

McLEAN'S HISTORY OF THE SCOTCH SECTION

Two Manuscript Volumes Prepared By Former Governor McLean At Considerable Expense

By Arnold A. McKay, Route 2, Maxton, N. C.

"Much can be made of a Scotchman," says Samuel Johnson, "if he be caught young." The brilliant old conversationalist and eighteenth century literary dictator was merely growling his personal approval of the psychological dictum that you can take a child and make him what you want him to be.

Fortunately nobody caught Former Governor Angus Wilton McLean and made him something besides a Highland Scotsman. His contribution to the history of the state will probably be of greater value in time than his governorship—despite the very satisfactory and enduring services he rendered North Carolina from 1925 to 1929.

To any Scot who happens to be in Raleigh or Chapel Hill with a little idle time, a visit to the Historical Commission or University Library will be well worth the while. Ask for McLean's history of the Scotch section. You will be given two large volumes of about a thousand pages each, of typewritten material, bound substantially with numbered pages, table of contents, and general book arrangement. You can not take the volumes home, of course, for there are only two copies in print; but find you an easy chair and look over the volumes casually—that is, if you have any insatiable interest in state history or belong through no fault of your own to the most cantankerous and finger-in-every-pie race that has added its full share of eternal passion, eternal pain to this old world's record. If you have any interest at all in such matters you will spend a very pleasant hour or so.

Governor McLean really spent hundreds of dollars collecting material for this history. As early as 1910 he had local historians and a crew of young college men and women tramping all over the counties of Bladen, Cumberland, Moore, Scotland, Robeson, Hoke, Rockingham, the bordering South Carolina counties, and other Highland Scotch sections. They talked with old folk, strolled through abandoned cemeteries, visited battle sites, investigated church, school, courthouse and newspaper records. Wherever there was even a cold trail of local history these kindly sleuths ran it down and committed their findings to paper. Sometimes they found little of actual value, but in 1926 with the assistance of an experienced historical assistant from Ohio the author had the data typewritten and bound, depositing one copy at Raleigh and the other at Chapel Hill. Originally he planned to have all the material published in book form and sold. It is a pity that high printing costs made such a venture impossible; but even if the book had been issued it is doubtful if sufficient number of copies would have been sold to pay a third of the cost.

The book is historical and biographical. History begins with the settlement of Longstreet (so-called because it was a long street of Highland settlers above Fayetteville when this whole section was covered with long leaf pine and a succulent species of wild pea which the cattle liked so well that it was in time exterminated) and ends with the opening of the World War. There are biographical sketches about earliest-known pioneers and some of the later pre-war tycoons. Briefly and at random, here are some of the subject data:

Why so many of the Highland Scots were Loyalists (thereby keeping estimable female descendants from becoming D. A. R.'s though this is not in the book); Fayetteville and environs (really should have remained Campbelton instead of being rechristened for a gay adventurer who was any country's patriot which could show him a good time); the Scotch preacher who died 15 years after his mother's death; another divine who, unfrocked by the clerics, gathered his flock and continued to "preach the Gospel despite devils and Presbytery"; John Gilchrist, a young lawyer, peeved in his first trial because he thought a colleague took unfair advantage of him, transferred his enthusiasm to the building of a women's college, founding Floral College, a non-sectarian institution, among the first in this country; Flora MacDonald, more of a Helen than a Penelope, but withal a mother with two children buried in Moore county; McPhaul's Mill, the Tory stronghold, and "Tory Land" the internment camp; Spring Hill Temperance Society with interesting records of how members backslid, debated current questions, or how the Yankees "that gang of ruffians" turned over and kicked out everything the deliberate body held of value; John Charles McNeill, beyond question genius yet born within the

state's borders, now practically forgotten; the world-renowned painter, James Abbot McNeill Whistler who added the McNeill part to his name in deference to his mother; how zealots cut the throat of the new melodeon in Center church because they believed God should be praised naturally, not artificially (Heavens, think of our "cash register" choirs today!); the Civil War and the men recruited from this section including the "Scotch Boys" and the "Scotch Greys," every man a six-footer, whose tragic war record reads uncannily like that of "The First Hundred Thousand"; and there are scores of other articles quite as interesting and informative.

All the book is not appreciative criticism. There is much that is critical and controversial, much that came directly from the lips of another generation now gone and hence not entirely accurate. But the collecting and preserving of local data is always a worthy public service. The state is indebted to Governor McLean. One can spend some time most profitably by looking through these volumes.

Please read the article at the top of Columns 2 and 3, page 4.

"Impossibilities" Not Always Such

Even Legislatures May Be Made to Regard the Behests of the People

Dear O. J.: In *The State's Voice* a few days ago you referred to the trisection of an angle as an accepted impossibility. Maybe it is. I'm not an expert. Three or four years ago, Prof. J. C. Massie, professor of mathematics in Fayetteville, Ark., high school issued a brochure claiming to demonstrate the trisection outlined on enclosed sheet. If further interested you might send him a dime for brochure. Mine has been mislaid.

The 5 percent beer bill repeals our prohibition of intoxicants ratified by popular vote in 1908. Don't you think it time for us to submit to the electorate a constitutional amendment putting a stop to things like that? Here's a form I suggest, taken from Constitution of Nevada, Art. XIX, Sec. 2:

"When the majority of electors voting at a state election shall by their votes signify approval of a law or resolution, such law or resolution shall stand as the law of the state, and shall not be overruled, amended, set aside, or suspended, or in any way made inoperative except by the direct vote of the people. When such majority shall so signify disapproval, the law or resolution so disapproved shall be void and of no effect."

With every good wish, I am,
Sincerely yours,
Raleigh, N. C. W. F. MARSHALL

SOME RESULTS OF PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S COTTON POLICY

A. M. SNIDER, Hoffman, N. C.

When the present administration embarked upon its cotton policy, it was plain to me that the policy, if pursued, would lead to the destruction of the cotton industry of the South. Let us examine some of the results obtained so far.

Senator J. W. Bailey had an article in the *Saturday Evening Post* some time ago. In this article he showed that twelve and one-half cent cotton was worth only about eight cents in terms of the old money—money before the devaluation. At the time of his writing there was an apparent advance of nearly 50 percent over two years before. At this time some of that has been lost. The actual gain was less than half of the apparent gain. The farmer gained on one point only. When he went to pay an old debt, one hundred of his new 59c dollars would pay a debt of a hundred dollars of the 100 per cent kind; but when he went to buy he found that the 59c-dollar did not buy anything.

That fact was due to several factors. Several of those factors were the results of the operation of the NRA. Those factors we shall leave out of this article. The processing taxes should be included in this discussion. These processing taxes were added to the farmer's product as soon as it left his hands and became a part of the price thereafter. These processing taxes necessarily keep down the price to the farmer, for the simple reason that an article can be sold for only about so much in the market. It is a mistaken notion that all taxes ultimately come out of the consumer. The consumer can often buy somewhere else. And that is what he is doing now in more cases than formerly.

The American mills have had to pay a premium of more than three cents a pound for American cotton. This tax plus so many other added costs resulting from Roosevelt policies has raised the cost of American textiles to a point where they will not go in the world market. Our textile mills are perhaps the worst handicapped they have ever been in their history. I understand that they are going on three days a week soon.

The Japanese are especially strong competitors of American mills just now. That is not the worst of it, we sat by and saw Japan take Manchuria away from China. There she expects to grow her own cotton. The Roosevelt administration has added three burdens to the cotton mills: higher priced cotton, the processing tax, and greater labor costs and many other costs that have come in through the general higher price level.

Many Americans have long labored under the false notion that the South alone could raise cotton to any extent. When the truth was there are perhaps ten acres of suitable cotton land outside the United States to every one here. When foreign countries possessing lands suitable for cotton learned of the administration's policy, they began to extend their cotton acreage in order to reap the harvest from our policy. One of our Hispanic American neighbors, Brazil, is now rivaling the United States in cotton exports.

We cannot raise the price of our cotton by artificial means and expect to export it; neither can we export textiles for more than the world

market price. We cannot follow the present cotton policy and export either raw or manufactured cotton. In my opinion Mr. Roosevelt's policies are the worst possible for the South. To follow them one of two things must come—either we must quickly work out a new and different economic system or be driven on the rocks of economic disaster.

If we work out a new economic system, it must be along the lines of self-sufficiency. We must produce agricultural crops to meet our own needs. Such a system for the South would result in greater economic confusion and distress for the West.

Let us look at other aspects of the cotton reduction policy. Two results stand out conspicuously. The reduction fell with crushing effects upon the small farmers and tenants. Farmers who were raising 50 to 1,000 bales of cotton could well afford to take a cut. In fact, not the land but the tenant was cut. The tenants were the goats. The landlords dismissed part of their tenants. They joined the army of unemployed and tramped the roads hunting some place to go, found work if perchance they could wherever they could, got bread and clothes in the charity line.

Many of the tenants who were not dismissed outright were even worse off. They had just enough work and help to keep them off CWA, PWA, etc., works. Nowhere to go, little to do, little to eat, nothing to wear (to speak of).

The Hill Bill By Means Fair Or Foul

The temperance question is a moral question and as such it certainly should not have been sent to the Senate Finance committee for consideration when its defeat seemed apparent in the Senate several days ago. It only goes to show how hell bent the advocates of the Hill liquor bill are for its passage. They are going to attempt to make it a revenue bill to insure its passage if necessary. That's like murdering a person to get his money to pay off a debt. We are absolutely unwilling for a select bunch of lawmakers to nullify the voice and wishes of the people through the legalization of liquor without a vote of the people. We are unalterably opposed to local option. If "local option" failed to work twenty-five years ago there can hardly be reason to believe that it is feasible in this age of the automobile and other means of fast conveyances.

The question is: Shall the people rule?—*The Sandhill Citizen*.

One of the most startling announcements of the past year is that more than ten millions of dollars have been spent in advertising alcoholic liquors—all of this to increase drink and to debase the people of America. This high-pressure method and colossal advertising campaign is creating a tremendous social menace. *Christian Science Monitor*.