The Lower Cape Fear Historical Society has rendered an invaluable service to this community. The increasing interest of the people in the aims of the Society is very encouraging. With your continued support the membership this year will pass the five hundred mark. The modest membership fee is necessary to the work of the Society.

The major emphasis in the Society this year will be the Carolina Charter Tercentenary, 1663-1663. Outstanding speakers will be featured at our various meetings. The Carolina Tercentenary Commission will publish numerous leaflets and pamphlets on a variety of subjects which will be made available to our members through our Exhibition Chairman, Mrs. Paul Jennewein. A publication Colonial Carolina Coins and Currency has already been received. Dr. William Waggoner will distribute a thousand copies through the public schools.

Mr. William Broadfoot, Chairman of Commemorative Events in New Hanover County for the North Carolina Tercentenary Celebration of 1663, suggested the following projects for the consideration of the Society:

1. Selection and composition of highway markers to be requested from the state.
2. Reproduction of maps, papers or pamphlets pertinent to this area.
3. Reproduction of paper currency issued by the bank of Wilmington during this period.
4. Supplying speakers to local clubs and groups throughout the Tercentenary Celebration year.
5. Re-enactments of historic events in this area.
6. Distribution throughout New Hanover County of historic materials and papers released by the Carolina Charter Tercentenary Commission.

In order that the Society might cooperate fully in this celebration the following committee was appointed to consider the Tercentenary projects and make recommendations: Mr. Henry J. MacMillan, Chairman, Mr. Stanley South, Mrs. Paul Jennewein, Mr. Al Honeycutt and Mr. Ludlow Strong. This committee will welcome your suggestions.

You will be interested to know that the Society has become a member of the National Trust for Historic Preservation. Your Board of Directors acting upon a request from Dr. Crittenden of the State Department of Archives and History sent a resolution to our Representatives, Mr. Calder and Mr. Yow, supporting the proposed building to house historic materials. Your Board has appealed to the City Council not to move the Latimer Fountain from the plaza on Third Street primarily because among several reasons, it would violate the previously expressed intention of the City Council to protect the designated historic area of the City of Wilmington. The City Council was also asked to appoint, without further delay, the Commission to Preserve and Protect the Historic Area of Wilmington, and to give serious consideration to including a member of the Society on that Commission. Preserving our priceless historical possessions is a never ending task which demands vigilance, research, dissemination of information, enlistment of the aid of warm sympathizers, and the continued support of the members of the Society.

As the state of North Carolina prepares to celebrate the Carolina Proprietary Charter of 1663, it may be well to take a brief look at our early beginnings as related by Hugh Talman Lefer and Albert Ray Newsome in their book "The History of a Southern State, NORTH CAROLINA." To pay off a political debt Charles II granted the proprietary charter.

"The Eight Lords Proprietors of Carolina.—The eight grantees of Carolina were distinguished men. Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, was Lord High Chancellor and the King's first minister; George Monck, newly created Duke of Albemarle, was Master of the King's Horse and Captain General of all his forces; William Earl of Craven, was an old soldier of the King and a man of great wealth; Lord John Berkeley was a member of the Privy Council and active in naval administration; Sir William Berkeley, his brother, was then Governor of Virginia; Sir George Carteret was a privy councillor, a vice-chamberlain of the household, treasurer of the navy, and famous for his defense of the Jersey Isles during the English Civil War; Anthony Ashley-Cooper, who later became the first Earl of Shaftesbury, was Chancellor of the Exchequer and member of the Special Council for Foreign Plantations; and Sir John Colleton was also a member of this body ... Besides any personal aims or ambitions which Charles II might have had, there were at least four motives for issuing the charter: a laudable and pious zeal for the propagation of the Christian faith, the enlargement of our empire and dominions, the increase of English commerce—and the increase of the Proprietors' fortunes. By the terms of the charter of March 24, 1663, the true and absolute Lords Proprietors were granted all territory lying between 36 and 31 degrees north latitude and extending westward to the South Seas (Pacific Ocean), to be held of the King in free and common socage, for which a nominal payment of twenty marks of lawful money of England was to be paid the King annually, as well as one-fourth of all gold and silver found. Proprietary shares were alienable and inheritable. The proprietors were to have, use, exercise, and enjoy any power any Bishop of Durham in our Kingdom of England, ever heretofore have held, used or enjoyed."

What was the meaning of this last statement? The authors explained it:

"The County Palatine of Durham served as the prototype for Carolina and all other English pro-
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HISTORY AS AN ART

An address by Winston Broadfoot
To the Lower Cape Fear Historical Society, Inc.
May 9, 1962

First let me say that my comments are those of a consumer, not a producer, of history, and if this has disadvantages at least a previous record is not one of them. In the remarks that follow I shall attempt to examine some of the basic attitudes of the historian toward his work, agreeing and disagreeing at will. I hope you will do the same with me.

In the latter half of the 19th Century the natural sciences, especially Biology, had opened new vistas for human imagination. Evolution, laws of change, and scientific method were concepts that spilled over into one’s thinking about everything. The professional historian of that day, a scholar with a newly created Ph.D. degree, was all set to apply the scientific method to history and thereby achieve a scientific result never before dreamed: if he could only reduce the past to laws of cause and effect, the touchstone for accurate prediction of future events would be his. Never did the end product of alchemy more dazzle the imagination. Consider these quotations from early presidential addresses of American Historical Association. Professor Dabney in 1890: “Great labor has been expended in this century in the investigation of not only the facts of history, but also of their causes and effects. More and more the conception of resistless law in human events is gaining ground.” Henry Adams in 1894: “No teacher with a spark of imagination or with an idea of scientific method can have helped dreaming of the immortality that would be achieved by the man who should successfully apply Darwin’s method to the facts of human history.” In 1908 Professor S. B. Adams: “The events with which history is concerned have been determined by forces which act according to fixed law.”

Today that dream is fading. No immutable laws of change in human affairs have been discovered and, with the notable exception of Toynbee, historians have ceased trying. Though the noble optimism that tried to unveil the future is dead, historiography was born of the attempt and lives on to give legitimacy to the historian’s profession. As part of the epitaph it is interesting to note that many of our better minds in science no longer believe that every action in the physical world can be reduced to law. Acausal is a word they use to describe happenings for which they know no law and for which they think there is no law.

Essential to any inquiry is the elimination of self as a factor in the research and the findings. Historians readily embrace this requirement of objectivity and they have been
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The firing in the direction of the sea which ended the observance of Colonel William Lamb Day on July 4, 1962 made a spectacle of dramatic impact. Mr. Phil Morgan has captured the spirit of the celebration in a series of photographs which will be exhibited at the meeting of the Society on November 7.
loathe to relinquish it. If history is a science, objectivity is an imperative. If history is an art, objectivity is an impediment. The remainder of this paper examines the problems and the possibilities.

The record does not speak for itself. A high degree of selection is required to pick the facts that will go into a particular study and those to be eliminated. Take, for example, a history of Wilmington. Your primary sources would be eyewitness accounts written from or about Wilmington, all business records, the entire public record at the Courthouse and City Hall, all information on the lives of everyone here tonight, plus all who have gone before. The unselected record could run to a thousand tons of raw material if everything were included. So for the one pound of finished product the historian selects and the problem begins. Through adverse selection we have had historical writing that is unbalanced, being all politics, all economics, all biography, or all great events and movements. It sounds simple to insist on balance, but who is to say when a thing is balanced? What facts are worth a chapter, which go into a footnote, and which can be ignored? History may have produced the facts, but it cannot provide the emphasis.

If the historian is to be more than a fact-finder and reporter, he must do more than select the facts and arrange them in chronological sequence. There must be explanation; he must interpret. The fear of losing objectivity has caused a few historians to insist that there be no interpretation at all, and a larger number to interpret too little. As rational beings we try to understand our history, to make sense of it. We should not approach the past with emptiness. We want to know about the villains and the good people, about decisions or policies that were wise or foolish, about good and evil. We meet with these things today; they must have been present in the past. As an aside or afterthought: all of you must remember as children how most adults looked alike, and the older they were the more alike they looked. This was because we did not know them. They were be-whiskered or bespectacled objects to be respected but they were without meaning to us. All of us, as we grew older, learned more about them, perhaps after they died, they have distinct personalities, at last with meaning. History is like that: the historian must make us see distinctions.

Like poetry, not all historical interpretation is good just because the attempt was made. The pacifist is not apt to write well, if at all, of war. The Southerner and the Northerner would have unlike accounts of Reconstruction. Protestants and Catholics have differing ideas about the Reformation. This sort of thing is called climate of opinion, point of view, frame of reference, and a variety of terms that mark us as being in the same subjective and irascible error. The more expansive meta-physicians say there is no reality beyond our own experience, and no doubt if we all believed, at a given time, the same error, there would be no problem. But man is cantankerous and we do have an irreducible core. What to do about this has met with several suggestions. Some people throw up their hands and say history is a hobby, a hunk, or a lie. They overlook the underlying skeleton of fact and see only the twisted interpretation. Jerome Frank, a jurist, has not too helpfully proposed that historians use the advocate system and have offsetting biases argued at will. Fortunately or not there is no appellate court to stamp the imprimatur of truth upon the abler advocate and vanquish the loser, despite Mr. Frank’s novel idea, there is general agreement that personal bias makes bad history.

The problem should not be more considerable bias, the greater portion of historical interpretation is yet unaccounted for. What do we say of determinist notions? Are we whirled about in great cycles by the hand of God? Do our leaders shape our destiny? Perhaps you prefer to think of geography or environment as the important determinants. Why not pick a baker’s dozen and interpret with a little of this and a little of that? Though not often mentioned, an valid law of cause and effect formulated from history must be deterministic and ultimately independent of human will. Human events would not be inevitable cannot provide a basis for blame. This is not to say we should not admit the reality if it exists, but from it will flow total irresponsibility. Till that unhappy day, we must judge the past as, in time, the present shall be judged.

The judgments that we use are the only ones we are capable of using, those of the world we live in. Without getting into the old dispute as to whether our moral convictions are absolute or relative, it can be said that a great number of them do change. More to the point is the fact that our changing moral convictions affect historical interpretation. Let me suggest an example.

Between the two world wars that we have thus far experienced the academic attitude was in great measure pacifist and isolationist, certainly more than it is today. In such a climate of opinion World War II was not really a war, it was an egregious blunder. It could not have and should have been avoided. Today opinion is shifting; we dream less of peace and recognize a shrunken globe. Our central concern is civil rights, particularly those of the Negro. Historians no longer speak objectively of competing systems of labor in the ante-bellum period. The same war has become necessary and even desirable.

This idea of equality, though in some measure an extension of the earlier ideals of liberty and democracy, is essentially 20th Century in its breadth of concept and the vigor of its application. One wonders at the paradox of its coming at this time, when all indications are that too many people are about plague the earth. Scientific inquiry does not support it, so in a scientific age we ignore facts and accept the ideal anyway. Religion supports the ideal but, compared with earlier times, ours is not a religious era. If the cause of the ideal is not difficult, its progress is. Despite the apocalyptic predictions of doomsday and utopia, right now we just don’t know. Whether mass values will turn into mass mediocrity remains to be seen, but already the ideal is at work in history. No adequate explanation of the recent proliferation of permit-and-policing dictatorial statehood can be made without reconciling with the idea of equality.

If the historian who hopes to understand cause and effect must grapple with intangibles, such as ideas, there are still tougher nuts waiting to be cracked. Accident and impulse are items that defy order and resist our scheming. We are familiar with the fortuitous event, the effects of which can be traced, but the causative device is impossible to assign. Strange that we should speak of the stream of history and not consider a molecular concept, a kind of knuckling about of loose circumstances.

Impulse presents a special irony for some historians. Just when economic man was about to be neatly wrapped up and presented to the ages, a advertising folk have learned that much of our buying is on impulse. There has developed a new marketing technique, so-called hidden persuaders that motivate us in subtle, non-economic and non-rational ways. We have reasons for doing things of which we are not consciously aware, and which we can readily explain is false. Psychologists have been saying much the same thing for years but now comes proof in the marketplace: pitch a selling campaign to conscious reasoning and you are dead; use hidden persuaders and you make a million. Some of this new expertise was used in the 1956 presidential campaign; in 1960 it became an open issue. Of all the topics involved in the great debate it is quite probable that none were more decisive than the trivial fact that Mr. Nixon’s make-up wasn’t quite right, a little too light about the chin to hide the whiskers (suggesting roughness) and a bit too heavy on cheek and forehead (suggesting sickness). Questions about any make-up at all for either candidate, were nervously and hastily brushed aside because, though the American public generally recognizes that make-up is necessary for a good TV announcer’s appearance, it considerably resents any use of it on men with sappiness. I don’t know whether the mass media examining the 1960 election, is prepared to give as much emphasis to Nixon’s beard as to the gross national product, but the indications are that he should. The new word is image, the sub-surface connotations that persuade us more than over bearing reality.

Incidently, while on the subject of beards, market research has established the fact that you can make money out of sharper razor blades, foamy lathers, and any variety of devices that make the morning shave easier. But should you market a product that eliminates the beard you won’t sell it. The American male equates masculinity and is not hesitating to reveal in a minimum of inconvenience because of it.

Colin Wilson, in his book The Outsider, sums up our contradictions: “All men and women have these dangerous, insensible impulses, yet they keep up the pretense, to them-

Continued on Page 6
Wilmington in the early days of the Civil War comes to
life in Elizabeth W. Allston Pringle’s Chronicles of Chincora
Wood. The following, from pages 194-195, is a personal recol-
lection more vivid than the detailed view of the history book.

I went for a month to visit my sister in Wilmington, Major
Van der Horst being on General Whiting’s staff, stationed
at Wilmington. Mr. McCrea had lent them his beautiful and
convenient house, so that my sister was delightfully situated
there, and the society was very gay. A very handsome man,
young De Rosset, asked me to dance as soon as he was in-
troduced. I accepted with pleasure, as I was devoted to
dancing. As we stood preparatory to the start, he asked: “Do
you dance fast or loose?” I was confused and stammered
out, “Oh, I made a mistake. I do not dance at all,” and sat
down. I could not bear to say “fast” nor could I bear to say
“loose;” but, as I looked at the dancers, I understood what it
meant, and there was nothing to terrify me in it. One-half of
the dancers held hands crossed, as you do in skating. This
was “loose,” and the rest danced in the ordinary way which
I had always been accustomed to; this was called “fast.”
This marred my pleasure in the many parties I went to while
in Wilmington; for, once having said I didn’t dance, I had to
stick to it.

The price of every article of clothing was enormous, and
shoes were impossible. I thought of buying a pair of stays,
but a very common pair were fifty dollars, so I ripped up
some old Paris ones and made a beautiful pair for myself,
using all the bones, etc. Mamma wrote me to get three yards
of material to make a coat to wear next winter. It was nine-
ty-five dollars a yard, the only stuff I could get, thick and
hairy, but not fine at all.

Mrs. Pringle’s sister, Adele Allston, married Major Adol-
phus Van der Hout of Charleston in 1863, and her visit to
the bride and groom occurred shortly after. It seems likely
that the Mr. McCrea mentioned was actually Mr. MacRae and
that the house occupied by the Van der Horsts was Donald
MacRae’s house which was built in the 1830’s at 108 South
Third Street and still stands. There were several young de
Rosset brothers at this time and so it is difficult to identify
the one who unintentionally confused Miss Allston.

—H. J. MacM.

THE PRESIDENT’S MESSAGE

Continued from Page 1

proprietary colonies . . . Early in English history, the
County Palatine of Durham had been created on the
northern frontier, as a buffer against Scotland. Un-
like the ordinary English shires, Durham was virtual-
ly autonomous, owing only nominal allegiance to the
Crown. The Bishop, as ruler of the county, was su-
preme in civil and military affairs. He raised and
directed his own military and naval forces, controlled
the tax system, and enjoyed many feudal privileges.
In payment for these special favors, the Bishop was
obligated to protect England’s frontier against the
Scots.”

You must forgive me, for I am sure that you will un-
derstand, that as a member of the cloth, and being a New Testa-
ment bishop, I long for a return to the “good old days.”

RANDOLPH L. GREGORY
President
selves, to others: their respectability, their philosophy, their religion, are all attempts to gloss over, to make look civilized something that is savage, unorganized, irrational." If Mr. Wilson is right, we approach a state in human affairs not unlike the casual events in the physical world. To the extent that he is right at all, the historian's task of explaining the past in an orderly fashion is made more difficult.

In the actual writing of historical and scientific findings there are further distinctions. Both disciplines try to report in lucid language, to make intelligible their findings. We speak of good style as showing this competence. Yet a number of persons, historians notably not among them, refer to historical writing as an art, something distinct from even the best of scientific reporting.

The scientist writes about a body of facts that have independent significance. If he can get others to understand, the merit of his work will rest on his findings, not on his manner of setting them forth. In case of doubt, the laboratory ultimately will be persuasive. But the findings of the historian cannot be divorced from his presentation of them. He must create as well as narrate. Unlike the scientist coldly watching moving molecules through a glass, the historian achieves understanding of his facts through involvement. As nearly as he can, he must, through imagination, become a part of another time and place. The human past is full of drama and the tremendous task of the historian is to re-live it and bring it back alive for his readers to experience. It is not enough to say that the soldiers were without shoes in the winter of Valley Forge, not enough to say that Lee surrendered at Appomattox. For the historian, so that they may for us, the Roman legions must march again. If anything, talent and art are inadequate words to describe the undertaking.

To an extent, this returning to the past will be like the Connecticut Yankee in King Arthur's Court. We have difficulty understanding chivalry. The code of the ante-bellum gentleman was a real thing but we are separated from that day by a chasm wider than years. Medieval and Renaissance man present even more formidable problems.

Because of the constant flux in history, due a little to newly discovered facts but due a lot more to changing ideals and attitudes, there can be no such thing as timeless writing. Even those who most strongly insist on objectivity, and their numbers are dwindling, do not hope for perpetuity. It is no exaggeration to say that what endures most is authorship. Who remembers The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire without equally remembering that Edward Gibbon wrote it? Boswell's Johnson are inseparable words and Boswell accounts for a large measure of Johnson's lasting reputation.

Lytton Strachey is another biographer who is remembered almost as well as his subjects.

Works that last longest are lively, full of drama, and most often present a thesis or interpretation that holds the thing together. These are author contributions, the opposite of objectivity. Works that do not last are those that are dead and dull, however accurate. While accuracy in historical writing is important, it takes second place to the art of the author.

Thus far we have been concerned with the "how" of historical writing when all the time the larger question, and part of the answer, lies in the "why" of it. What is the justification for any interest in the past? First let's drag out the old chestnut about "history repeating itself." Some people hope that if they can know how an event went before, they can protect themselves, maybe gain a little, when it swings by again. Immediately you will note the similarity of this thought to the theme of the early American Historical Association addresses. Perhaps if you lose an election by a close margin and another opportunity comes closely on its heels you can win it from the lessons learned. Militarists have learned from past battles, even old battles, by allowing for the variables of more modern weapons, though it would appear that the new variable of space renders obsolete all earlier wars. The stock market has become attractive to an increasing number of Americans. Its past performance has been assiduously studied, yet all this study has produced few, if any, experts. You would get about even money on which way the market would break tomorrow and a lot of the smart boys still prefer to work on commission.

If history repeating itself has no real meaning, what is left? Why bother with it? I think the answer lies in what we are more than in what history is. We accept the proposition that man is complex, that he has a funny-bone as well as a God, that his economic well-being is not the totality of his existence, only then can we justify activities that do not get coin of the realm.

Among other things we are an extension of the past. Man's climb out of the mud has been slow, agonizing, and beset with pitfalls. While surely we are at no pinnacle, the past has brought us to the present. In a sense history extends our memory, provides us with the diary of our contemporaries before our day. Though we cannot know where we are going, we should not be content to be waifs in a wasteland and not know from whence we came. We should have curiosity about whatever we can learn. The uses, if any, to which knowledge can be put, come later; first comes the knowledge. This has always been one of the things that distinguishes man from the other animals. And I would insist it also distinguishes education from training, culture from status-seeking.