, Dr. J. W.,
Greenville
MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY—Continued

Jeter, E. R.,
Rock Hill
Johnson, Miss Leila G.,
Columbia
Johnstone, Francis E., Jr.,
Auburn, Ala.
Jones, F. D.,
Clinton
Jordan, A. B.,
Dillon
Julien, C. T.,
Greenwood
Kendall, H. P.,
Camden
Kennedy, Perrin,
Columbia
LaGrone, T. E.,
Columbia
Latimer, S. L., Jr.,
Columbia
Lesesne, J. M.,
Due West
Lewis, A. R.,
Columbia
Lewis, Ralph,
Columbia
Lieber, Miss Mary,
Newport, R. I.
Lipscomb, G. F.,
Columbia
Long, Miss Alves,
Columbia
Lott, Mrs. J. C.,
Columbia
Lowrance, W. B.,
Pickens
Lucas, Dr. S. R.,
Florence
*Lumpkin, A. M.,
Columbia
Lumpkin, Bryan,
Columbia
Lyles, Miss Mary E.,
Columbia
Macaulay, A. H.,
Chester
Madden, Rev. R. C.,
Georgetown
Manning, Mrs. R. I.,
Columbia
Manning, W. M.,
Stateburg
Marion, J. H.,
Charlotte, N. C.
Marshall, Miss May C.,
Columbia
Marshall, M. C.,
Montgomery, Ala.
Mason, G. H.,
Society Hill,
Mauldin, Mrs. T. F.,
Columbia
Mays, C. A.,
Greenwood
McCull, Mrs. D. D.,
Bennettsville
McGowan, Frank,
Columbia
McKissick, Mrs. A. F.,
Greenville
McKissick, Ellison,
Greenville
McKissick, J. R.,
Columbia
McLean, H. B.,
Blythewood
McMaster, F. H.,
Columbia
McMaster, the family of Col.
Fitz William,
Columbia
Meriwether, R. L.,
Columbia
Meriwether, Mrs. R. L.,
Columbia
Milling, Dr. C. J.,
Columbia
Mills, J. E.,
Hartsville
Mims, Mrs. J. L.,
Edgefield
Moise, Harold,
Sumter
Montgomery, Miss Mabel,
Columbia
Moore, W. B., Jr.,
Columbia
Moore, Mrs. W. B., Jr.,
Columbia
Morgan, Miss Katherine G.,
Georgetown
Morris, J. B.,
St. Matthews
Moses, H. A.,
Sumter
Murchison, Rev. H. R.,
Columbia
Murphy, J. B.,
Columbia
Nettles, J. B.,
Columbia
Nicholson, Allan,
Union
Oliphant, Mrs. A. D.,
Greenville
Parker, Frank,
Washington, D. C.

*Deceased.
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Parler, Miss Mary C.,
Cuthbert, Ga.
*Parler, Mrs. M. L.,
Wedgefield
Plowden, Mrs. Oliver,
Sumter
Poplar Springs Baptist
Church,
Ware Shoals
Porcher, Miss Elizabeth L.,
Columbia
*Porcher, O. T.,
Bennettsville
Prince, S. L.,
Anderson
Ravenel, Miss Mary H.,
Aiken
Rawl, F. B.,
Columbia
Reed, Mrs. Mary Swaffield,
Columbia
Reid, Miss Thelma M.,
Columbia
Reynolds, Mark, Jr.,
Sumter
Rion, Mrs. W. C.,
Columbia
Robertson, Ben, Jr.,
Clemson
Robinson, D. W.,
Columbia
Robinson, F. C.,
Columbia
Scott, Mrs. Florence J.,
Rio Grande City, Texas
Scott, Mrs. Irene A.,
Columbia
Seibels, Mrs. Alice C.,
Columbia
Seibels, E. G.,
Columbia
Seibels, Mrs. E. G.,
Columbia
Shand, Miss Louly,
Columbia
*Shand, William,
Columbia
Shaw, Dr. A. E.,
Columbia
Sheppard, J. O.,
Edgefield
Sherrill, G. R.,
Columbia
Simons, A. St.J.,
Columbia
Sledge, Miss Mary G.,
Chester
Society for Orphan and Destitute
Children,
Columbia
Spivey, D. A.,
Conway
Stackhouse, Mrs. T. B.,
Columbia
Stukes, T. H.,
Manning
*Sumter, J. R.,
Sumter
Sumwalt, R. L.,
Columbia
Surles, Miss Flora B.,
Columbia
Swaffield, Miss Caroline
Columbia
Taylor, G. L.,
Georgetown
Taylor, J. P.,
Columbia
Taylor, Mrs. Thomas
Columbia
Taylor, W. F.,
Columbia
Thomas, J. P., Jr.,
Columbia
*Thorne, J. C.,
New York City
Thornley, Faint,
Columbia
Tilghman, Mrs. H. L.,
Marion
Tillman, B. R.,
Washington, D. C.
Tillman, Mrs. Mamie N.,
Edgefield
Timberlake, J. E.,
Columbia
Timberlake, Mrs. J. E.,
Columbia
Todd, M. A.,
Charleston
Townsend, Miss Leah,
Florence
Trotti, M. W.,
West Columbia
Verner, Miss Mary,
Columbia
Want, Samuel,
Darlington
Ward, W. H.,
Columbia
Wardlaw, F. H.,
Columbia
Wardlaw, Patterson,
Columbia
Wasdin, Mrs. Agnes M.,
Georgetown

*Deceased.
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Watkins, H. H.,
Anderson
Watson, H. L.,
Greenwood
Wauchope, G. A.,
Columbia
Welbourne, F. F.,
Columbia
Weston, Mrs. A. D.,
Columbia
Wheeler, Miss Mary P.,
Columbia
White, Miss Fannie Belle,
Columbia
White, Mrs. Walter C.,
Stateburg
White, Mrs. W. H.,
Abbeville
Wienefeld, R. H.,
Columbia
Wiggins, A. L. M.,
Hartsville
Wilds, J. L.,
Chicago, Ill.

Williams, G. C.,
Columbia
Willson, Mrs. J. O.,
Anderson
Wilson, Mrs. C. C.,
Columbia
Wilson, J. M.,
Columbia
Wingard, Miss Mary C.,
Lexington
Woods, W. S.,
Columbia
Woodson, Mrs. A. A.,
Edgefield
Woodson, Miss Hortense
Edgefield
Wright, M. A.,
Conway
Wyeth, Dr. M. S.,
Palm Beach, Fla.
Yeargin, Mrs. W. W.,
Laurens
THE JUNIOR UNIVERSITY SOUTSouth CAROLINIANA SOCIETY

On Commencement Day, May 25, 1942, several members of the graduating class, with the approval of the Caroliniana Committee, organized the Junior University South Caroliniana Society. The purposes of the new organization are to aid in building up the library and to stimulate interest among college and university students in the preservation of South Carolina historical and literary records. Membership is confined to college and university students.

Officers

President ..................... Mildred Kohn
Vice-President ................. Betty Kinard
Secretary and Treasurer ....... G. G. Williamson, Jr.

Members

Adams, Charlotte
Columbia

Cardwell, Virginia
Columbia

Copeland, Virginia
Columbia

Faulkenberry, Mack A.
Lancaster

Gaston, Thelma
Sumter

George, Elizabeth
Columbia

Kinard, Betty
Columbia

Kohn, Mildred
Columbia

Reid, T. F.
Columbia

Trotti, Marion W.
West Columbia

Williamson, G. G., Jr.
Columbia
ANNUAL ADDRESS*

JULIAN P. BOYD
Librarian, Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

CUSTODIANS OF THE DEMOCRATIC TRADITION

A distinguished South Carolina editor ten years ago closed his delightful volume of reminiscences, history, and political observation with the statement that "South Carolina . . . in some strange manner . . . has lost its memory and is sundered from its past. That," he concluded, "is calamitous to a state." Dr. William Watts Ball is a devoted servant of the State, he is a learned and urbane gentleman of the old school, he has the professional newspaper man's penetrating insight into the motives of men, he is a proud student of South Carolina's distinguished past, he loves the up-country-men from whom he sprang no less than he loves the aristocratic charm of Charleston with its traditions and its conservatism. I am certain that if I had the privilege of knowing him, I should like Dr. Ball as much as I respect his public spirited character and his uncompromising defense of integrity in public and private life. But, while Dr. Ball and I are in agreement that South Carolina in many respects is "The State that Forgot," we follow different roads toward the past and toward the things of the past that South Carolina ought to remember. If I understand the import of his book correctly, it is that he adheres to a political theory of simple and classic proportions. It is a theory stemming out of John Locke, who among other things, drew up the Fundamental Constitution of Carolina for the eight Lords Proprietors, thereby attempting to engraft upon the few settlers in this American wilderness a feudal concept of government in the hands of the few. It is a theory, much modified, which was set forth in the South Carolina Constitution of 1808 and which controlled the government of the State down to the Civil War. It is a theory which was discredited in the Declaration of Independence in 1776 and which was annihilated in South Carolina precisely a century later.

It was this annihilation of the theory of government by men of property that Dr. Ball deplored as calamitous to the State. It was for this reason that he urged that South Carolinians remember the able government that had been given to the State from 1808 to 1861 under the reign of King Cotton when, under the parish system of representation, the tidewater aristocrats guided the affairs of the commonwealth. It was, in short, that South Carolina might return to the past that Dr. Ball would urge South Carolinians to study and to remember the past. He

*On the occasion of the sixth annual meeting of the University South Caroliniana Society, the South Caroliniana Library, Columbia, March 10, 1942.
felt that democracy—that is, democracy as reflected in universal suffrage and in the direct primary—has brought the State to a low and dismal place in the national scene. He pointed, on the one hand, to the undeniably great place of national leadership held by South Carolina, through the default of Virginia, in the first half of the 19th century. He pointed to the absence of public scandal among officeholders, to the economic administration of the government, to the sense of responsibility for public leadership developed under the code of the gentleman, to the classic deportment in private and public that characterized the men bred for leadership under such a system. He pointed, on the other hand, to the venality and self-seeking demagoguery of some political figures in South Carolina since 1876 and particularly since 1890, to the bitterness aroused by that master of discontent, Ben Tillman, to his attacks upon such centers of learning as this University, to the irresponsibility, the waste, the inefficiency of conducting government under the theory that any man capable of reading is potentially capable of mastering the complicated affairs of government.

There is no denying that there is something to be said for Dr. Ball’s theory. There is much in the public record of ante-bellum South Carolina that her citizens may well be proud of. There is much in the post-bellum period of which they may well be ashamed. But to draw from this fact the conclusion that South Carolinians ought to study the past in order to return to it, that the aristocratic concept of government is unqualifiedly good and that the democratic concept, even as practiced today, is unqualifiedly calamitous, is to distort both history and political theory. Dr. Ball, being a highly cultivated and intelligent man, knows full well that South Carolina will never return to the system of government that prevailed in the past. This he considers a hopeless situation from which “There is no recovery.” I do not share this despondency any more than I share Dr. Ball’s unqualified respect for the ante-bellum government of South Carolina or any more than I share his approach to the study of South Carolina’s history. I could consume more than my allotted time in defending a less misanthropic, less despondent position than that assumed by the learned editor from Charleston. I could point out that in what Colonel Ball regards as the golden era of South Carolina history, other states in other parts of the Union, as widely different in population, custom, manners, and traditions as Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania and Virginia were undergoing the slow process of implementing the democratic ideals of the Declaration of Independence—a political philosophy, incidentally, which might also be traced back to that same John Locke who wrote the Fundamental Constitutions and who penned the liberal Frame of Government for William Penn. This same irresistible force reached to other parts of the world at about the same time—
to the wealthy British islands of the Caribbean and to the Dominion of Canada. Not only was South Carolina in the ante-bellum period facing what others were facing, but her government, if modest in what it took for operating costs, was excessively modest in what it gave. Property was its first consideration, and science, learning, public education and many other fields that are now regarded as the basic concern of government were by and large, left in that day to private initiative. If, as Colonel Ball thinks, a professor in a South Carolina college of the post Civil War period dares not take an unconventional stand with regard to one of the State’s sacred cows, does he suppose that a professor in the ante-bellum days could with impunity belabor the sacred cows of that day? There were those who tried it on the basic issue of slavery—and some of them were compelled to leave the State. The sort of approach to history that would turn history in upon itself is the sort of history that David Hume set forth, and indeed it is no mark of disrespect to the Charleston editor to say that his concept of government is an 18th century concept. Certainly, such a theory was more at home in that century than in the next. David Hume, like Dr. Ball, was a defender of the inherited tradition. He was, according to a modern historian, to be “regarded as the acutest thinker in Great Britain of the eighteenth century, and the most qualified interpreter of its intellectual tendencies.” Hume gave evidence that he would have agreed with this appraisal of himself. He appointed himself a guardian of the inherited tradition and his history is one long artillery duel against the enemies of established authority in church and state, one eloquent voice raised in behalf of the things that the Tory intellect valued. It was literature of the first order, it was a responsible judgment about men and institutions by an eminently qualified man of learning, but it was not the kind of history that the free inquiry of a democratic way of life has evolved. As for its influence, let Thomas Jefferson speak of Hume and of his contemporary in defence of the Tory or property tradition in government, Sir William Blackstone. “Blackstone and Hume,” wrote Jefferson, “have made Tories of all England, and are making Tories of those young Americans whose native feelings of independence do not place them above the wily sophistries of a Hume or a Blackstone. These two books . . . have done more towards the suppression of the liberties of man, than all the million of men in arms of Bonaparte and the millions of human lives with the sacrifice of which he will stand loaded before the judgment seat of his Maker. I fear nothing for our liberties from the assaults of force, but I have seen and felt much, and fear more from . . . such books.” Jefferson, you will note, does not speak of property: he speaks of the “liberties of man.”
effort to recapture the light that never was. It is, like democracy itself, the most exciting, the most challenging, the most promising ideal that man has ever set up for himself.

In this whole process of remembering the past, of remembering it as an obligation in the intelligent citizen’s preparation for his present duties and liberties, those societies and agencies which serve as hewers of wood and drawers of water for historians are indispensable. For no historian can recreate the past without the documents and the records left by past generations. Even historical novelists would be severely limited if they had no such accumulations of documents such as your society and scores of others like it are endeavoring to preserve, though the novelists, by a liberal use of the imagination, would be less sorely handicapped than the historians. These institutions, which themselves have a long history, are a part of our democratic institutions. How useful and how necessary a part they play in this respect was evident in the compliment paid them when one of the Stuart Kings, three centuries ago, sought to dissolve the Royal Society of Antiquaries because he feared its members would inquire too closely into the arcana of government. This important role of our historical societies as the custodians of our democratic tradition and of the records of its way of life, was clearly defined by John Quincy Adams in an address before the New York Historical Society in 1844 when he declared that they were among the most useful of human institutions because they stood as warnings to public men that their acts would be recorded and remembered.

Historical societies in the United States trace their lineage back a century and a half, and their ancestry stems from New England. It is not very difficult to understand why the New Englanders encouraged the preservation of historical records and stimulated the writing of history to such a notable extent, though it is more difficult to understand why the inhabitants of the Southern region so signally failed to do so. The differences between the manner of life in the two sections were wide and they were noted at a very early date. One of the most civilized men produced in the Southern colonies was William Byrd of Westover in Virginia and he was one of the few writers in any of the colonies who could match wits and style with the best that England had to offer in his day. In his famous History of the Dividing Line between Virginia and North Carolina, Byrd wrote that the New Englanders “may be ridiculed for some Pharisaical Particularitys in their Worship and Behavior, yet they were very useful Subjects, as being Frugal and Industrious, giving no Scandal or bad Example, at least by any Open and Public Vices. By which Excellent qualities they had much the advantage of the Southern Colony(s), who thought their being Members of the Establish’d Church sufficient to sanctifie very loose and Profligate Morals.
For this reason New England improved much faster than Virginia.” It is not necessary to investigate causes too far, but it seems clear that the homogeneous religion of New England, her concern for public education, her deep-rooted regard for covenants and written documents, her extreme care in the protection of public records, particularly those having to do with wills, surveys, deeds and other records of property, her strict Calvinism which enjoined a study of the past because history was the Divine record and therefore its study a religious and moral duty—all of these factors led to the formation of the Massachusetts historical society a century and a half ago, the first of its kind in America. That it was such factors and not merely a provincial pride in local and ancestral achievement that impelled the Puritan to study history is indicated by the spread of historical societies in America in the early 19th century. It was a New Hampshire youth, Jonathan Peter Cushing, who went South and became the chief founder of the Virginia Historical Society in 1831. Lyman Copeland Draper had a New England ancestry going back five generations; he was one of the first of those who, in President McKissick’s felicitous phrase, “were literary carpetbaggers from outlandish parts,” and who profited by South Carolina’s lack of interest in her historical records by gathering them into his own collection. By oxcart, canal boat, stage-coach and every other means of conveyance, Draper travelled up and down the Appalachian frontier collecting original documents. That great collection is not in South Carolina or in the other states from which most of it was drawn, but in the Wisconsin Historical Society, of which Draper was made superintendent. Two of the principal founders of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio were Samuel P. Hildreth and Benjamin Tappan, both born in Massachusetts. It was another migrant son of New Hampshire, Lewis Cass, who in 1828 founded the short-lived Michigan Historical Society and who became the first president of the American Historical Society founded by Peter Force at Washington in 1835. James Hall, a distinguished figure in the early literary history of the Mississippi Valley and the founder of the Antiquarian and Historical Society of Illinois in 1827, was born in Massachusetts. Orlando C. Howe and Josiah Grinnell, two of the founders of the Iowa Historical Society, were both born in Vermont. It is needless to multiply instances in which New Englanders undertook to promote an interest in the history of such states as Virginia and Iowa as eagerly as if they were Massachusetts or Vermont. But the fact is that historical societies were most numerous and drew the widest support in areas covered by the New England expansion.

Today there are perhaps a thousand such societies in America. Their capitalized endowments aggregate many millions of dollars. Their collections of books, pamphlets, newspapers, maps,
prints, and manuscripts are of immense value to historians. Their published proceedings, quarterly magazines, and monographs would in themselves constitute a library of American history of considerable size. There has recently come into existence an American Association of State and Local Historical Societies, presided over by Dr. C. C. Crittenden of the North Carolina Historical Commission. Thus this immense fraternity of historical institutions, of which your Society is a young but vigorous part, has at last recognized its community interests and has established its own autonomous organization, a step which the much younger libraries and museums of America have long since taken. These societies are of various types. They are national, regional, religious, racial, scientific, business, genealogical, patriotic. In terms of wealth they vary from the small village society sustained by nominal dues to the wealthy New York Historical Society, whose endowment is capitalized at several millions of dollars. Some of them, such as the older societies of the East, seem to flourish best under an aristocratic concept of gentility. In one of them, for example, there occurred in the 1830's a disruptive incident brought about by the fact that some members of the society wished to elect to membership one of the leading publishers of the country; others fought this subversive effort on the ground that the publisher had been born in Ireland. Not until 1824 did any of the early societies dare to include in its constitution the provision that membership might be extended to include females. The later societies of the Middle West emphasized a democratic approach to history, and today the Massachusetts Historical Society and the American Antiquarian Society appear to be the only institutions of importance that have limited memberships. All of them, in the beginning, experienced the embarrassing problem produced by over-zealous but uncritical supporters who crowded their museum cabinets with sea shells, stuffed animals, bullets picked up from battlegrounds, pieces of wood from historic trees shaped into gavels or walking sticks, locks of hair clipped from the heads of important personages, and miscellaneous assortments of artifacts collected without regard to provenance or significance.

But I am firmly convinced that the historical societies of America have within the past decade attained their maturity and have in consequence discarded most if not all of their childish antiquarianism, their almost apologetic appeal to the public for assistance, their detached attitude toward things of the present. They are on the verge of realizing their proud role as conservators of the democratic heritage and of demonstrating to the world at large that they are in reality an indispensable part of our social institutions. They are becoming less and less interested in documents merely because they are old, and they are focussing their attention more and more upon the significant
documents of the present. Their national association is at this moment alert to the fact that we are engaged in a war in which the democratic heritage is threatened, and a movement is under way to have every state in the Union preserve while the opportunity is present all forms of records produced by the civilian population in its total war effort. This opportunity was largely missed during the last war, but if the plans now under way are carried out, we shall be prepared in the future to say at once, when the need arises, what has been done, what mistakes have been made, what obstacles have been met by a democratic people engaged in total war.

Nothing that the societies themselves have done has so much emphasized their value to the American people as the unprecedented undertaking of the Federal Government through the Historical Records Survey of the Work Projects Administration. There are many who have criticized this effort as another boondoggling enterprise. If it was boondoggling, it was the same sort of boondoggling that produced the great Domesday Book of English fame, but it was an undertaking on a scale so vast, so carefully planned, so competently executed as to make the Domesday Book seem by comparison the ephemeral publication of a local society. Nothing quite like the work of the Historical Records Survey has ever been undertaken by any other nation at any time in history. It has surveyed the state and local records of every municipal government in this country, of most of its important manuscripts repositories, of a large number of its churches, fraternal organizations, and even of some of the federal and other agencies in the Territories. It has published more than fourteen hundred guides, bibliographies, indexes, and calendars of documents which are the very substance of the great story that lies back of this greatest world power in history. It has employed thousands of people, more perhaps than have been engaged in all of the historical societies in America since their beginning. It has cost the taxpayers of America more money, beyond a doubt, than all the historical societies have spent since 1791. I, for one, am proud to have had a part of my tax money used for such a purpose and I am proud to have been associated with the Historical Records Survey from the beginning and to have shared in its unparalleled exploits.

Has all this been worth it? I think it has. I think that when the thousand or so historical societies realize fully what the Federal Government has done by thus underwriting the purpose for which they stand they will no longer tolerate antiquarianism and will no longer appeal for charity. They will demand support as democratic institutions and will claim as full a title to it as public schools and public libraries. They will, of course, be faced with the responsibility of proving their worth in the same manner that public libraries and public schools have been called upon to prove their usefulness to society. I
am convinced that they cannot prove their worth to those who refuse to be persuaded, to those who see no need in preserving old documents which may appear to be merely quaint or new documents which may seem like the sweepings from yesterday's wastebasket. A democratic society will always have such skeptics and I suppose a certain amount of healthy skepticism should be encouraged. We had the same sort of skeptics at the beginning of the public school system and the public library system. But to those increasing numbers of intelligent, well-educated Americans who more and more reflect upon the ends of government and the good of society, demonstration will be simple. For if we do not support the institutions which have preserved and published so vast a multitude of historical records in the past century and a half, we shall not merely deny them that sustenance which is their right; we shall also be forced into the position of denying other and even more basic concepts in our Democracy. One of these is the democratic concept of free inquiry, the belief that the kind of history suited to a democracy is not the state-taught, state-dominated history of totalitarian countries, filled with mythical jargons of racial superiority or pagan cults, but the free and untrammelled pursuit of truth into whatever quarter truth is to be found. Under this ideal, which is at the very heart of the democratic ideal of man, American historians in the past three-quarters of a century have produced some of the finest historical literature ever written. Under this ideal the historian has freely pursued his facts, hidden away in multitudes of documents, he has developed a scientific technique for evaluating these facts, he has claimed the right to present his conclusions fairly and honestly for the judgment of his fellow historians and his fellow citizens, and he has done all this in the belief that an understanding of history gained from such an impartial effort to discover truth would provide a rational basis for discussion and for social action. Under this ideal we have justified immense aggregates of capital for endowed professorships of history, for libraries, for fellowships, for archival repositories, for immensely multiplied publications and for all the paraphernalia and subsidy of scientific history.

If we are to abandon or to fail to support the effort now being carried on by such societies as this, then we shall have to abandon also the ideal under which the historian has labored and produced in America his fine achievements in historical writing. For the historians cannot write history if such institutions as this do not preserve the records from which it is to be written, if the magnificent work of the Historical Records Survey does not guide the historians to their proper sources.

Our enemies do not need such societies as this; they and their historians may invent or suppress or distort their history. Invention and suppression and distortion are devices which they
desperately must employ in order to bolster a government based upon a false philosophy and upon a denial of the truth rather than upon a passion to discover truth. That is not the American way. We have pursued another and a nobler ideal and, whether or not the skeptics are right about our historical societies, our way of pursuing truth in history has at least not prevented us from becoming a great nation, a nation whose foundation is in belief in human liberty and which has no need for falsifying the record. If you believe, as I do, that the free inquiry of free historians in America has helped to produce a richer, a more mature, a more understanding way of life in a democracy, then we cannot avoid our responsibility to see to it that such institutions as this are not among the casualties of war hysteria. We must see to it that the records we preserve are not those that reflect one side and one side only of the truth. We must see to it, above all, that historians do not abandon in time of crisis their ideal of the scientific method, their confidence in the value of the time perspective, their unwillingness to pass judgments at too close range, their belief in the need of waiting until all of the diaries, the memoirs, the private correspondences, the conflicting reports are weighed and checked and balanced and sifted. We must see to it that our own national pride, which has not been spared by historians in the past, does not drive us in the post-war period to the folly of adopting the ways of our enemies by explaining, and justifying, and excusing ourselves while maligning our enemies. For if we do that, we shall sacrifice all of the gains made by our historians in the past. We shall do worse. We shall prepare the way for such hatreds and enmities as will inevitably result in a still greater catastrophe, and by so doing we shall discover the truth of Wellington’s remark that nothing, save a battle lost, can be so costly as a battle won.