THE SOUTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

JANUARY 2000 VOLUME 101 • NUMBER 1

Centennial Volume 1900-2000

This issue is dedicated to

Mrs. Mary P. Anderson and Dr. Charles R. Anderson

in honor of their generous and longstanding support of the South Carolina Historical Society

Publication of this issue is made possible in part by the Frederick Horner Bunting Publication Fund and

WACHOVIA

THE SOUTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL MAGAZINE

JANUARY 2000 VOLUME 101 • NUMBER 1

Centennial Volume 1900-2000

CONTENTS

SOUTH CAROLINA FEDERALISTS AND THE ORIGINS OF THE NULLIFICATION MOVEMENT

GEORGE C. ROGERS, JR. *

WHY DID SOUTH CAROLINA VOTE TO JOIN THE UNION IN 1788? Why did she vote in 1860 to withdraw from that Union? As the same elite guided the destinies of the state from the Revolution to the Civil War, there was a change in thought concerning the value of the Union among the leaders of this rice and cotton planting society. When South Carolina voted for ratification in May 1788, Charleston and the neighboring parishes unanimously favored the adoption of the Constitution. The center of Federalist strength was in the city and the lowcountry.

In my book on William Loughton Smith, I identified four Federalist factions in Charleston: the Izard-Manigault-Smith faction, the Smiths, DeSaussure, and Darrell faction, the Read-Simons faction, and the Rutledge-Pinckney faction. Since then I have identified two more in the lowcountry: the Hugers of Georgetown and the Barnwells of Beaufort. This was government by an elite as these men stood out because of their antecedents, their wealth, and the prestige gained in winning the recent struggle.

Why did these men, all of whom were slaveholders, trust the institution of slavery in the new Union? The gentlemen who met in Philadelphia in 1787 shared a common experience, which had begun in New York in 1765 and had been strengthened in Philadelphia after 1774. Although John Adams was harsh in his strictures on the Rutledges, the New Englanders needed the South Carolinians in 1774 and made a significant concession when they permitted rice to be excepted from the nonexportation agreement. This may have been the point from which grew the southern feeling that a southern staple was "king". The bonds of common experience, forged during the Revolution, were tightened in the 1780's at triennial meetings of the Cincinnati and during summer visits to the fashionable northern spas.

Among these American gentlemen it was understood that the southern

This article first appeared in *South Carolina Historical Magazine*, 71 (January 1970), 17-32. It appears here in its original form.

*This paper, written after the author's book *Charleston in the Age of the Pinckneys* had been sent to the publisher, was read at a session of the Southern Historical Association's convention which met in New Orleans in November 1968. It develops somewhat further the themes set forth in that book. It benefits from certain insights provided by the New Left historians although the author has rejected their general stance. It is also based on new research in one large category of papers: the messages that the governors of South Carolina sent to the legislature from 1790 to 1880 which can be found in the South Carolina Archives.

staples of rice and indigo could only be grown by slave labor. Therefore, Charles Cotesworth Pinckney did not seek protection in the Constitution for southern interests, once concessions on slavery had been made by eastern delegates. Undoubtedly the southern Federalists were men who believed that gentlemen would keep their word. But even if New Englanders did not keep their word on slavery, South Carolinians had quite extraordinary faith in their own abilities to control the situation.

There was, however, among the South Carolina leadership, even in 1787, an awareness that the South Carolina interest, resting on slavery, was peculiar and should have strong constitutional protection. Charles Pinckney, after delineating five economic interests in the thirteen states, demanded in the convention a three-fourths vote as necessary for the passage of any navigation act. Although this suggestion was lost, a two-thirds vote to ratify treaties gave some protection. In the state legislature Rawlins Lowndes led the opposition to ratification simply on the basis that southern interests were not fully protected under the new Constitution. Those who could not put their faith in good intentions, but only in the strongest guarantees, were the forerunners of the Nullifiers. They were more agrarian than commercial in their interests. What seemed to be emerging in South Carolina was the typical story of rivalry between the Hamiltonians and the Jeffersonians.

But not quite! The historians of the New Left have done at least one good thing. They have forced us to look at the arguments over slavery in the earliest Congresses. Staughton Lynd in his essay "Beyond Beard" stated that "the emergence of sectional parties in 1789-1792" constituted "the connecting link between analysis of the formation of the Constitution and analysis of the origins of the Civil War."[1] The debate over the anti-slavery petitions in the first Congress divided the country into a South and a North, this debate providing the first tug drawing the Federalists of South Carolina away from their northern friends.

More important was the effect of the insurrection in Santo Domingo on Charles Pinckney who had in spite of some reservations supported the Union. Pinckney, as governor of South Carolina, received pleas for help from the French, which he passed on to the national government on the basis that under the new union these were matters deserving of attention at the center of government. Nevertheless as the refugees arrived and the stories of horror mounted, Pinckney and the state thought it necessary to reorganize the militia. As the 1792 militia law of the federal government called for new laws at the state level, South Carolina quickly responded. Charles Pinckney, as did all the South Carolina governors of this period, believed "a well

[1]Staughton Lynd, "Beyond Beard," in *Towards a New Past, Dissenting Essays in American History*, ed. Barton J. Bernstein (New York, 1968), p. 54.

regulated militia" was "the most natural & safe defense of a free people."[2]

The threats to the Carolina community were best represented by the scare of 1798. Senator Jacob Read in May 1798 wrote to Charles Pinckney, then governor for the third time, of the "immediate danger of the Southern States being invaded by an Army from the French West Indies composed principally of Black Troops."[3] Pinckney called the legislature into special session, in Charleston, to prepare the harbor defenses, to strengthen the militia, and even to send presents through Generals Pickens and Anderson to the Indians on the frontier. Pinckney described the situation to the regular session of the legislature in November 1798: "on our Frontiers we have savage & restless neighbours . . . on whose long continuance in Peace we cannot with safety rely. We have too among ourselves in the very Bosom of our Country & Families a property who although valuable as the means of our cultivation can only continue so by being kept compleatly subordinate & who have in other Countries less vigilant & able to controul them proved the most dreadful instruments of assassination & plunder. These ought in my Judgment to prove with you forcible arguments to induce you to be prepared for every emergency."[4]

It is the theme of this paper that the Nullifiers and the Secessionists could never have achieved separate state action until external dangers had disappeared and internal peace had been assured. Just as the thirteen colonies would not have revolted before 1763 as long as the Spanish, French, and Indians were immediate threats, so the South would not have risked secession until the dangers from Florida, Louisiana, and Texas, as well as from Mexico and the Caribbean, had disappeared. The Pinckney Treaty, the Louisiana Purchase, the Florida Treaty, the Seminole War, and a new measure of stability in the West Indies did push back these external dangers.

Internal unity among the white population was obtained in South Carolina in the decade 1800-1810. The differences between the lowcountry rice planters and the upcountry subsistence farmers disappeared at that time. The spread of cotton and the extension of slavery into the backcountry brought about the transformation of many families such as the Calhouns, Hamptons, Taylors, Andersons, Pickens, Mannings, and Richardsons, from farmers to planters. And this economic change was sealed by the constitutional amendment of 1808 which provided a more equal representation in the South Carolina legislature. More importantly the new unity was nurtured by the state college in Columbia. Governor John Drayton in 1801 advocated a state college because "The friendships of our

[2]Charles Pinckney, Nov. 26, 1792, Governor's Message, Legislative System, S. C. Archives (hereinafter this series of governors' papers will be referred to as GM).

[3]Enclosure submitted with Charles Pinckney, Nov. 28, 1798, GM.

[4]Charles Pinckney, Nov. 28, 1798, GM.

young men, would thence be promoted; and strengthened, throughout the state: and, our political union, be much advanced thereby."[5] Governor James B. Richardson in 1803 stated that college friendships "will tend to the complete annihilation of all divisions in our state."[6] By 1810, five years after the college opened, John Drayton was satisfied that the youth of our own State, were "no longer dependent upon foreign institutions."[7] South Carolina leaders were henceforth trained at home rather than at the Inns of Court or in the North, and a Carolina mind was forming.

Since the white population never really increased after 1810, South Carolina society was static. A vast problem, however, had yet to be solved. How could a Santo Domingo be avoided? How could Revolutionary ideas which might enter through itinerant preachers, free Negroes, and fresh slaves be blocked?

The Methodist preachers were the chief cause of concern. On July 18, 1800, Senator Jacob Read, sent Governor John Drayton a copy of "The Address of the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, to all their Brethren and Friends in the United States," signed by Bishops Coke, Asbury, and Whatcoat and dated May 20, 1800, at Baltimore. This address spoke of the "great national evil of Negro-Slavery" as being repugnant to the unalienable rights of mankind, to the very essence of civil liberty, and to the spirit of the Christian religion. The three bishops regretted "that so large a proportion of the inhabitants of this country, who so truly boast of the liberty they enjoy . . . should continue to deprive of every trace of liberty so many of their fellow creatures equally capable with themselves of every social blessing and of eternal happiness." This was an inconsistency which was "scarcely to be paralleled in the history of mankind!" The bishops thereupon urged each annual conference of the Methodist church to petition its state legislature in behalf of emancipation.[8]

Unfortunately for the Methodists this appeal coincided with the Gabriel insurrection in Virginia. Governor John Drayton laid the Methodist appeal and correspondence concerning the insurrection in Virginia before the South Carolina legislature in November 1800. Although there had been no reverberations from the Gabriel insurrection in South Carolina, John Drayton warned that the legislature might soon expect Methodist petitions.[9] Drayton also transmitted Jacob Read's own letter which bristled with hostility. Senator Read had written: "The Quakers & Methodists have long been sapping the very existence of the Southern States. The former are however harmless when compared with the latter. The Quakers with very few

[5]John Drayton, Nov. 28, 1801, GM.
[6]James B. Richardson, Nov. 24, 1803, GM.
[7]John Drayton, Nov. 27, 1810, GM.
[8]Enclosures submitted with John Drayton, Nov. 25, 1800, GM.
[9]John Drayton, Nov. 25, 1800, GM.

exceptions do not go from home, they have no organized institutions & but very few active Instruments. The Methodists as they are governed & directed by a penurious greedy set of low fellows many of them adventurers lately arrived from Europe calling themselves Bishops and preachers are vastly more dangerous—they are spreading themselves every where & doing infinite mischief to Society.... Hitherto indeed their attempts have been scant & silent and addressed only to their own silly followers, but encouraged by their success they now venture to speak out and in a late address say they mean 'to lay the axe to the root of the tree' in which indeed they in fact lay the firebrand to our houses and the dagger to our throats... should either Coke or Ashberry or both again visit Carolina our own safety seems to require that they be arrested, their papers examined & themselves bound to their good behavior."[10]

It was shortly after this in 1804 that the Methodists settled on two Disciplines, one for the North and one for the South. Donald G. Mathews has highlighted the importance of this compromise in his book *Slavery and Methodism*.[11] As it was shortly thereafter that the Quakers migrated from South Carolina, the chance of the churches preaching against slavery evaporated.

Governor John Drayton in his November 1800 message had also thrown light on the plight of the free negro in South Carolina. "The free Negroes in divers parts of this State, are assuming some rights of citizenship, incompatible with their degree in life. And in Charleston, they have actually arrived to that pass; that although they associate with slaves, in terms of great familiarity; yet, on the least offence, they institute actions of slander, assault and battery, and other actions of offensive nature against them, before Justices of the Peace; before whose tribunal, they have been generally successful: and often without reason or justice. Our present situation, seems to require some Legislative interference, in all these matters."[12] The free Negroes were pressing for rights of citizens; the white leadership obviously did not consider them citizens of the state.

Although the free Negroes formed in Charleston their own Methodist churches, new city ordinances controlled their meetings. By an 1806 city ordinance assemblies of more than seven free persons of color had to be attended by a white person, nor could free persons of color assemble for dancing or "other merriment" without written permission of the city

[10]Jacob Read to John Drayton, July 18, 1800, from Newport, R. I., enclosure submitted with John Drayton, Nov. 16, 1800, GM.

[11]Donald G. Mathews, *Slavery and Methodism, A Chapter in American Morality, 1780-1845* (Princeton, N. J., 1965), p. 26.

[12]John Drayton, Nov. 25, 1800, GM.

wardens.[13] Free Negroes who left South Carolina could not return to the state.[14] In 1822 free Negroes arriving on vessels as crewmen must be lodged in the workhouse during their stay.[15] The pressure upon free Negroes never let up before the Civil War.

In spite of the dangers, the slave trade was reopened in 1803 for five years. But none could be brought from the West Indies; all must come from Africa.[16] Obviously those who came from Africa could be conditioned more easily.

With the presence of free Negroes and the introduction of more slaves, there should have been more manumissions. The humanitarian impulses of the American Revolutionary period, however, never embraced emancipation. In fact, South Carolina took one big step in 1800 and another in 1820 to make it almost impossible to free slaves.[17] As Winthrop Jordan says in his book, *White over Black*, the decision of Virginia in 1806 to make it difficult to free slaves was the turning point in attitudes of whites toward blacks in America.[18] As long as Virginia was doubtful, the enlightenment impulses embedded in the Revolution might have run towards emancipation. But when Virginia made her fateful decision, a white America became a reality. If this decision had implications for the nation, as Jordan implies, it also had implications for South Carolina. The American Colonization Society was formed to remove free Negroes from America; Andrew Jackson succeeded in removing the red men to a new state west of the Mississippi River. South Carolina approved these movements as they led to a free white America. But she did not desire an end to black slavery.

The fact that William Loughton Smith and Jacob Read held southern views on slavery shows that South Carolina Federalists did believe in slavery. Yet they had supported the union because of large commercial interests and because of an acceptable style of politics. It was the embargo of 1808, the ensuing nonimportation regulations, and the War of 1812 that undermined the commercial interests of Charleston. When Smith's urgings for a homespun company in 1808 came to naught, I have suggested that we have a date for South Carolina as crucial as Mathews' date of 1804 for the

[13]*Digest of the Ordinances of the City Council of Charleston, From the Year 1783 to July 1818* (Charleston, S. C., 1818), pp. 180-181.

[14]*S. C. Statutes*, VII, 461.

[15]*S. C. Statutes*, VII, 461-462.

[16]Carl H. Brown, "The Reopening of the Foreign Slave Trade in South Carolina, 1803-1807" (MA thesis, Univ. of S. C., 1968).

[17]*S. C. Statutes*, VII, 440-443, 459-460; John L. Bradley, "Slave Manumission in South Carolina, 1820-1860" (MA thesis, Univ. of S. C., 1964).

[18]In 1806 Virginia passed a law which stated that slaves freed thereafter were required to leave the commonwealth within twelve months. Jordan wrote: "This was, of course, a key decision in a key state." Winthrop D. Jordan, *White over Black, American Attitudes Toward the Negro, 1550-1812* (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1968), p. 348.

South or as Jordan's date of 1806 for Virginia.[19]

The Federalists were overwhelmed by new tactics in 1800. The South Carolina Republicans under Charles Pinckney had developed a new brand of politics which gave them victory in 1800 in South Carolina and earned for them the everlasting hatred of the Federalists. The old leadership of the Federalists believed in a deference type of politics. The conduct of Thomas and Charles Cotesworth Pinckney in 1796, 1800, 1804, and 1808 is proof. Younger Federalists like John Rutledge, Jr., as David Fischer has suggested, tried to emulate the Republican tactics of Charles Pinckney.[20] But actually such rough-and-tumble politics has never been congenial to the South Carolinians who find the elitist brand more to their liking. When Aaron Burr tried to dip into South Carolina politics and use the Alstons of Waccamaw, the Republicans had an example to place beside Hamilton's use of the Pinckneys, which examples undermined any taste for these national alliances.[21]

When the declining Federalists in the North after the War of 1812 tried to introduce the slave issue as a means of regaining power in the nation, South Carolina broke with that party—once on the issue of slavery and again on the issue of partisan politics. The old faith was broken. This was why the Missouri controversy was a great dividing line in South Carolina politics. Could the state bar the entry of free Negroes? South Carolina had been doing so, why not Missouri? It was at this juncture of affairs that South Carolina began to rely upon constitutional interpretation as her safeguard in the union. And Charles Pinckney emerged as the link between the men who made the union in 1788 and those who embraced nullification in 1832. In 1821, while serving in the national House of Representatives, he gave his view of the privileges and immunities clause of the Constitution as never having included free Negroes, who were therefore obviously not citizens within the meaning of that word as used in the Constitution—a white man's document, if you will.[22] Governor John Geddes said in his 1820 message to the legislature, when discussing the fact that free persons of color were emigrating to South Carolina: "The policy of our country forbids the increase of this class of persons amongst us." We ought to oppose this "at the threshold."[23]

[19]George C. Rogers, Jr., *Evolution of a Federalist, William Loughton Smith of Charleston (1758-1812)* (Columbia, S. C., 1962), p. 374.

[20]David H. Fischer, *The Revolution of American Conservatism, The Federalist Party in the Era of Jeffersonian Democracy* (New York, 1965), pp. 40-41.

[21]See Chapter X, "Aristocratic Factions," in my forthcoming *History of Georgetown County, South Carolina* (Columbia, S. C., 1970).

[22]*Annals of Congress* (16th cong., 2nd sess.), pp. 1129-1145.

[23]John Geddes, Nov. 27, 1820, GM.

What South Carolina already saw in the Missouri situation was that Congress was legislating on the slavery question. This is why she began more and more to oppose both the New Nationalism of Henry Clay with its emphasis on implied powers and the judicial nationalism of John Marshall with its emphasis on one people. Although Marshall was thundering forth with a new conception of the union, Governor Thomas Bennett could still in 1821 consider the Federal Constitution "as an emanation of Divine wisdom." But it was because Bennett gave the Constitution a state rights interpretation. "State rights" are "not," he said, "more essential to the preservation of the union, and the liberty and happiness of the people, than the immutable Laws of Nature to the harmony with which revolving worlds move around their great first Cause."[24]

And yet state rights meant that the federal force could not be called upon to keep the slaves in submission. Actually there was less danger at home than before. Governor Thomas Bennett in 1821 while asking for an amelioration of punishments in criminal and slave codes told why. In our "Penal Laws, there are no provisions which present stronger and more urgent claims to the justice, humanity and prompt attention of the Legislature, than those which prescribe the mode of trial and punishment for crimes committed by slaves and other negroes. The necessity which originally induced their adoption will be found in that feeble and immature state of society which would justify a resort to the most summary and rigorous measures under the great rule of self-preservation. Thinly scattered over an immense extent of territory, whose varied soils offered an ample recompense to labour, the early inhabitants of this country were allured to" the accumulation of wealth "by the extended sphere of operation and diversity of employment. A spirit of commercial rapacity already engaged in administering to similar wants anticipated and even supplied them to excess. Unempowered in a provincial capacity to restrict a system of speculation so gainful to the parent state," South Carolinians "contemplated with deep concern the rapid augmentation and dangerous character of this population. Associations with the wily aborigine and occasional demonstrations of a spirit of insubordination educed by a sudden transition from the indolence and precarious enjoyments of uncivilized life to labour and servility, coerced our forefathers to the adoption of a system of Law which should deter from crime by a prompt and appalling severity of punishment. This system is still maintained although the necessity which dictated has long since ceased and been supplanted by affections and sympathies whose growth has been cultivated by the active beneficence and humane attentions of their proprietors."[25] Much that is important about

[24]Thomas Bennett, Nov. 27, 1821, GM.
[25]*Ibid.*

South Carolina is buried in this statement. First, that South Carolina in the early eighteenth century exemplified a capitalistic culture, harsh, brutal, rapacious. Those were the days of allurement, a word now made famous by David Bertelson in *The Lazy South*.[26] Governor Bennett tells us that allurement was replaced by a sense of community. The Federalists had been linked with allurement; the Nullifiers with community. Bennett was saying that by 1820 the savage had been rubbed out of the Negro, a way of co-existence between whites and blacks was growing up.

What Bennett was saying about social relations can be exemplified by a reference to what had happened to language. In mid-eighteenth century, Charleston was a tower of Babel. The Huguenots spoke French to mid-century. The Scots lent their northern burr to the sounds of the city. Germans, Dutch, Portuguese, and Spaniards spoke their native tongues. Intermingling with these were the sounds of the Negroes just off the vessels from Africa. Each accent would have been distinct among the original arrivals. But gradually two strains of accent emerged.

The sons of the planters and merchants who were sent to England for an education in ever increasing numbers in the two decades before the Revolution acquired a polished English accent. The son of a Scottish merchant wrote to his father from London: "With respect to one great object for which you were at the expense and trouble of placing me here, I think I am beginning to *pronounce* some *words* as Englishmen do, and just to *feel* the difference between the *rhythm* of their conversation and mine." Nearly a year later he wrote more optimistically: "I am sensible that I have by no means made myself master of all the variety of the English accents: I am now and then detected in a Scotch inflexion, but hardly ever without previously detecting myself. This circumstance will inform you of the degree of advance I have made...."[27] The Charleston boys, after such conditioning, brought home an accent with very special vowel sounds.

The Negro slaves struggling to make themselves understood both among themselves and by their masters, who might have been of either English or French speaking stock in the early days, developed a language which combined African dialects with French and English words. The result was Gullah. No one knows the derivation. One school emphasizes the disintegration of English and French; the other the retention of Africanisms. The first claims that eighteenth-century English words were trapped in the Negro language and through mental indolence transformed. This indolence, according to John Bennett, "shows itself in the shortening of words, the elision of syllables, and modification of every difficult

[26]David Bertelson, *The Lazy South* (New York, 1967), pp. 9-10, passim.

[27]Francis Horner to his father, Nov. 23, 1795, Sept. 3, 1796, *Memoirs and Correspondence of Francis Horner, M.P.*, ed. Leonard Horner (London, 1843), I, 7, 17.

enunciation." The result is difficult to understand "so great has been the sound-change and so complete the disintegration."[28] Another historian of the language, Lorenzo Dow Turner, emphasizes the Africanisms. He finds much similarity between Gullah and Negro dialects of Brazil and the West Indies, and the tie is the African origins.[29] The real influence among the South Carolina Negroes came from the continual arrival down to 1808 of Negroes fresh from Africa. Thus for over a century the lowcountry and the sea islands were stocked with Negroes. What happened in the nineteenth century was that the aristocrats by the time of nullification had cut themselves off from the rest of the world and associated more and more with their slave population, a bit of Gullah therefore rubbed back into the English eighteenth-century aristocratic speech, giving a residue which is peculiarly Charlestonian—high Gullah one might call it. The blending of voices implied a blending of social relations.

What I am trying to warn against is being completely misled by the Denmark Vesey insurrection. Admitting that violence was plotted, that severe punishments were meted out, let us not draw the conclusion that henceforth there was only antagonism between the white and black worlds. Although William Freehling has said that the 1820's was the violent decade in South Carolina's history, he has also pointed out that there was relative calm afterward.[30] But even in the 1820's it might be noted that the Denmark Vesey plot was related to whites by faithful slaves, as was the earlier Camden plot. That there were faithful slaves Eugene Genovese has pointed out to the critics of William Styron.[31]

If we go off in the direction of the New Left and say that since these men were slaveholders and since they did suppress all insurrections, that they had no virtue, we go off in the wrong direction. The relations were infinitely more complex as Genovese has pointed out: "On the one hand, slavery threw whites and blacks together intimately in relations often harsh and brutal, and sometimes affectionate and loving, sometimes all at once."[32] Genovese in his essay "Marxian Interpretations of the Slave South" has written of the planters: "These men were class conscious, socially responsible, and personally honorable; they selflessly fulfilled their duties and did what their class and society required of them . . . If we blind ourselves to everything noble, virtuous, honorable, decent, and selfless in a ruling class,

[28]John Bennett, "Gullah: A Negro Patois," *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, VIII (1909), 40.

[29]Lorenzo Dow Turner, *Africanisms in the Gullah Dialect* (Chicago, Ill., 1949).

[30]William W. Freehling, *Prelude to Civil War, The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina, 1816- 1836* (New York, 1965), p. 64.

[31]Eugene D. Genovese, "The Nat Turner Case," *The New York Review of Books*, September 26, 1968, pp. 34-35.

[32]*Ibid.*, p. 86.

how do we account for its hegemony? . . . Such hegemony could never be maintained without some leaders whose individual qualities are intrinsically admirable...." Slavery raised "to regional power a prebourgeois ruling class of formidable political strength and military potential."[32]

What did their class and society require of these planters?

Faced with a crisis—both in their relationship to the union and in their need to maintain order at home—what did they do? Just as the New Left today amidst a crisis seeks models in the past, and come together in a book entitled *Towards A New Past*, these planters searched for a usable past.[33] They too found consolation and strength in history, false history perhaps, but for them their history.

The heroes of the Revolution had fought against tyranny; their descendants would do likewise. What was therefore necessary was a history that ensured heroes. So there began in the 1820's the idolization of the Revolutionary figures. Myths were manufactured out of good material. This was the day of Parson Weems' *George Washington* and *Francis Marion*, but the key work in South Carolina hagiography was Major Alexander Garden's *Anecdotes of the Revolutionary War* which appeared in 1822 and was reprinted in 1828. Major Garden dedicated his work to the Pinckneys. "My object, in giving publicity to the Anecdotes I would record, is, avowedly, to honour the Fathers of our Revolution, and to excite that emulation in their descendants, to imitate their example, that will best secure the benefits resulting from their valour, and their virtues."[34] Garden's volume begins with the story of William Moultrie and his famous band on Sullivan's Island, the author comparing them to Leonidas and those who stood at Thermopylae.[35] The Americans who had been imprisoned on board the *Torbay* and the *Pack-Horse* were akin to Regulus.[36] Garden contrasted the "Demosthenian eloquence" of John Rutledge with the "Ciceronian style" of his brother Edward.[37] The classics had always supplied examples, but now to the ancients would be added the modern heroes. The stories of Francis Marion and the sweet potatoes, of Andrew Jackson and the officer's boots, of Sergeant Jasper and the flag, of Rebecca Motte and the flaming arrows stud the book.[38] If Andrew Jackson by his victory at New Orleans had

[33]Eugene D. Genovese, "Marxian Interpretations of the Slave South," in *Towards a New Past, Dissenting Essays in American History*, ed. Barton J. Bernstein (New York, 1968), pp. 113-115.

[34]Alexander Garden, *Anecdotes of the Revolutionary War in America, with Sketches of Character of Persons the most Distinguished, in the Southern States, for Civil and Military Services* (Charleston, S. C., 1822), p. 115.

[35]*Ibid.*, pp. 7-16.

[36]*Ibid.*, p. 163.

[37]*Ibid.*, p. 176.

[38]*Ibid.*, pp. 21-22, 90-91, 115, 226-227.

become a "symbol for an age," Garden was creating symbols for a state.[39]

When Judge William Johnson wrote in the 1820's his biography of General Nathanael Greene, he admitted that there were differences in feeling between his own times and those Revolutionary days. Johnson who could look with favor on Greene and treat him dispassionately, not letting the guerilla leaders Sumter and Marion usurp too much of the narrative, was still appalled at the idea that Greene wanted to arm the slaves. Concerning General Greene's letter of December 1781 suggesting to Governor Rutledge the use of Negro troops, Johnson wrote: "Those who can enter into the feelings and opinions of the citizens of those states which tolerate slavery, will be not a little startled at the proposition submitted to the governor and council, in this letter. A strong, deep-seated feeling, nurtured from earliest infancy, decides, with instinctive promptness, against a measure of so threatening an aspect, and so offensive to that republican pride, which disdains to commit the defence of the country to servile hands; or share with a colour, to which the idea of inferiority is inseparably connected, the profession of arms."[40] "Republican pride" would not permit a country to be defended by "servile hands." After thirty years of such drilling in the classics ancient and modern, the young men of the state in 1860 were ready to fight and never to think during the Civil War of calling upon their slaves to fight beside them.

Such history must challenge all attempts to reveal the faults of the heroes. There is no better example of this side of historical writing than Robert Y. Hayne's attempt in one of the 1828 issues of the *Southern Review* to refute Lord Rawdon's slurs upon the motives of Col. Isaac Hayne. Senator Hayne did not wish apologies for Weymms, Watson, Brown, Tarleton, and Rawdon. "And thus, one by one, may our history be rifled of every incident calculated to confer honor on the American character." After the senator had completed weighing Col. Isaac Hayne's "moral necessity" for taking protection with Lord Rawdon's comments thereupon, he concluded: "We have now performed, as well as we were able, what we conceived a duty to the memory of one of the most revered of our martyrs. It is due to the country, that not a single trophy of the Revolution should be suffered to be destroyed, and we should be sorry to see recorded on one of them, the memorable inscription on the beautiful naval monument in Washington, 'mutilated by Britons.' We would, if we could, preserve them all, in their simple majesty and beauty, to kindle in the bosom of our American youth, to the latest posterity, the sacred glow of patriotism. We have always

[39]See John William Ward, *Andrew Jackson, Symbol for an Age* (New York, 1962).

[40]William Johnson, *Sketches of the Life and Correspondence of Nathanael Greene* (Charleston, S. C., 1822), II, 274-275.

considered the moral and political lessons, taught by the history of the Revolution, as the most precious inheritance derived from our fathers."[41] In 1830 when Maria Henrietta Pinckney, the daughter of Gen. Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, had reduced the nullification doctrine to its simplest form in *The Quintessence of Long Speeches, arranged as a Political Catechism*, she asked herself and her readers on whom could they depend. Her answer was: "on the descendants of the patriot hand who achieved the Revolution."[42]

When Judge Harper, also writing in the *Southern Review* for 1828, compared South Carolina to Santo Domingo and the abolitionists in the north to the "Amis des Noirs" in France, he also raised the question of how the South should respond. His answer was state self-reliance. We are "sovereign States."[43] The state would respond as it had done during the Revolution. The doctrine of nullification was fierce and unyielding, not so much because of fear but because of pride, which on looking back to the American Revolution was more than half justified. It was this pride which drove them to Civil War and sustained them through it.

This search for the past was conscious. It is apparent in the great amount of name changing. William Smith in 1804 added Loughton as his middle name; Joseph Allen Smith assumed Izard as his last name. John Lynch Bowman changed his name to John Bowman Lynch. Francis Marion provided in his will that his nephew must assume the name of Francis Marion in order to inherit his estate.[44] The practice became so common that in 1814 the state passed a law in order to make it easier to change the name of a family.[45] The most famous use of this law was in 1837 when the six Smith brothers of Beaufort asked to change their names from Smith to Rhett, in order, as the prayer of the petitioners said, that "the name of Rhett, in the grand Maternal line, and now extinct, may be revived and preserved, a name held dear by the Petitioners, and consecrated by natural regard and affection."[46] Robert Barnwell Rhett, the father of secession, is therefore the prime example.

In such a society, where thoughts were freezing into a permanent form, what was the place of education? Thomas Smith Grimké, almost alone among his contemporaries, as Adrienne Koch has so eloquently told us,

[41][Robert Y. Hayne] "Execution of Colonel Isaac Hayne," *The Southern Review*, I (February and May 1828), 74, 105.

[42][Maria Henrietta Pinckney] *The Quintessence of Long Speeches, arranged as a Political Catechism* (Charleston, S. C., 1830), p. 24.

[43][Judge William Harper] "Colonization Society," *The Southern Review*, I (February & May, 1828), 222-223.

[44]"Will of Francis Marion," proved March 6, 1795, Charleston County Wills, XXV, Book A (1793-1800), 270-271, S. C. Archives.

[45]*S. C. Statutes*, V, 718-719.

[46]This *Magazine*, XXX (1929), 257.

expounded a theory of education which would have acted as a bridge to the future.[47] In a speech in Charleston in 1827 and in another at Yale in 1830 before the Phi Beta Kappa Society Grimké attacked education "on the Catholic principle," that students "must read with a submissive faith, that they must believe *all* in Homer and Vergil, in Horace and Theocritus to be poetry—all in Cicero and Demosthenes to be eloquence—*all* in Thucydides and Herodotus, in Livy and Tacitus, to be unrivalled in History." He attacked rote memorization of the classics. Grimké wanted education to be based "on the Protestant principle"— that one must "think and reason" for oneself.[48] Grimké, as David Ramsay before him, saw in the ideals of the Protestant Reformation and the American Revolution fertilizing currents. The drift of his thinking was that human learning should be used to enlighten people and to meliorate the condition of man. He hoped that America (for his thoughts were never provincial) would become "a republic of thought."[49]

Hugh Swinton Legaré took up Grimké's challenge in the first article in the *Southern Review* and defended classical learning against modern or scientific learning. One should study in order to observe beauty, not to improve the condition of mankind. One should study the beauty that is eternal in nature. The beauty is always there; it is the same for all, no matter what a man's place in the ranks of society. For Legaré natural instincts were unchanging, and law should be built on this premise. Above all he challenged Jeremy Bentham's idea that positive legislation could produce the greatest happiness of the greatest number.[50]

South Carolina followed Legaré more than Grimké on the matter of education. Education was designed not to further enquiry, but to further acceptance of things as they were.

And then out of the nation in the 1820's came a new brand of politics of which Andrew Jackson was the champion. It was an appeal to the masses on a crass basis—demagoguery. This was at odds with the South Carolina

[47]Adrienne Koch, "Two Charlestonians in Pursuit of Truth: The Grimké Brothers," this *Magazine*, LXIX (1968), 159-170.

[48]These quotations are taken from a letter from Grimké to his son Drayton, 1826, quoted by Koch in *ibid.*, pp. 163-164. The quotations represent the theme to be found in the two orations. Thomas S. Grimké, *An Address, on the Character and Objects of Science: And, especially, The Influence of the Reformation on the Science and Literature, Past, Present and Future, of Protestant Nations* . . . (Charleston, S. C., 1827); Thomas S. Grimké, *Oration on the Advantages, to be derived from the Introduction of the Bible, and of Sacred Literature, as Essential Parts of All Education* . . . (New Haven, Conn., 1830).

[49]Grimké, *An Address, on the Character and Objects of Science* . . ., p. 73.

[50][Hugh Swinton Legaré] "Classical Learning," *The Southern Review*, I (February & May, 1828), 1-49.

ideal of no electioneering, no appeals to the people for their votes, the belief that the finest product of the code would be chosen quite naturally. This was the threat from the rise of Jackson.

The Federalists (and the later Unionists) had been undermined. There was no need for federal protection of commerce or for a pro-English commercial policy as there were no longer any British merchants in Charleston. There was no need for protection from abroad or for federal protection against the slaves at home. There was no need for a strong federal legislative power as this power might be a threat to slavery itself. The state was soundly financed, and there was little need for outside capital.

The society had been transformed into a completely agrarian one with the rice and cotton worlds resting on slavery. A common unified interest was coming under attack but this attack could be met by those with a common tradition, a common education, and pride in ancestors who had struggled against tyranny. These men were not descendants of cavaliers, but they were sons of a Revolution. And where there had been doubts about slavery, there was now acceptance and a desire to make slavery work—better.

So the tariff issue and Calhoun, when dropped into this society, were merely catalytic agents.

BOOK REVIEWS

Carolina's Historical Landscapes: Archaeological Perspectives. By Linda F. Stine, Martha Zierden, Lesley M. Drucker, and Christopher Judge. (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1997. Pp. xvi, 283. $45.00, cloth.)

This book is difficult to categorize. Given the purpose of the editors and authors, this is most likely a compliment. In it, a group of scholars dominated by archaeologists but whose ranks include historians, geographers, and museum professionals attempt to broaden the scope of both archaeology and the management of cultural resources. Their tool is the concept of "landscape" which they borrow, often rather loosely, from geographers. As University of South Carolina geographer John J. Winberry notes in his excellent introductory essay, many of the scholars in this volume have borrowed words, though not necessarily the meanings of those words, from their geographer colleagues. Winberry argues that geographers in the twentieth century have offered different ways of interpreting landscapes, but have maintained an essentially static definition of the term: "those works of man that are inscribed into the earth's surface" (p. 8). The scholars in this volume have given landscape and "the landscape approach" a range of meanings that includes a comparative perspective on archaeological sites, the history of human interaction with the environment, the integration of architectural and archaeological resources in a given area, and an interdisciplinary approach to archaeology. Despite these frequent and frustrating confusions, *Carolina's Historical Landscapes* remains an extremely valuable book for those interested in South Carolina's prehistory and history.

The book is clearly organized into three sections. An introductory essay by Linda F. Stine and Martha Zierden leads off the first set of five essays, most of which seek to lay a theoretical foundation for the concept of "landscape archaeology" and "the landscape approach." Many of these essays, particularly in this introductory section, take a strongly comparative perspective. In the practice of archaeology, this translates to the need to look at individual archaeological sites not as independent elements to be interpreted and evaluated on their own, but rather in connection with other sites as parts of a broader whole. As Stanton W. Green notes, while archaeologists focus on individual sites, which is often a by-product of the inability to excavate large areas, "human activities do not typically occur within such well-defined spaces" (p. 18). Various essays in the book's second section put this comparative approach into practice. This emphasis on a broader geographical awareness is certainly one of the strengths of the book, despite the often murky, occasionally even sloppy, attempts at defining a theoretical base and the dubious claims that this is a new