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ABSTRACT

The Masters of the Blue Room is an investigation of the relationship between environment and ideology. As such, it focuses on a single educational institution, The College of William and Mary, in a specific time/space setting, 1836-1846, Williamsburg, Virginia, to explore the relationship between the institution and its environment, the mental and physical formative environments of its faculty, and the value systems represented by their lifestyles and teaching. The period 1836-1846 covers the tenure of Thomas Roderick Dew’s presidency of William and Mary with the following faculty members: Nathaniel Beverley Tucker, professor of law, Robert Saunders, professor of mathematics, John Millington, professor of chemistry and natural philosophy, Dabney Browne, professor of humanities, and, replacing Browne in 1842, Charles Frederick Minnegerode.

The Dew faculty was a microcosm representing a critical and exciting juncture of western values as well as the unique perspective of tidewater Virginia. Acutely aware of the forces unleashed by the developing industrial revolution, the rise of the fourth estate, and romanticism, at least five of these men were also intensely sensitive to
the leveling tendencies within American society which threatened the economic base of their Lockian liberalism, especially the institutions of landholding and slavery, at a time when the future of tidewater ascendancy was questionable. Their perception of what was meaningful in their society and how it was to be preserved they passed to their students, most of whom were products of the same environment and shared the same values.

The dissertation is organized into ten chapters on six topics: an introduction with a presentation of purpose and method, an interpretation of Williamsburg as an environmental influence, an interpretation of the College of William and Mary as an environmental influence, an analysis of the college's curriculum, the physical and ideological environmental influences on the faculty along with the values reflected in their lifestyles, an analysis of the published lecture notes used in three courses taught by two of them, Thomas Dew, himself, and Nathaniel Beverley Tucker.

The investigation documented in The Masters of the Blue Room yielded provocative results which may challenge some of the current thinking about southern intellectual life and the values it represented. Of special note would be the faculty's "Quidistic" political philosophy, closely akin to the English country whig belief system, its eighteenth century reason-natural law bias rationalizing its perception of a meaningful life, its cyclical view of history and the
related fear of change, and, most especially, its homogeneity in lifestyle and ideology. The Dew faculty, even those of foreign birth, held the same fundamental credo which reflected the historical landscape, supported the mores of college and community, and, in a way more European than American, regarded the past as part of the present and essential to the future.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

William and Mary, by the grace of God, of England, Scotland, France and Ireland, King and Queen .... have had it in their minds .... to make, found and establish a certain place of universal study, a perpetual College of Divinity, Philosophy, Languages, and other good Arts and Sciences, consisting of one President, six Masters....

On the second floor, front, of the Wren building at the College of William and Mary is a room, traditionally painted blue, in which faculty meetings were held for many years. On a golden-maple, October afternoon in 1836, the first faculty meeting for the fall session was convened. The distinguished members present were Thomas Roderick Dew, president of the college and professor of history, Nathaniel Beverley Tucker, professor of law, Robert Saunders, professor of mathematics, John Millington, professor of chemistry and natural philosophy, and Dabney Browne (replaced by Charles Frederick Minnegerod in 1842), professor of humanity. The group gathered here was neither singularly lacking in "mind" nor unaware of its responsibility for communicating not only a body of knowledge but also a value system of ideas, customs, and institutions, considered worthwhile, to its student body.

Excellent work has been done by historians -- Henry Nash Smith, William R. Taylor, Drew Faust, Thomas Breen,
Rhys Isaac, Michael O'Brien among others -- on southern intellectual, social, and cultural history. No one has, as yet, focused on a single educational institution in a specific time/space setting to explore the relationship between the institution and its environment, the mental and physical formative environments of its faculty, and the value systems represented by their lifestyles and teaching. It is the purpose of this dissertation, therefore, to contribute, very modestly, to the body of existing work dealing with the relationship between ideas and environment by critically examining the formative environments of both William and Mary and the faculty of President Thomas Dew (1836-1846), the values reflected in their lifestyles and in the published lectures of two of them, Thomas Dew, himself, and Nathaniel Beverley Tucker. It is expected that this study will yield some insight into the development of value systems, in general, and of educational institutions, in particular, and will suggest a sequel investigating the impact of teaching on student conceptualization of what Rhys Isaac would call "the meaning of life." It will certainly demonstrate that the Dew faculty, both native and foreign born, accepted wholesale the values of community and college and supported those values in their personal and professional lives.¹

The Dew faculty existed at a critical and exciting juncture in the evolution of western values. The newly
modern age in the western world was wrestling with the juggernaut of the industrial revolution and the belief systems conceived to address the social, economic, and political problems it created. The Romantic movement was contributing its emotional apprehension of freedom, individualism, and fantasy, and the liberalism which had begun with the Lockian emphasis on the rights of the propertied male as opposed to the equality of all males was rapidly giving way to a sometimes frightening leveling process which stressed the equality of all males at the expense of the propertied. And, in matters involving the means of production including land, the capitalism envisioned by Adam Smith as channeling competitive economic strife into productive self-interest had only channeled it into intense political conflict.

The more immediate environment of the Dew faculty, the United States, was in the middle of a regionally divisive but class leveling political transition and religious revival. By 1828, the original two-party system had broken down and been replaced by regional and local special interest groups eventually lumped together, because of their opposition to Jackson's misnamed "democracy", in the category of "Whig". Between 1810 and 1821, six western states had entered the union with universal white manhood suffrage (or something close), and four older states had dropped property qualifications for voting. The result of
these changes was an extension of the franchise to the lower classes of small farmers and workers, an extension threatening the power structure and forcing that structure to cultivate the support of social groups once considered irrelevant to a solid government of vested interests. This expansion of democracy was coupled with the New England-based, Yale-inspired Second Great Awakening which linked individual salvation with the reform and, eventually, the perfection of society, and moved from exhortations to temperance and Sunday school attendance to a fiery denunciation of slavery as a moral evil and a firm advocacy of woman's rights.

The process of "manifest destiny", not formally conceptualized until the mid-nineteenth century but present in spirit from the beginning of English settlement, carried the new democracy and its evangelical comrade westward with increasing momentum after the War of 1812 until, by 1860, half of the United States' population of thirty-one million resided west of the Appalachian Mountains. Such a "peopling" of the continent brought to national attention the controversy over the balance of power between slave and free states which served only to aggravate southern paranoia over militant anti-slavery tract reformism and northern animosity at what northerners perceived to be blatant southern attacks on the right of free speech.²
The period in which the new United States was scrambling, bounding, and praying its way over what appeared to be obstacles in the path of progress was traumatic for tidewater Virginia. The state which had once led the union had come to realize, slowly and painfully, that in this time of national vitality and growth she had scarcely a thing to recommend her but her past. Looking back, the tidewater Virginian could envision a time when landholding, the production of a staple crop, tobacco, and slavery had become the economic bases of a value paradigm. The descendants of small feudal landowners discontented in seventeenth-century England with the depreciating value of estate and tenancy returns, tenants discouraged with the insufficiency of land, second sons searching for a substitute birthright all had, by the end of the eighteenth century, acquired hundreds or thousands of tobacco-producing acres and the slave labor to work it, built Georgian homes, planted boxwood hedges and indebted themselves up to their buckled stocks to British factors. They cultivated what they thought to be the attributes of English gentlemen, joined the Order of the Cincinnati, and swore publicly and privately that their great, great-grandfathers had fought against Cromwell at Naseby. Willingly devoting themselves to virtuous public service, they espoused the agrarian ideal, fought the centralization of national government, valiantly defended the personal liberty ideals of the propertied, conceded that
slavery might well be an evil, entertained and rejected various proposals for its abolition, and denied outright that all men were equal. The early nineteenth century "Quidism" of John Randolph gave voice to this value paradigm, a paradigm similar, in many ways, to that of the English "country" whigs about whom such historians as Joyce Appleby and Gordon Wood have contributed valuable interpretive studies.  

After 1815, a new trend became evident in Virginia. Gradual exhaustion of tidewater soil, the lure of the west, the lack of commercial enterprise and facile means of communication - all contributed to a loss of population and an encroaching decadence. The bid on the part of the Valley and the trans-Allegheny region at the Constitutional Convention of 1829 for greater parity in representation, the Turner rebellion of August 1831 relatively coincident with the initial appearance of the Liberator in the January of the same year, and the seeming challenge to slavery in the General Assembly of 1831-1832 heightened the sense, in many quarters, that the glory days of the state might, indeed, lie in the past and the prescription for the future consisted of retrenchment and the presentation of a rationale for preserving the status quo as a positive good and the only secure hope for progress.  

The Dew faculty was a microcosm of this larger environment and, as such, shared its premises. They could
not help but apply their considerable knowledge and broad perception of the world to their immediate circumstance, and they had the opportunity, to a far greater extent than most, to represent their knowledge, their perception, their values to a world beyond themselves. They were teachers, and, in both the physical and the ideological sense, they stood as environmental symbols in the student world. In both their lifestyles and their teaching they reflected the values of their environment, and those most vulnerable to the absorption of such values sat in the classes they taught.

Historians attempt to reconstruct the past and decode its meaning for the present and the future. Words, natural and manmade landscapes, costume, behavior patterns, social position, political persuasion, etc., reflect and, in turn, create meanings unique to a particular time and space which the historian ferrets out and translates into new symbols for the current generation. Primary sources range from monuments like a planned colonial town to a professor's set of lecture notes, neither of which would be unusual "grist" for the interpreter's "mill" in the writing of history, and such sources will be the fundamental "stuff" of this dissertation. It all reflects and, reciprocally, molds values, indicating what the human figures considered to be meaningful in their world. The same methodological principles of investigation, interpretation, summation apply
and yield results which provide additional access to the
secrets of the past.

The dissertation is organized into ten chapters. The
first serves as an introduction with a presentation of
purpose, explanations of time/space scope, method, and
structure. The second provides an interpretation of a town,
Williamsburg, Virginia, as an environmental influence. The
third takes the same approach for the College of William and
Mary, while the fourth deals with its curriculum. The fifth
chapter initiates the focus on faculty with reference to the
environmental influence, both physical and ideological, of
their formative and mature years and the values reflected in
lifestyle. The expansion of this material comprises
chapters six and seven. Chapters eight and nine provide an
analysis of the published lecture notes used in three
courses taught by two of the "masters," Thomas Dew and
Nathaniel Beverly Tucker, with the intent of demonstrating
the presentation of a value paradigm generated by the
pleasant experience of environment and rationalized, within
the context of a classical education, for the consumption of
future generations. Chapter ten is the conclusion and
includes a summation of findings and suggestions for further
study.

There are several things this dissertation does not
intend to be. It is not an historiographical essay and has
no particular ax to grind for national, economic, consensus,
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revisionist, post-revisionist, or modernization history. Nor is it a polemic designed to offer profound, hitherto unrecognized, insights into the irrepressible or aberrational nature of the Civil War. It is merely an investigation of a small, academic community with a somewhat larger than local influence, the beliefs it held as embodied in lifestyle and teaching, and the reasons it might have held such beliefs. The study will accent, of course, those faculty members who actually left appropriate written "remains" and will suggest that sometimes people really do believe what they say they believe and will act, with whatever degree of intensity necessary, to protect those beliefs.
CHAPTER 1

ENDNOTES

1"The Charter of the College of William and Mary, in Virginia" in The History of the College of William and Mary From its Foundation, 1660, to 1874 (Richmond: J.W. Randolph & English, 1874), 3.

2Charles Frederick Minnegerode, the sixth faculty member of this dissertation, qualified for the professorship of Latin and Greek in 1842; The work, "mind", is a reference to W.J. Cash's The Mind of the South.


CHAPTER 2
THE TOWN

Williamsburg was a planned town, and, as such, it reflected cultural values derived from an historical experience dating to the town’s inception in 1633 as a fortified outpost against Indian attacks. Those values were embodied in myth, a partly factual, invented web of ideas, customs, and institutions rationalizing a way of life that had meaning for its practitioners. The town was a myth made concrete by streets and buildings, gardens and property demarcations that consciously or subconsciously demonstrated the intrinsic and reciprocal relationship between ideas which produce the real world of experience and experience which influences the conceptual world of ideas.

Human societies shape their living space, in so far as they are able, to accord with their ideas of well-being. The "shapes" they leave behind indicate how they related to their environments economically, in terms of production for survival or prosperity, and socially and politically, in terms of the relationships that production conditioned. A town plan of two or, with the addition of architecture, three dimensions is a text which communicates the values of
a specific time and location. The experience of this text, in turn, influences the formation of new ideas.¹

Three members of the Dew faculty, Beverley Tucker, Robert Saunders and John Millington, owned residences in the same Williamsburg neighborhood. Dew lived in the President’s house on campus, and Charles Minnegerode, with the Tucker family for the duration of his service as tutor to the Tucker children. All faculty members experienced the town on a regular basis, and it is reasonable to assume that their attitudes and ideas bore the impact of what they encountered sensually and intellectually.

Williamsburg began as part of an English colonial project to promote survival and prosperity in Virginia. Originally known as Middle Plantation, the settlement occupied a high ridge at the headsprings of two creeks, Archer’s Hope and Queens, roughly in the middle of a stockade about six miles long, constructed in 1633 across the peninsula between the York and the James Rivers. The project was conceived as a barrier against Indian attacks and as a giant cow pen, "near fortie miles in length and in most places twelve miles broad," to protect a valuable economic asset.²

Middle Plantation expanded upon its militaristic and mercantile conception when, in 1699, as a result of Jamestown’s proclivity for fiery self-destruction and swampy contagion, the General Assembly voted to promote the outpost
to capital of the Virginia colony. Even though the "Plantation" consisted of only several houses, some shops, two mills, a small brick church and the singularly impressive "Wren" building of a new college established in 1683, it was considered to have several advantages. It lay on high ground; it was safe from naval bombardment; it contained a building, the "Wren", suitable for meetings of the Assembly until a capitol could be constructed; it had on occasion already served as a substitute capital. The settlement had, from another point of view, one further advantage. Unlike European capitals, it was a virtually undeveloped site, a blank page, as it were, upon which a new city, representing the best in turn-of-the-century design, could be impressed. The new capital was renamed Williamsburg, in honor of William II, and within fifty years its plan was realized as a model for modern town design.\(^3\)

Francis Nicholson, appointed governor of Virginia in 1698, was, according to Hugh Jones and Robert Beverley, largely responsible for the three dimensional Williamsburg plan formalized in the legislature of 1699. Beverley's History of 1705, the earliest account of the Virginia colony, claimed in rather unflattering terms that Governor Nicholson considered himself the "Founder of a new city ... marked out the Streets in many Places, so as that they might represent the Figure of a W, in Memory of the late Majesty King William...." In 1724, Hugh Jones declared Nicholson's
intention to have been "a cypher made of W. and M.", a design later "changed to a much better", and the ultimate, plan. This plan may have had an interesting source. Nicholson, a career officer who had served as lieutenant governor of the Dominion of New England, lieutenant governor of Virginia (1690 - 92), and governor of Maryland, had been in London before taking office in Maryland. While little is known of his activities there, it is probable that his interest in the College of William and Mary led him to the offices of the Royal Surveyor. All colonial buildings of importance were designed by that office which was directed, at the time, by Sir Christopher Wren. No proof exists that Wren, himself, participated in planning, but Nicholson’s concern with design seems to date from a period when Wren exercised at least supervisory control over colonial construction."

The Act of 1699 establishing Williamsburg’s design was the "most detailed town planning law yet adopted in the English colonies." It specified the area of the town, the site for the capitol, the capitol’s form and dimensions, landing areas on both local "rivers" and the roads leading to these areas; it had, however, a significance far beyond its detailing. It embodied in graphic form the conceptualizations of late seventeenth century educated Europeans about their cosmos. The mathematical and scientific work of a Descartes, a Leibniz, a Napier, capped
by Newton's classic laws, had produced an idea of a neat, mechanistic universe which ran according to natural law imposed by a "god" reduced by some from a providential Christian deity to an Aristotelian first cause. Such scientific progress is generally associated with a world view or value system called rationalism, the belief that the human faculty of reason is paramount and the one best suited to enable men and women to survive and prosper in the physical world. The notion that human beings could prosper, let alone achieve a happiness akin to contentment or even perfection, in this world was at odds with the medieval western idea that such a state was reserved for those who lived the "good" life and were rewarded in heaven. If human beings would only use their reason to understand the natural order of the universe and model their lives, their institutions, their customs on that order, society would progress, possibly to a state of perfection. All human endeavor, from the attempts of Dutch insurance actuaries to quantify risk to the designing of urban centers, would yield the best results if based upon the mathematical precision, natural law, logic, order in the best of all worlds, the reasonable universe.5

Williamsburg, in its design, reflected the world view of rationalism. The town was a virtual metaphor for the "myth" of reason. It literally cried out well-being and contentment for its inhabitants. And because it remained in
the nineteenth century the size for which it had been designed in the eighteenth, a town for 2000 people, never experiencing what James Henretta saw as the expansion phase of New England colonial towns, it exerted, with significant modifications, the same influence on its nineteenth century residents as it had on those of the eighteenth.6

Williamsburg was designed on a grid, a network of horizontal and perpendicular lines, considered the most perfect geometric form, indicating communication axes. This design had been typical for planned business or trading centers since the fifth century B.C. when Hippodamus was allowed to gratify the despised trading classes of Piraeus by imposing the plan of Babylon on their port. The grid plan permitted ease in the location of sites and great accessibility. It also provided unobscured vistas, unlike a radiocentric design with its spirals of suspenseful curves. Without exterior fortifications, however, it was not useful for defense, and it was generally employed by a community in a peaceful relationship with its neighbors. A variation, the linear axis plan, described below tended, moreover, to lose its consistency if a community expanded beyond a population of 5000 residents who erected their dwellings and trod out their communication paths around and over natural obstacles not embraced in the original design. Williamsburg never experienced much expansion, and, therefore, the residents of the nineteenth century inhabited the same
houses and walked the same streets as those of the eighteenth.

Grid plans featured a primary linear axis (or main street) and a number of subsidiary parallel and perpendicular axes. Williamsburg's spinal or primary axis was the Duke of Gloucester Street laid out on the divide between the two creeks. Running east and west, the street was ninety-nine feet wide and approximately seven-eights of a mile long, a remarkably open-vistad esplanade which almost certainly resulted from "lessons learned" from the Great Fire of London in 1666 and may have been copied from Sir Christopher Wren's unrealized design for rebuilding the city. Duke of Gloucester Street linked actually and symbolically the College of William and Mary at its western terminus with the Capitol at its eastern. Even though the second Capitol was destroyed by fire in 1832, very few townspeople with any educational background could have missed the impact of this arterial landscape symbol which underscored the rational conviction that an intrinsically linear or direct relationship existed between an enlightened mind and an enlightened government. In both the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, this meant, more specifically, the relationship between reason and a government which should represent those who, according to the liberal principle of "right of conquest", controlled the land.
A secondary axis intersected Duke of Gloucester Street about 1600 feet from the grounds of the College and ran north approximately 1000 feet to terminate in what had been the royal governor's palace which burned in 1781 while occupied by wounded from the Yorktown campaign. This was Palace Street, divided down its center by a wide grassy expanse known as the Palace Green, whose total width of over 200 feet exceeded even that of Duke of Gloucester Street. Palace Street organized Williamsburg into two geometric sections, a square and a rectangle. The square or the "uptown" section of the town comprised the area between the Palace and the College enclosed by the original boundary lines, the east - west streets of Scotland on the north and France on the south. The rectangular or "downtown" section lay between Palace and the Capitol and was outlined by the east - west streets of Nicholson on the north and Francis on the south.9

Life on the Williamsburg grid of precise vertical and horizontal lines, right angles, squares and rectangles gave a geometric order to the habitual activities of walking and riding. Unless, as was highly unlikely in their adult years, Thomas Dew and his colleagues were given to shortcuts over fences, through gardens, and across pastures, their experience of movement within their living space was orderly, logical, not too time consuming considering the distances involved, and comfortable relative to the state of
the weather and the roads. Discomfort, at any rate, was of negligible duration, and shelter was available at almost any point of their methodical peregrinations. Moving about town from point A to point B to point C and so on has political, economic and social connotations. The action, itself, may not generate full-fledged conceptualizations, but it certainly predisposes the mind to suggestion. The ease with which one reaches a destination may, for example, affect the attitude one maintains toward his business there. Habits of order and ease in one’s personal time and space may predispose the mind to a dislike and even fear of change which could extend far beyond the motor activities.

The wide, green vistas provided by the broad main arteries of Williamsburg illustrated another important characteristic of the town’s formal design -- the inclusion of nature, of open space and sunlight, trees and sky. Nature as an intentional part of a city’s structure came with the seventeenth century, new forms of social behavior, and the French. The Mail, an area for sports, and the Cours, a promenade for seeing and being seen, were French innovations catering to the upper class need for pleasant, leisure time activities. Renaissance Italians had revived the classical concept of aesthetically appealing urban scenery, but this concept rested on the construction of fountains, obelisks, circuses, etc. A hard and fast line was drawn between nature, wild and domesticated, and town
until the building of Marie de Medici's Luxembourg Palace in 1620. The inclusion of nature in city planning served practical as well as aesthetic and social purposes. Light and air seemed to mitigate the spread of contagion, and open space impeded the spread of flames, as evidenced, again, in the great London fire. Reason would dictate, therefore, that the narrow, twisting streets, the row housing, the overhanging second stories of medieval European cities were vestiges of an irrational past, and new cities or towns, like Williamsburg, should stand as models for the modern age of rationalism.¹⁰

The inclusion of nature was emphasized by another impressive characteristic of the legislated town plan. This was the provision regarding dwelling places and lot size:

Williamburg shall be laid out and proportioned into half Acres .... a distinct lott of ground .... whosoever shall build in the maine Street ... shall not build a house less than tenn foot pitch from ground floor to the second floor and the front of each house shall come within Six foot of the street and not nearer ....¹¹

This section of Nicholson's plan reflected his insistence that each head of household have his own house and that each house lot should be one half acre in size, a sufficient quantity of land for house, garden, orchard and dependencies. What a change this was from the narrow, row housing of Jamestown! How these regularly-spaced openings contributed to the airy impression of the whole! And this concept was extended to the inclusion of "grounds" or
squares, sections of land which surrounded public buildings, such as the square, 475 feet on each side, in which the capitol was placed and the "gardens" of the governor's palace. Market Square, an additional green open space about halfway between the College and the Capitol, was established for markets and fairs, auctions of slaves, goods, and land. The James City County Courthouse centered the Square, and across the Duke of Gloucester Street from it lay the training field for the colonial militia and the powder magazine. After the capital of Virginia was moved to Richmond in 1780, Market Square became the real civic center of Williamsburg, and the houses facing it were considered to occupy a very prestigious location.

The open vistas of Williamsburg reflected in the eighteenth as well as the nineteenth centuries not only the practicalities of new town design but also a unique and most significant characteristic of the American colonies -- the availability of land, possibly the single greatest influential factor in the development of American cultural values. Williamsburgers were not only encouraged to be structured and precise in their communal movements, but they were continuously reminded that land, one of the three pillars which along with a staple crop and a slave labor force upheld their regional version of an economy, was abundant for those with the power to purchase or the lineage to inherit. After 1815, gradual exhaustion of Tidewater
soil, the lure of the west, lack of commercial enterprise and facile means of communication contributed to a loss of population and an encroaching decadence which was very obvious by 1824. Williamsburg mirrored this decadence in its burned public buildings, the depreciation of its political currency, and its failure to expand. It remained, however, a design symbol of early prosperity and opportunity with landscape perceptions of the arcadian images from some Golden Age in the past which had provided the ideal human environment.

Any commuter on the two main axes of Williamsburg in the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries would have had before his eyes as terminal vistas one or two of its public buildings or the sites upon which they had once stood. These buildings were the Capitol, landscape symbol of colonial and, briefly, commonwealth liberal government; the Governor’s Palace, symbol of royal executive power; Bruton Parish Church, seat of the once established religion; the Wren Building, the emblem of academia in the wilderness of the new world. The Wren Building with its companions, the President’s House and the Brafferton Building flanking it to the north and the south, formed The College of William and Mary at the western terminus of Duke of Gloucester Street. The College will be the subject of Chapter III. Of the remaining buildings, the Capitol and the Governor’s Palace had burned by 1833, but Bruton Parish Church still stood on
Duke of Gloucester Street at its intersection with the western branch of Palace.

At least three members of the Dew faculty must have had personal knowledge of the appearance of the second colonial capitol constructed in 1753. After Richmond became the capital in 1780, it was used by George Wythe to hold moot courts. Later, it served as a Court of Admiralty, then a military hospital and a grammar school. In 1794 half the building was torn down, and in 1832 the remaining half burned. Few records remain for even a fragmentary description of this structure, a veritable monument to the revolutionary fervor of Thomas Jefferson, Patrick Henry, and Richard Lee. The second building, however, utilized the surviving walls of its predecessor, although it differed in appearance. Some idea of the second capitol's design can be grasped, therefore, by a study of the first's. More importantly, an impression of the Lockian liberalism which its design symbolized so well is readily apparent.

The first capitol, whose foundation was laid in 1701, was a notable structure in eighteenth century America. It was one of the few public buildings of any size constructed in the colonies. With a floor plan in the shape of an "H", this brick edifice was classical in appearance. Two wings formed the stanchions of the "H". These wings ended in semicircular tribunes and were linked by a round (Romanesque) arched, arcaded loggia with a room above. The
House of Burgesses, the first representative governmental body in the colonies and one which represented free, white, male freeholders, only, until the Constitutional Convention of 1829 - 30, met on the ground floor of the east wing and had three committee rooms on the second. The west wing housed the General court on the first floor and the Council Chamber on the second. The Council was, in effect, a kind of upper parliamentary house, tantamount to the House of Lords. Its twelve members were nominated by the royal governor and appointed for life by the British Board of Trade. The conference room above the loggia was practically and figuratively a place of "coming together" of "Lords" and "Commons" for morning prayer or the resolution of disagreements. Additional architectural features such as round and arched sashed windows (compass windows), dormers and a hexagonal cupola above the loggia reinforced the classical impact. A visual impression of this building or one derived from its successor and even a rudimentary knowledge and acceptance of its purpose supported the ideology that the "great and chief end therefore, of Men uniting into Commonwealths, and putting themselves under Government, is the Preservation of their Property." The government of the commonwealth, in the eighteenth as well as the nineteenth centuries until 1850, was in jurisdiction of those free white males who, according to all that was reasonable, owned freeholds, or, after 1830, leaseholds or
households. This was the message of the capitol metaphor, which stood within a perfect square at the end of the primary linear axis of a mathematically precise town plan.\textsuperscript{13}

The Governor's Palace, symbol of what had once been royal colonial power, would not have been personally experienced by any members of the Dew faculty. It would be reasonable to assume, however, that at least Dew, Saunders, and Tucker had some impression of its appearance and considerable knowledge of its history. Function predetermined that the Palace would represent, more so than any other town structure, a converging of influences from the classical to the imperial. It was the first, so-called, double-pile structure in Virginia. Originally designed as a square, two rooms deep on either side of a central hall, the house was enlarged by the addition of a ballroom and a supper room about 1752, which coincided with a trend in English architecture focusing on the construction of large rooms for entertainment. This trend reflected growing imperial prosperity and a desire to emulate the leisure-time activities of Louis XIV and his court at Versailles.\textsuperscript{14}

Following French fashion, the Palace was fancifully and figuratively "fortified" by the castellated walls around the forecourt, and in classical style, it featured dormers, regularly spaced sashed windows, and a Dutch-inspired lantern cupola flanked by two massive chimneys on a hipped roof. The frame outbuildings or dependencies as well as the
brick main building resembled English country estates, but the dependencies, especially, bore the distinct Virginian colonial characteristics of self-sufficiency -- buildings for the smoking and salting of meat, a separate structure for food preparation to avoid the constant hazard of fire, necessary buildings, etc. These dependencies, to a lesser degree, were typical of large Williamsburg residences. Whether they served as offices, kitchens, coach houses, or stables, they constituted a miniature or a microcosm of what was thought to be the ideal allocation of social space in a mercantile adjunct of an imperial power -- the plantation, the most affluent economic unit in an agricultural society which for all intents and purposes remained a colonial supplier of raw materials long after the colony became a state.

The elaborate landscaping of the Palace grounds had once embraced no less than ten distinct gardens of English, Italian, and French parentage. The "back" door of the ballroom opened upon an attenuated veranda with steps descending into the rectangular ballroom garden guarded by twelve huge, cone-shaped topiaries, the "Twelve Apostles" often found on English estates. This garden, alone, featured diamond-shaped parterres bordered neatly by clipped boxwood hedges. Small, rounded topiaries, one on each side of each diamond, provided contrast to the linearity of the parterres and the placement of the "Apostles." The ballroom
The Palace gardens, a triumph of Anglo-Franco-Dutch landscaping, was a tangle of flora by the 1830's. Few people remained who had witnessed the facility in its days of splendor, but even its decay constituted a spectacle with considerable emotional impact, one more indigenous to the romantic period. Here was a ruin symbolizing the fate of an imperial power which had dared to encroach upon the personal autonomy of those pursuing what Creve-Coeur styled as "self-interest". Much of value in terms of life-style had been inherited from that power, but when English government became irrelevant and a downright hinderance, in the eyes of its colonial subjects, to "the preservation of their Property" those same colonial subjects deemed themselves "absolved from any farther Obedience" and justified in resuming "their original Liberty". This Lockian lesson could not be lost on the intelligentsia of a region which would come to regard the President and Congress of the
United States of America as it had once regarded the King and Parliament of Great Britain.  

The third major architectural symbol in the Williamsburg landscape was Bruton Parish Church, along with the College the strongest surviving link between the past and the present. Bruton Parish was formed in 1674, before Middle Plantation had metamorphosed into Williamsburg, and named for an English parish in Somerset. The first church in Jacobean style was built in 1677, but the removal of the capital from Jamestown to Williamsburg made it inadequate. In 1711 Governor Spotswood presented the vestry with a plan for a new church, and the Assembly voted 200 pounds to defray the cost. The new (and present) church was designed by Spotswood, like Wren, a mathematician, and was completed in 1715. It followed the Latin-cross plan of the basilica and the Romanesque and gothic design for a nave and a transept. The dimension gauge was, again, geometrically perfect, this time, that of an equilateral triangle with straight edges of seventy-five feet each. A steeple, in the Anglican-Baroque style of Wren, was added in 1769-70, a feature slightly at variance with the church's classical characteristics such as round-arched, sashed windows.

Bruton Parish Church, as an Anglican house of worship, represented the established or state religion in Virginia until 1786. This meant that the church was supported by colonial taxes which all taxpayers, regardless of religious
preference, were required to pay. All office-holders were to be conformists, and every white, with the exception of a few Quakers who formally dissented and some Catholics, was considered to be a member and had to attend services at least once a month on pain of paying a fine. The church's official connection with the College was severed after the Revolution, but there continued to be a close relationship between the two. Old tidewater families like the Dews, Tuckers, Saunders, etc. often counted church membership among the regalia of social status, and college ceremonials were considered appropriately executed within the confines of Bruton Parish Church or, at least, the Wren Chapel. Seating within the church reflected and accentuated social structure with persons of importance occupying transept pews, college students, the west gallery, and slaves, the north gallery. In colonial Virginia, God, Himself, had appeared to sanction the position of the propertied; in the commonwealth, He seemed to do no less.

Individual residences, in addition to public buildings, expanded the metaphor which Williamsburg presented. The legislation of 1699, as noted before, differed from other town plans in its stipulations regarding aspects of domestic architecture besides dimension. The provisions for half-acre residential lots on city land and houses of no less than ten foot pitch on the "maine Street" were refined by stipulations that on the main street houses were to be no
closer than six feet to the street and the floor area of each house was to be twenty feet wide and thirty feet long. Houses elsewhere were to be constructed according to the regulations of appointed directors or "the incorporation of Mayor, Aldermen, and Commonality of the City of Williamsburg." These and other restrictions on structuring plus a common architectural formula made for an overall uniformity which reinforced the rationality of the town design.\textsuperscript{18}

The architecture of Williamsburg demonstrated a fascination with mathematical formulas characteristic of the eighteenth century and important in the history of western design. Systems of design using such formulas are modular, in which dimensions are stated in terms of a given unit, or geometrical, in which dimensions are derived from a line of given length by constructing geometric figures on it. The formulas employed in Williamsburg architecture were geometric. To early theorists, the most perfect figures were the circle, the square and the equilateral triangle. The circular plan was reflected in dependencies such as icehouses and dovecots. The square, however, was fundamental to domestic architecture. In the Saunders and Tucker homes, for example, the front elevation between the basement and the eaves cornice formed a double square. The height of chimneys would equal the altitude of a triangle with sides the length of the house. The overall visual
impression of such controlling geometric factors is one of homogeneity, symmetry, regularity which goes beyond individual differences and circumscribes a "style". This style was apparent from any vantage point in Williamsburg and heightened the experience of perfection in a material world.¹⁹

Williamsburg homes, as Hugh Jones pointed out, were most commonly built of timber, a readily available material, but some were constructed of brick, fired locally and laid in the fashion of Flemish or English bond. These homes tended to be moderate in size, comfortable and unornamented with accoutrements like pillars, lengthy verandas, and balconies. They were also indigenous to Virginia in certain characteristics such as their wide, central hallways to improve circulation in the warm, humid summer climate. These residences tended to be of three types. The first type boasted a central hallway which, in addition to its cooling propensities, provided a privacy which houses with immediate entry lacked. On either side of the hall was a room, and these rooms were sometimes of unequal width with a varied number of windows.²⁰

The second type of home was two rooms deep with a hall running alongside the two rooms. This structure could have two stories, and the ground floor plan was repeated upstairs. Downstairs, the front room was usually designated the "parlor" and had a corner fireplace. The third type, a
more spacious arrangement, featured two stories with a similar organization -- a central hall with two rooms deep on both sides.

The President's House on the College campus and one faculty home followed the third residential plan. Built in 1732-33, the President's House had been designed by Henry Cary Jr., the architect of the Governor's Palace to which it bore a resemblance. Although smaller and less ornate than the Palace, the President's House also featured a steep, hipped roof surmounted by two enormous chimneys. It was, in addition, a two-story, brick structure with regularly spaced sashed windows and dormers in the roof. Upstairs and down there was a central hall with two rooms deep on both sides. The height of the roof ridge could have been determined by the altitude of a triangle with sides the length of the house.21

John Millington's home, the Wythe House on the west side of Palace Street, one of the most famous in Williamsburg, was a handsome, two-story brick built in 1752-54. It was erected by Richard Taliaferro who may well have designed it, as he was charged with repairing the Governor's Palace and adding the ballroom wing. The Wythe House was similar to the President's house in terms of floor plan, building material, hipped roof and chimneys. Its roof height was also determined by the equilateral triangle, and it followed the square and a half plan (ratio of 1:1 1/2 )
being thirty-six feet six inches by fifty-four feet six inches. It did not, however, have dormers nor was its roof as steep as that of the President’s House or the Governor’s Palace. Behind the house a symmetrical landscape plan apportioned the lot into functional areas such as an orchard, garden, and green (bowling). Smokehouse, kitchen, laundry, lumber house, poultry house, well, dovecot, stable, and necessary houses (two) intensified the image of a miniature plantation.²²

The last house on the west side of Palace Street, as one approached the site of the Governor’s Palace, belonged to Robert Saunders. This house, like that of Beverley Tucker, was rather unique. Saunder’s father had purchased the home in 1801 from Robert Carter of Nomini Hall, a member of the colonial governor’s council, who had owned it since 1761. Built before 1746, the two-story dwelling was of frame, painted white, and displayed an M-shaped roof, a most unusual exterior feature. Originally, the roof had two parallel ridges with a valley between. In the eighteenth century, an upper slope was added which covered the valley and produced a mansard shape. In the nineteenth century, the porch was replaced by a two-story portico in Doric style. It is difficult to ascertain exactly when this was done, and it may have been accomplished after Saunders’ residence. Instead of a broad, central passage inside the house, there was an L-shaped entrance hall with stairs to
the right in the horizontal stroke of the L. One room lay on one side of the entrance, two rooms, on the other, and a small, narrow chamber, between these complexes and behind the hall. The interior of the Saunders' house was, therefore, as much a curiosity as the exterior had once been.23

If Robert Saunders were to walk out his front door, proceed south on Palace Street past the home of John Millington, and take a left turn on Nicholson, he would come to the residence of another colleague, Nathaniel Beverley Tucker. This home had been the second of Tucker's childhood domiciles, and he had inherited it from his father, the noted jurist and Professor of Law at William and Mary, St. George Tucker. St. George had purchased the property on the north side of Nicholson Street at its intersection with Palace in 1788 and moved to the site an older building from around the corner which he had expanded with several one and a half story additions and a second story. The resulting structure of cream colored and brown trimmed frame was narrow in width, multi-sectioned and gable-roofed, with three imposing chimneys. An addition to the north side of the house (the back) was once called the "shed", but in Tucker's time it was known as the "Great Hall". The precise floor plan of this rambling structure is not available (The home is still privately owned.), but it seems to be a
variation on the third type, a central hallway, attenuated in this case, with adjoining rooms. The Tucker house fronted on Market Square, across the street, and, thus, its residents enjoyed a spacious vista from their front windows. The second story windows were regularly spaced, as were those of the first story. They were, however, smaller in length and width, a characteristic shared by Millington's residence and the President's House. This characteristic seems to have been peculiar to Williamsburg in the colonies and probably reflected the classical Greek penchant for producing the optical illusion of symmetry by constructing asymmetrical features.²³

The above faculty homes stood as metaphors for what passed in the tidewater for the "good" if not the "best" life. They were large, comfortable dwellings in prestigious locations, owned, excepting the President's House, by their male heads-of-household, and tended by slaves. If they were not actual plantations they reflected in miniature the plantation "style" of a studied, if not quite real, self-sufficiency and balanced elegance. Their design indicated an attempt to impose mathematical order on everyday existence, and the act of daily moving through that ordered space in the relatively free pursuit of self-interest must have lent the sanction of rationality to that pursuit.

The sanction of rationality for the faculty lifestyle was accentuated by the sanction of history. The Dew faculty
had a keen sensitivity to history, both in the personal and in the professional sense. With the exception of Millington and Minnegerode, they descended from families whose genealogies were easily identifiable with the growth of the privileged class in Virginia. They lived in homes once owned by Wythe, several Carters, a Tucker and a royal institution, homes frequented by the Randolphins (Peyton and John), Jefferson, Marshall, Edmund Pendleton, George Washington, Rochambeau, Lafayette, and a procession of similar dignitaries. They walked the streets these luminaries had trod, and they looked daily at reminders of an illustrious colonial and national past. And that past gently persuaded its children that the fight for nationhood by thirteen defiant colonies had been rational, that prosperity had resulted, and that Virginia had assumed a position of leadership in the process. The comfortable, rational life had been fought for and secured, and the cause was deemed just.

The sanctions of rationality and history which Williamsburg mythically embodied were mightily overshadowed by the third sanction presenting itself daily in the form of a certain brick structure at the corner of Palace and Duke of Gloucester -- the redoubtable sanction of God. Bruton Parish Church had once represented the established church which dominated the Tidewater and the Piedmont and, as in England, was identified strongly with the upper strata of
society. Even the Anglican clergy in the colonies, unlike their counterparts in England, hobnobbed familiarly with Tidewater aristocracy, an activity resulting in a not-altogether-justified reputation for drinking, gambling and other similar leisure time pursuits. It had been official policy in Williamsburg to invite dissenters like the Presbyterians and the Lutherans into the area west of the mountains where they were more useful as staunch defenders of the frontier than as contentious neighbors in the Tidewater. After the revolution, the Anglican, now Episcopal, identification remained partly as a mark of class distinction, regionally-based, partly as a designation of legitimate and natural progression from colonial to national status, partly as a memorial to tradition, and, of course, partly as a spiritual commitment. William and Mary had an historical association with the Church of England, and the faculty, at least through the first half of the nineteenth century, supported this association. Episcopalianism and its God were an integral part of the harmonious pattern Williamsburg presented to the world.

Certain jarring dissonances, unfortunately, marred the consonant harmony of the Williamsburg composition in the nineteenth century. The glory-filled days of the town as a colonial and state capital were gone forever, and it was essentially a small, quiet backwater in a state which, by the 1830's was threatened from within by economic
degeneration and political dissension and from without by the industrialization of the northeast and the abolition movement. The material ruins of British colonialism were constant visible reminders of victory; but might they not also presage defeat at a time when the liberal franchise was expanding beyond the propertied and the definition of property, itself, was questioned? Those who lived the rational life in comfortable homes on the well-ordered grid of Williamsburg might well feel the disturbing tremor of a coming upheaval.
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CHAPTER 3
THE COLLEGE

Thomas Dew met, for the first time as president, with his faculty in the second week of October 1836 in the "blue room" on the second floor of the Wren Building. Dew had known these four men as colleagues while serving as professor of moral philosophy, history and political economy -- Nathaniel Beverley Tucker, Robert Saunders, Dabney Browne. The fourth, John Millington, from England by way of Mexico and Philadelphia, had just qualified as professor of natural philosophy and chemistry the previous winter and was relatively unknown, save by reputation, to the new president. During the meeting proper, these five men most probably sat around an oval table set before the fireplace. At any point in the discussion or after, one or more of them might well have risen and walked to one of the four windows overlooking the front college yard, taken a long look down Duke of Gloucester Street, and speculated briefly on his position as an academic in the second oldest institution of higher learning in the United States and the ninth among all the universities of the English-speaking world.\footnote{Speculation on one’s position in the community of life must necessarily focus on factors such as occupation,}
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economic, political and social status, familial and/or affectional, collegial, and opportunistic relationships, geographical location, etc. and the characteristics which gave those factors meaning of any kind. The long view from the height of the Wren's second story revealed an homogeneity of landscape and architecture which, at first, appeared uncanny. Town and college seemed as one, merging into a unity of brick and frame, linear linkages and arboreal relief. Laid out before the viewer was an historical tableau which pointed up the distinctive features, some damaged or destroyed, of royal, religious, and revolutionary sanction for a society's ideas and aspirations, and the college which had preceded them all bestowed the imprimatur of learning to this shaped environment which no master, with the possible exception of Millington, could ignore. William and Mary had struggled and grown with the town of which it was a part. In the midst of revolutionary success, it had, like Williamsburg, suffered defeat, but as an institution it had never lost its sense of what well-being meant and how that was interpreted in its society. And it had never lost its awareness of how the environment in which the members of the institution moved from day to day had been designed to effect that well-being. When, for example, Dew wrote of slavery or Tucker of secession or the role of women, they did so with a
conviction imposed by virtually everything in their landscape which they were determined to preserve.²

The chartering and funding of William and Mary evidenced three important alliances upon which the school's existence rested and which became integral parts of the tradition-load it bore into the future. It was, first, tied to imperial government; second, to the established church; third, to the political economy of Virginia. It was, in three words, royal, Anglican, and landed, descriptions it was not quite able to shake off in the ante-bellum period. Its seal, for which the redoubtable James Blair had hied himself over to the College of Heralds as soon as the charter was approved, proclaimed its nobility, its mission, its religion, and its vestiture, specifically, the entire land system of Virginia which the college controlled until the Revolution. This control placed the college squarely among the propertied with the prerogatives of the propertied including a vote in the House of Burgesses. William and Mary could not have more closely mirrored the value-base of Virginia which remained after the Revolution a "colonial" agricultural adjunct of Britain, the northeastern United States, and, for one "peculiar" product, slaves, the deep south. In that value base, first, land, slavery, and tobacco, then, land, wheat, and slaves shored up the customs and institutions which gave meaning to life.³
The college had existed in conceptual form since 1617. In that year James I wrote to his Archbishops requiring them to instruct their Bishops to take up collections in all the parishes four times each year, for two years, for "the erecting of some ... Schooles" in Virginia. As early as 1609, the Virginia Company had discussed plans for the conversion of Native American children, a policy found useful by the English in subduing the "dangerous" Irish and one which became part of colonial policy. Christianization of the proper kind and education tended to bring whichever "barbarians" the British had in mind at the moment into the life and service of a colony and reduce the potential for rebellion.¹

The original plan for educational institutions in Virginia called for two preparatory schools, one at Henrico, eighty miles up the James, for Indians and, in an expansion of the plan, one at Charles City for colonial boys. The capstone would be a college which would also be situated at Henrico. Massacre, rebellion, the change in status from a corporate to a royal colony, the magnetism of British schools, and various other factors postponed the raising of the latter school until the arrival in Virginia of the Scotsman, James Blair.

The intrepid Reverend Blair had been educated at the University of Edinburgh and ordained a minister of the Church of England. Refusing to take the oath demanded of
all ministers under the Scottish Test Act of 1681, he went to London where he so impressed the Bishop of London with his piety that he was sent to Virginia as a missionary. Blair soon established himself as a leader among the Virginia clergy, a position not difficult to achieve given the dubious qualities of his colleagues, allied himself with the aristocracy by marrying a Harrison, and by 1690 found himself the Bishop of London’s Commissary or representative in the colony. At this point, the state religion, in the person of Blair, conjoined with the state, in the person of the then Lieutenant-Governor, Francis Nicholson, who came to Virginia bearing Blair’s commission as commissary. These two gentlemen soon identified a common purpose - the revival of plans for a college - and made a formidable pair in negotiating, wheedling or bullying their project through the Council and the House of Burgesses.

The Virginia climate at the time was especially favorable to educational developments. The Indians were once again restless and, therefore, needful of education and/or some other form of pacification; many parents still suffered concern over the Great Fire and recurring outbreaks of smallpox in London, preferring to keep their sons at home rather than risk their health in the big city across the Atlantic. Then, too, Blair sensibly refrained from asking embarrassing questions about the funds and lands which, since 1619, had been set aside for the establishment of a
College and which had, remarkably, disappeared. All matters proceeded well and quickly, and by 1691 Blair was on his way to London to seek a royal charter.

That Blair did obtain the charter, after a lengthy and complex experience with ministries, reams of paper for memorials and the intervention of an old friend with influence is common knowledge. Not so well-known was the necessity, at that time as well as in the present, for funding which provided, as it was met, more poundage for the load of tradition William and Mary was to bear into the future. With considerable ingenuity, Blair put together a bequest for the promotion of Christianity, Anglican, of course, in the will of the noted chemist and founder and president of the Royal Society, the Honorable Robert Boyle, a literally blackmailed payment from a couple of impertinent pirates in London to sue for the restitution of their "property", and a royal endowment to finance his academic project. To the Christian and the not-so-Christian solicited funds, the government added almost £2000 from quit-rents on Virginia landholdings, a penny per pound on all tobacco shipped from Virginia and Maryland to any other colony, and control of the office of Surveyor-General of the colony with its fees, specifically 1985fs, 14s, 10d, and 20,000 Virginia acres to be held in free and common soccage.

It was no wonder that the financially acute Blair was the only candidate he, himself, or, for that matter, Nicholson
ever had for the presidency of the college, a post which he held for fifty years, a record never equaled.®

Blair's presidency aside, his funding, when taken into account with the chartered governing structure of the college, created a kind of paradox with regard to the institution's autonomy. It was British custom to endow an educational institution with its own income so that it was independent of local prejudice and pecuniary bias associated with taxation. The House of Burgesses reinforced this independence by allotting the college a tax of seven and one-half percent on all furs and skins exported. Even though this entire monetary package did not always prove lucrative or even adequate, the principle prevailed in the English world that support from endowments presumed a degree of institutional independence which allowed those who more fully understood and appreciated the learning process, namely, the masters, to prescribe for the good of the whole.®

And it was the masters who would rule. So stated the charter. So should power rightly be placed. But, in the developmental stages of William and Mary, before power came to reside officially in the masters, eighteen to twenty Trustees nominated by the General Assembly were to govern the process. The Trustees were to select one of their number to serve as rector. There was to be, in addition, a Chancellor who would serve for seven years, and the custom
of selecting either the Bishop of London or the Archbishop
of Canterbury for this office continued for seventy years.
When the college was established, control would, indeed,
pass to the president and faculty serving as a senate, and
the Trustees would then become a largely advisory board.
Such a power structure led to many disagreements and
confrontations in William and Mary’s first fifty years which
are not the focus of this writing. It is quickly apparent,
however, that an institution which is ostensibly governed by
its faculty but which is overseen by a powerful Board of
Visitors chained by an economic umbilical cord to the
propertied interests of crown and colony, situated within a
colonial capital, and blessed by the established religion
could hardly enjoy a great degree of autonomy. The college
would have two opportunities to break this organic
relationship with community, once, immediately after the
Revolution, when economic and political status was in
extreme flux, and, again, in the 1820’s when William and
Mary would bid and fail to become the state university of
Virginia. By the time of the Dew presidency, 1836, there
seemed little doubt, and little tolerance if any, that
"town" and "gown" were entwined in a community of interests
and values. As went the town, so went the gown. And the
landscape observed from the Wren’s second story blue room,
the landscape with its homes and shops, its ruins and
arbors, its roads and greens, its symbols of victory and
defeat and what was meaningful in life, gave back to its viewer a visual reaffirmation of his society's canons of belief.

Before the business of institutionalized cultural transferral, or education, could begin with the objective of rendering impotent the threat of native American hostility and civilizing the young, colonial, upper class male, a site and a structure for the college were necessary. The Burgesses and Council in General Assembly designated that site as Middle Plantation "as near the Church now standing ... as convenience will permit." An area of 330 acres west of the church extending to Archer's Hope swamp was purchased by the trustees, and boundary line stones were imposed to mark exclusive property rights. As in the case of Williamsburg, itself, the demarcation of property holdings contributed to what was probably "the most decisive act of the English invaders in reshaping the configuration of the Chesapeake landscape." At this point, 1694, the foundation was laid, literally and figuratively, for an academic controversy which would reach into the twentieth century -- whether or not the "Wren" building was designed by Christopher Wren. For some, the most relevant question may be, does it matter? In studying the transmission of cultural belief systems, such a question does "matter". The valid appellation, "Wren", is like a brand name guaranteeing quality, something of value reflecting social
ideals to pass to the future. And by the process of association, the activities carried on in a structure designated by a name embodying the best characteristics of British architecture of a certain period acquire some of the gloss, the sanction, of their habitation. A campus landmark of recognized quality, therefore, lends the aura of truth and goodness to the doctrines promulgated under its roof, especially if those doctrines are reinforced by the landmark's environment.

Hugh Jones, writing in 1724, stated flatly that the college building "is beautiful and commodious, being first modelled by Sir Christopher Wren...." Largely on the basis of this evidence, the original college building acquired the name, "Wren" which it tenaciously retains to the present day. Given Wren's office of Surveyor-General and the prerogatives attendant on that office plus the opportunities offered by both Nicholson's and Blair's London affiliations, this designation is within probability. Robert Beverley, in 1705, made, however, no reference to Wren, although he describes the building plan as "a Quadrangle, two sides of which, are yet only carryed up." Beverley, a plantation owner in Gloucester County and in King and Queen County, was known to be highly critical of Nicholson and the crown for what Beverley perceived as attempts to curtail the liberties of Virginians, and he may have attached no importance to or deliberately denigrated
any connection with a famous London architect. Hugh Jones, on the other hand, was a William and Mary faculty member (born in England), serving both as master of the grammar school and professor of natural philosophy and mathematics and had the opportunity and the motivation to endorse the "Wren" origins. The slight flaw in Jones' position is that the structure he describes as a "brick building adorns with a cupola ... a large wing ... and ... a spacious piazza on the west side ...." is the replacement for the partially completed original which burned in 1705. The replacement, however, was constructed, with minor variation, on the original foundations, and the relatively undamaged west wall was allowed to remain in place. Wren frequently designed academic buildings, and, if there be any truth to the supposition that he had at least an approving hand in the plan for Williamsburg, there could well be truth to his authorship of the Wren plan. Architectural historians point out that in its detail the Wren building is unlike anything Wren ever designed. It was, however, the only presumed Wren work outside of England, and its final form was certainly influenced by the exigencies of climate and finance.

Whatever its genesis, the second Wren building (and the one known by the Dew faculty) was a handsome stylistic complement to the new capital. Stimulated by the arrival in the colony, in 1710, of Lieutenant-Governor, Alexander Spotswood, a gentlemen of considerable architectural and
mathematical knowledge, the second Wren structure was a classical, rectangular, three-storied brick, with the third story enclosed in the roof and lighted by dormer windows. Regularly-spaced first-floor windows on either side of a central entrance were matched by smaller windows in the second story. The central entrance, itself, opened into a corridor extending through the width of the building and opening onto a piazza running across the back of the main structure. At the north end of the main structure was a wing containing a great hall, ordinarily the dining room or commons where president, faculty, students and staff sat in ranks and where the Burgesses met, 1700-1704, and again, 1747-1754. In 1732 a south wing was added with a chapel, making visual, architecturally, the relationship of William and Mary to the state church. The courtyard formed by the wings was intended to be enclosed by a structure similar to the main unit. Thomas Jefferson had drawn plans, and foundations had been laid for this enclosure when the Revolution ended the project.

As a landmark reflecting the values indicated by space-use, the Wren building is of considerable significance in its reinforcing influence on those who taught and, in the eighteenth century, lived within its walls. Its form was an approbation of English/colonial classicism; its site, of the close relationship between community and academia and the property ethic; its function, of an educational tradition,
hearkening back to medieval monasticism, deemed essential as a civilizing factor in the wilderness and as preparation for rational government by the upper class male. Even though the Revolution would formally change some of the salient features of that schema, the Wren building by the 1830's still represented the perceived best of the colonial inheritance, including a strong bent for the Episcopal (once, Anglican) Church and a political power structure resting on the landed, Virginian male.

To the right of the Wren building and facing north stood the Brafferton building, built in 1723. It was named after the income producing estate in Yorkshire in which Boyle's bequest had been invested, and, until the Revolution cut off funds, it served as the Indian school where native American boys were taught reading, writing, basic arithmetic, and the Christian religion. The Brafferton building was probably designed by Henry Cary Jr. (the designer of the Governor's Palace), and it was the second double-pile structure (the Palace, the first) in the colony. Externally it was another rectangular brick of three stories with a hipped roof, dormered windows, and two enormous chimneys. It was very similar, although smaller, to the president's house, also designed by Cary, which it faced across the college yard. The yard, therefore, demonstrated not only a unity in itself but also with the town in a simple, geometric architecture and airy, green vista. It
was in form and function a logical extension of the town and
the community of about 200 families the town embraced. On
the north side of the triangular yard ran the road to
Richmond; on the south, the road to what had once been
Jamestown. Both linkages converged in Boundary Street, the
western city limit of Williamsburg, at the apex of the
triangle. The viewer in the blue room could look neither
down the Jamestown road into the past nor up the Richmond
road into the future. Season permitting, the town and the
linear route that drew the college and the burned capitol
together filled his sight, creating the lasting, if somewhat
distorted, impression of an eighteenth century world
suspended forever in a present where the meaning of life
should be securely eternal.

A physical plant has no life principle, no vitality,
without a faculty, and, so, to speak of the college means
necessarily to speak of the faculty. The first official
faculty, the Blair faculty (and it would be the Blair
faculty until he died in 1743), was formalized in 1729 when,
all departments in the school having been established and
rules for government statuted, all the college realty,
income, and seventeen slaves were transferred to the control
of that body in the persons of President Blair and six
masters. These men, having sworn to the thirty-nine
articles of the Church of England, entered a corporate power
status claimed only by the upper class. As a corporation,
the faculty was similar to a legal "person" (male); they controlled property and had one vote in the Burgesses. As a privilege, the college was exempt from taxation.

The idea of a college (or university) as an endowed, self-governing association of scholars was a holdover from the medieval tradition and resulted in certain definite advantages. The faculty controlled economic as well as academic power. The economy and the academy went hand in hand, reinforcing one another and the institutions of monarchy, the established church, and Lockian representative government. Richard Hofstadter reinforced this concept broadly by claiming that "during the last three or four decades of the eighteenth century the American colleges had achieved a notable degree of freedom, vitality, and public usefulness", and from then on a sharp decline set in. Hofstadter offers no reasons for this phenomenon, but it is possible that independent income regulated by the academicians who enjoyed the same vested interests as the power elite accounted for a good proportion of this independence. Even immediately after the Revolution, this tradition remained strong because, fundamentally, the elite remained the same and the college retained its tie to that class.9

The Revolution did, however, create a great upheaval in the political and economic fortunes of William and Mary which was partially mitigated by the retention of its status.
as a peculiarly tidewater (or regional) institution. Economically, the upheaval was devastating, but in a strange sense it contributed to the improvement of teaching and the independence of the faculty. First, of course, the college lost the use of the Brafferton fund which was diverted to the education of blacks in the West Indies. The Indian School was closed, and the Brafferton building became a dormitory. This, in itself, seems not of great consequence, as there is no record that any of the youths taught there ever applied his education. The college also lost the Boyle fund, and all colonial laws for its support (tobacco, liquor, fur taxes) were discontinued. For that matter, Virginia's tobacco trade almost stopped, and inflation erased tax revenues. The Commonwealth spent money it did not have on war materials, and the college could expect nothing from that source. Students, if they paid their bills at all, did so in depreciated currency. The total impact of this situation meant, simply, that William and Mary was virtually out of money. Three years after the peace treaty, its available capital was only 2,505£. It still held the land granted by the crown which brought rent, and in 1784 the general assembly increased its real estate with "the lands commonly called the palace lands .... the lands near the said city ... vineyard .... the lands near Jamestown ...."10
To meet the economic crisis, then president, James Madison, (1777-1812) adopted what would become time-honored tactics for saving money. He abolished scholarships and increased tuition and boarding rates. He lowered salaries (he did refrain from cutting positions) and sold capital assets, land and slaves. William and Mary limped financially on until the end of the century, but one important advantage was gained. The faculty for a reason very different from that before the Revolution, retained its independence. Most Virginia voters were aware that the alternative of study in England was no longer as readily available as before. Without William and Mary, Virginians might have to go north, to colleges regarded by their "Southern ... Brethren with ineffable Contempt." Survival of the college depended on faculty, and, therefore, the Visitors adopted a "hands off" policy which reinforced faculty autonomy and carried the tradition of largely unimpeded faculty governance into the nineteenth century.¹¹

Politically, the Revolution divested William and Mary of its representation in the legislature in the constitutional convention of 23 June 1776, and the disestablishment of the Anglican Church, re-established as the Protestant Episcopal Church, completed the process by making God generic and an American. But the aura of Anglicanism still hovered over the academic triangle at the west end of the Duke of Gloucester Street, so much so that
it would one day contribute to the college's loss of state precedence to the University of Virginia. William and Mary continued to be led by a largely Episcopalian faculty, and the students were still required to attend prayers. President James Madison was consecrated a bishop of the Episcopal Church in 1792, and in the same year the new statutes introduced a Doctor of Divinity degree.

By 1817 William and Mary’s finances had been improved by the sale of college lands and amounted to $156,916.63. After 1817, however, and until 1827, a kind of decline set in both in the quality of teaching and in the enrollment. While this decline was a result, in part, of Thomas Jefferson's shift in allegiance, in 1819, from William and Mary to the University of Virginia, it reflected a much greater transition in the life of the new state which would keep William and Mary a tidewater institution linked in values to a community which was no longer the focal point of Virginia’s development. This is the juncture, in the midst of national rivalries and pressures, which gave some "commonwealthmen" like Tucker and Dew the defensive need to fall back upon the traditions of their environment, justify them in new ways, and use them to rationalize a way of life they felt was threatened.12

William and Mary had been the focal point of Jefferson's educational plan for Virginia in 1779. Bill LXXX, which followed the more famous Bill for the General
Diffusion of Knowledge, would have transformed the college into a state university serving as the educational capstone for those "whom nature hath endowed with genius and virtue" and who would "guard the sacred deposit of the rights and liberties of their fellow citizens." The bill failed because the college, viewed as "an establishment purely of the Church of England," failed to meet the republican criteria of Presbyterians and members of other denominations in the legislature. Later, when the University of Virginia was chartered by the General Assembly in 1819, that Charlottesville institution had become Jefferson's dream and the object of his patronage. The reasons for Jefferson's change of mind and heart are not the focus, here, but the preference for a piedmont site as opposed to the tidewater site of Williamsburg reflected a shift in the economic, political, and cultural profile of Virginia which left William and Mary regionally isolated.¹³

The Virginia piedmont was, quite simply, different from the tidewater. Settlement in this area was begun at the end of the seventeenth century and fueled by the exodus of hundreds of thousands of Calvinistic Huguenots from France. About eight or nine hundred of these, including such families as Moncure, Munford, Taliaferro, and Flournoy, had settled just west of Richmond and intermarried with the English. Given such a strong Calvinistic base, the piedmont was most receptive to the Great Awakening. New Side
Presbyterian missionaries, for example, inspired an enormous response in Hanover county in 1743, and the first Separate Baptist Churches found communities of small farmers accepting of their austere lifestyle in the 1760s and 1770s. These were the people who would have found the Episcopalianism of William and Mary, before and after the Revolution, degenerate and repugnant.\textsuperscript{14}

Religious differences underscored more fundamental economic divergence. As early as the 1760s, a conversion had begun in the tobacco economy of the tidewater as a result of climate variables and soil debilitation. This conversion accelerated as the tension between the colonies and Great Britain increased. At the time of the war, the debt of Virginia planters to British merchants was estimated at two million pounds sterling. Tidewater planters began to envision tobacco as a symbol of debt, disgrace, and dependence on the mother country, while wheat became a "vehicle of personal liberation" and a symbol for republican virtues. By the 1820s, tobacco agriculture in the tidewater had given way to that of grain - wheat, rye, and others, which provided for local needs and a surplus for export as flour and whiskey.\textsuperscript{15}

The piedmont, in its turn, had become one of the two great areas (the other, Kentucky) of tobacco production. Less affluent planters, by the mid-eighteenth century, were producing the sot weed with little slave labor. They sold
it to Scottish factors of Glasgow firms having huge contracts with the French tobacco monopoly demanding "quantity, not quality". Thus, the yeoman farmer of the piedmont who had great difficulty accepting the Church of England and its American successor was not at all reluctant to rest his financial hopes on a symbol of disgrace.\textsuperscript{16}

Economic and religious differences resulted in striking dissimilarities between the piedmont and the tidewater (and, for that matter, between the tidewater and the valley and the transmontane area). These distinctions were readily apparent in the legislature, the most representative branch of government, the controlling factor in state matters, and a strong influence in national affairs. Representation in the Virginia legislature was based, geographically, on the county. Virginia, with 108 counties in 1819, had the largest number in the south. Counties of small size were generally in the east, the tidewater. The farther into the interior one looked, the larger the counties became as the process of dividing them had not been completed. Each county elected two representatives to the lower house. The significance of this becomes clear when one is aware that by 1820 the eastern counties had, on the average, smaller white populations than the western counties. The average tidewater county, for example, had less than two-thirds as many white residents as the average county in the rest of the state, but the tidewater had a great number of counties.
The center of power, therefore, lay in the eastern counties. Manhood suffrage, moreover, was not universal. Only a man who owned at least fifty acres of unimproved land or twenty-five with a house could vote, and he could vote in each county in which he had the requisite amount of land. Voting was oral and public. The imbalance in representation which resulted from this configuration was remedied somewhat by the Constitution of 1830, which gave the northern Piedmont greater representation, but a genuine adjustment in voting balance awaited the Constitution of 1850.17

The inauguration of the University of Virginia, which opened its doors in 1825, marked a victory for the piedmont over the tidewater and its college which was not accomplished without contest by William and Mary. The college, in the person of President Smith, made a strong bid to defeat Jefferson’s project for a state university in 1824. Smith asked the legislature for permission to move the institution to Richmond. The affect such a change might have had on the college is a matter only for conjecture, but the measure was defeated in the General Assembly through Jefferson’s influence and that of Joseph Cabell, his spokesman in the Assembly. All the professors, except James Semple, professor of law, approved such a move, and the Visitors, except for the Rector, John Tyler, would have given their support. Semple, Tyler, and many townspeople of Williamsburg could not countenance the loss of William and
Mary which, along with the Lunatic Asylum behind its iron fence on Francis Street, remained the town's only claim to any significance.\textsuperscript{18}

The 1824 regional defeat of William and Mary's aspirations to reunite college and capital was accentuated by several factors affecting the state of Virginia. Until 1820, Virginia had had the largest population in the union. In that year, it fell to second place, beginning a decline in national status which, by 1860, placed it fifth. The population decline was accompanied by an economic downturn while the north, as Lucien Minor, who would become professor of law at William and Mary in 1859, pointed out in a series of articles in the \textit{Southern Literary Messenger} in the early 1830s, had "very far the start of us Virginians in almost all the constituents of civilization ..."\textsuperscript{19}

The election of John Quincy Adams in 1824 piled another defeat on the Old Dominion, most specifically on the tidewater. It ended Virginia's semi-monopoly of the presidential office and etched more deeply the divisions within the Republican party, for all practical purposes, the only party in the country since 1812. This political realignment had been foreshadowed by the metamorphosis of the War Hawks of 1812 into the Young Republicans of 1816 with their national, as opposed to sectional, focus and their desire for internal improvements, a national bank, a protective tariff, in effect, a loose construction of the
constitution which implied for some the sacrifice of certain parts for the whole. This more egalitarian approach produced by westward expansion found empathy in western Virginia but ran afoul of the tidewater's Old Republicans like John Randolph and John Tyler, with their close ties to William and Mary, who firmly resisted what they perceived as a threat to state and/or sectional autonomy. By the 1830s this sectionalism within the state would increase with the Old Jeffersonians in the tidewater becoming Whigs and the western Virginians, Jacksonian Democrats.

No historian has, as yet, thoroughly explored the sectional impact on educational institutions, what they taught, how it was taught, and to whom. William and Mary's faculty, however, by the 1830s, was clearly not only tidewater but, like Williamsburg, resoundingly Whig. The students may well have followed suit. Of the 2068 students enrolled at William and Mary from 1801 to 1861, 1869 were Virginians. Further research might very well reveal that most of these came from east of the mountains. The second greatest number (58) came from North Carolina, and the third (28), from Maryland. The origin of the North Carolinian and Maryland families which sent their sons to the college might show that these families had migrated from, or had kinship ties in, the tidewater or lower piedmont. An argument might, therefore, be made that a tidewater, whig faculty taught a student body from an environment similar to that of
the college and the faculty. Only eleven students of the total, interestingly enough, came from north of the Mason-Dixon line.20

Whatever the results statistical research on the student body might yield, it is evident that the members of the Dew faculty "professed" for a receptive audience. He and his very able faculty inaugurated a "golden period for the college." Enrollment, which had begun to rise during the presidency of Dew's predecessor, another Reverend, Adam Empie from Schenectady, New York, increased to 140 in 1839, the largest in the institution's history. National events of the period which contributed to the insularity of the South may have had bearing on this, but it is apparent that at least Dew, himself, and Nathaniel Beverley Tucker, professor of law, were immensely appealing to the student body. The political, economic, and social ideology espoused and promoted in the academic forum supplied sanction for institutions and customs perceived as necessary to a reasonable lifestyle. Dew, Tucker, Browne and Saunders, in addition to serving on the faculty, were also products of William and Mary, and what they purveyed to their students came from a shared tidewater experience which included the college as part of the whole.21

If Dew, Tucker, Browne and Saunders, if only by example, taught values influenced by their environment, a critical question could be raised. Why did their ideology
differ so dramatically, or apparently so, from that of an earlier faculty represented by George Wythe and St. George Tucker, Nathaniel's father, who headed the law school from 1779-1804? Wythe and Tucker, senior, along with Jefferson, Washington, Madison, Mason and Henry had advocated emancipation, but only under certain conditions such as the removal of former slaves from the state. The anti-slavery sentiments which flourished in the liberal fervor of the early national period in Virginia quickly disintegrated in the light of subsequent events. St. George Tucker's Dissertation on Slavery (1796), which was presented to the General Assembly but never discussed, was lost in the shuffle of such subsequent occurrences and developments as Gabriel's conspiracy, the increase of the free black population, effected by the manumission law of 1782, from 3000 to 1780 to 30,000 in 1810, and the conflict over jobs between free blacks and poor whites in the tidewater and the piedmont. The Virginia Abolition Society seems to have disappeared after the Gabriel affair, and any anti-slavery sentiment appeared to be confined to pockets of evangelicalism in and west of the mountains. The apparent recurrence of emancipation sentiment in the late 1820s and early 1830s which culminated in the debates in the Virginia legislature in the January of 1832, the only time an ante-bellum southern legislature opened the subject to such scrutiny, was more a result of Nat Turner-inspired fear and
sectional resentment than of humanitarian instincts, instincts which few in the tidewater displayed.\textsuperscript{22}

The difference between the ideology of Dew, Tucker, and their colleagues and that of an earlier generation demonstrates that ideologies are linked with many tendrils to their environments. While revelling in notions that "all Men are naturally in .... a State of perfect Freedom to order their Actions", Jefferson for example, might have seriously considered the rightness of emancipation; when faced with his sober reality, however, he was more likely to conclude that "the blacks .... are inferior to the whites in the endowments both of body and mind.... This unfortunate difference of colour, and perhaps of faculty, is a powerful obstacle to the emancipation of these people." The Dew generation, especially after the polarization of north-south interests in the debates of the Missouri Compromise and the incendiary magnetism of Walker's Appeal, never felt the security even to entertain theoretically the possibility of emancipation.\textsuperscript{23}

The education William and Mary offered through the Dew faculty had the impressive sanction of a structural tradition going back, by way of Oxford, to the rise of northern universities and their model, the University of Paris, in the twelfth century. It reinforced and reflected the value system of its immediate discursive environment, the tidewater. The physical plant of the institution as
well as the three dimensional architecture and the landscape of its community symbolized the logic and relevance of those beliefs. The lifestyle, writings, and teaching of Dew and his colleagues, as will be demonstrated, clearly indicated their endorsement of this ideology and their reverence for its environmental base. They perceived correctly that the land - slave holding society in which the vested male enjoyed a high degree of personal autonomy was in crisis, a crisis produced by an all-embracing anti-slavery movement and what was rapidly becoming an antecedent of that movement, the changing role of women. The masters of William and Mary who viewed their decaying community from their blue room saw with limited vision a tidewater Virginia whose cause was already lost.24
CHAPTER 3
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CHAPTER 4
THE CURRICULUM

The education the faculty of William and Mary offered its students in the first one hundred and thirteen years of the college's existence reflected and, conversely, reinforced a unique combination of American wilderness, English, Scotch, French and tidewater values. In the first third of the nineteenth century, the elements in this combination solidified into a compound sharing some characteristics with other American institutions of higher learning but retaining a focus on a singular ideology, a set of doctrines, which framed an intellectual justification for regional "ideas of well-being". This was not necessarily the ideology of the gentry or of the yeoman farmer, although their patterns of thought were certainly influenced by it: it was the ideology of the intellectual.¹

In its origin, William and Mary shared with Harvard the impressive sanction of an educational tradition going back by way of Oxford and Cambridge to the rise of the northern European universities (with the University of Paris as their model) in the twelfth century. It was not initially, however, a university with the prescribed four formal faculties of liberal arts, philosophy, theology, and law.
There were only two universities in the English-speaking world from the thirteenth to the late eighteenth centuries, Oxford and Cambridge, and only these two could, by Parliamentary authority, award the Bachelor of Arts degree in England. Their charters of incorporation dating to 1571 and 1573, respectively, gave them a monopoly in England which was not broken until London University was founded in 1827. Such a monopoly, needless to say, presented a problem for higher education in the American colonies where it was usually not feasible for a young man to earn a degree from either of the English universities.²

The solution to the "degree" problem of colonial education lay in dulling the distinction between "college" and "university", one of the major "wilderness" influences on the transfer of the European system to America and one which, in some measure, impaired the value of an American education. The college system of the northern universities dated back to the establishment of a college in Paris by Robert de Sorbon in 1258. At first, the college was essentially an endowed dormitory providing room and board for needy students who had proved their worth. It became, as in the cases of Oxford and Cambridge, a place of residence and instruction without the power to give exams or grant degrees. Oxford and Cambridge, then, were essentially federations of colleges with charters of incorporation which, with few exceptions, could be legally awarded only by
the king or parliament. In the American colonies, however, it became expedient for the college to take on the authority and the function of awarding degrees. Harvard granted its first degree in 1642, although it had not been legally incorporated. (Harvard was never legally incorporated by the crown or Parliament. Its only charter came from the Massachusetts General Court in 1650. This situation lends credibility to William and Mary's claim to be the first institution of higher education legally established in America.) William and Mary awarded its first degree in 1772. Before the Revolution, at least nine colonial institutions were granting degrees while there were still only two degree-granting institutions in England.

William and Mary was a prime example of the second major colonial influence on the European system, and that was the close identification of American colleges with their local communities. The medieval clerical background of European universities and colleges had left them with the custom of academic self-government which even the leveling influence of Protestantism had failed to shake. In the American colonies, as in the case of William and Mary, colleges were founded by communities to meet their needs, simply because there were no such institutions already in existence. Lay boards drawn from the surrounding community oversaw or actually controlled the college and its resources, making it especially responsive or reactive to
community pressure. William and Mary, Harvard, and Yale, the only colleges in the colonies until 1745, were integrally related to the established church in their respective colonies, which cemented the affiliation with the community.4

The third major effect of the colonial experience on the European university and college system related to the institutional mission. In Europe, universities and colleges were concerned not only with the dissemination of knowledge but also with its preservation and advancement. American institutions by the nature of their environment were primarily concerned with only the dissemination of knowledge. It was, first, extremely difficult or impossible for academics to do the kind of research necessary for the advancement of knowledge; second, there was no bank of primary sources in the wilderness deemed fit to preserve or study; third, colleges were compelled to meet the need of communities for doctors, lawyers, ministers, and teachers, the professionals not abundant in colonial society.5

Although its Charter legally protected a good portion of faculty governance, William and Mary was certainly from its origins a community project, responsive through its Board of visitors, to community opinion. This was evident in the conflict over the move to Richmond as well as in a number of earlier events and policies. Its original purpose, again, as specified in the Charter was to furnish
the "Church of Virginia" with ministers, to serve as a civilizing influence on the "Western Indians" and to provide training in "good letters and manners" for Virginia youth. Originally, this youth was to be offered philosophy, theology, languages, and "other good Arts and Sciences" as a curriculum. That curriculum would change in significant ways after the Revolution, but it continued, from the genesis of the college through Thomas Dew's tenure as president, to reflect and reinforce what its community considered to be the values which gave meaning to life. The material taught was considered worthy of transferal from generation to generation as part of a specific social group's cultural heritage.

The first curriculum for William and Mary was written by the Reverend James Blair and his supporter in the colonies, the Reverend Stephen Fouace. The Blair-Fouace syllabus intended to cover the grammar school and the college, both its Philosophy School and its Divinity School. In twentieth century parlance, this would be the equivalent of secondary, undergraduate, and graduate education. The grammar school is not of concern, here, but the course of study prescribed for the Philosophy and Divinity Schools revealed its English origins in addition to a surprising innovation which admirably complemented and reinforced local values.
The core of the young William and Mary was the philosophy school. According to the Blair-Fouace syllabus, the curriculum followed British example in providing that the professor of moral philosophy should teach rhetoric, logic, and ethics, which dealt with the rights and duties of the state, while the professor of natural philosophy and math would teach physics, metaphysics, and mathematics. Probably the Westminster Catechism and a little sacred and secular history in the form of politics was also taught. One professor of the Divinity School would teach Hebrew and the Old and New Testaments, while the other would cover theology and heresies.

Thus far, the syllabus was a reasonable copy of the English system, but it made a significant break with that curriculum which would have enormous impact not only on the course of Virginian political ideology but also, initially at the very least, on that of the nation. The Blair-Fouace syllabus instructed the professor of Moral Philosophy not to focus solely on Aristotle but to present modern work such as that "derived from Newton and Locke". This was an astounding prescription and a marked departure from the British system. Locke was considered too original by the conservative clergymen at Christ Church, Oxford, but it was not they but the crown which removed him from his Studentship in 1684. A half generation later, his works were still not recognized by that institution. At William
and Mary, however, from "1729 onwards, Locke was the recognized and respectable apostle of light." Whether the reason for Locke's inclusion lay in an already developed Tidewater empathy with his ideas or in the friendship Blair established with him, as a member of the Board of Trade, during his London sojourn of 1697, or in a combination of the two is impossible to determine. What is apparent is the influence Locke's ideas exerted over certain American patterns of political thought. In the Tidewater, the principles that the "chief end" of "Civil Society" was the "preservation of Property", that the "Legislative is not only the supreme power of the Common-wealth, but sacred and unalterable in the hands where the Community have once placed it", that the government "must not raise Taxes on the Property of the People, without the consent of the People", and that whenever the Legislative power breaks its trust and attempts to exert absolute power "they forfeit the Power, the People had put into their hands .... and ... the People .... have a Right to resume their original Liberty" became integral components in the value system which outlived the Revolution.

A few years before the Revolution, a roster of William and Mary students would have included Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Harrison, Carter Braxton, Thomas Welson and George Wythe, all signers of the very Lockian Declaration of Independence. So Lockian was the Declaration that Richard
Henry Lee "charged" Jefferson, its primary author, with having copied it from Locke. The list continues with Peyton Randolph, first president of the Continental Congress, John Tyler, first governor of Virginia, Edmund Randolph, Attorney-General and Secretary of State, Beverly Randolph, governor of Virginia, John Mercer, governor of Maryland, James Innes, attorney-general of Virginia, James Monroe, President of the United States, John Blair, associate justice of the United States Supreme Court, and John Marshall, Chief Justice of the United States. There is little or no evidence that all of these gentlemen, with notable exceptions, were staunch followers of John Locke. It is reasonable to assume, however, that Locke figured prominently in their formal education and that, in some way formal education does influence its students.²

The Blair-Fouace syllabus, with the ordinary number of successes and failures, was in effect until 1779. In that year significant changes were made. Thomas Jefferson related the course of events:

On the 1st of June, 1779, I was appointed Governor of the Commonwealth, and retired from the legislature. Being elected, also, one of the Visitors of William and Mary college, a self-electing body, I effected .... a change in the organization of that institution, by abolishing the Grammar school, and the two professorships of Divinity and Oriental languages, and substituting a professorship of Law and Police, one of Anatomy, Medicine and Chemistry, and one of Modern languages; and the charter confining us to six professorships, we added the Law of Nature and Nations, and the Fine Arts to the duties of the Moral Professor, and Natural History to those of the professor of Mathematics and Natural Philosophy.³
Jefferson's grandiose expectations of the number of subjects one individual could teach notwithstanding, the new curriculum seemed to respond to the needs of a society soon to be independent politically but still colonial, culturally. It did not make the college a university in the classical sense, as Lyon Tyler supposes, but it did bring to the faculty such noteworthy teachers as George Wythe in law and James McClurg in anatomy and medicine as well as the ebullient Charles Bellini in modern languages.

Unfortunately, McClurg moved to Richmond in 1783, and the medical school was discontinued. The loss may not have been as acute as it might seem, for McClurg, although he attended faculty meetings regularly, never set up a course of lectures, and no evidence suggests any lectures were ever held. After McClurg's departure, two separate professorships of Humanity (mathematics and natural philosophy) were instituted in place of Medicine (anatomy, medicine, and chemistry, and all were in operation in 1800. Modern languages suffered a similar, if not terminal, fate; the course was discontinued on the death of Bellini's successor, Louis H. Girardin, in 1805, not to be reinstated until 1829. The school of law, however, functioned vigorously, first, under Wythe and, later, under his successor, St. George Tucker.11

After Jefferson's proposal, the Visitors decided that the curriculum and the method of teaching each subject would
be supervised by a committee of the president, the professor, and six Visitors. This process is somewhat at variance with the one Lyon Tyler describes as that used to determine the books to be used in humanities and universal history courses which became part of the college offerings in 1819. In that year, the Visitors passed an order to establish a chair of history and humanity, and a Mr. Reuel Keith was retained for that position. The books to be used, according to Tyler, were determined by the "faculty". Whether course content was regulated by a committee or the faculty or even Thomas Jefferson, himself, the circumscriptions on academic freedom would seem intolerable to faculties of the late twentieth century. The Dew faculty, later, will seem to have fewer restrictions on course content, but given the pattern of community interference it was not unusual for locals serving in an administrative capacity to demonstrate their intellectual prowess or pretension by assuming a level of authority over academic matters.12

By 1792, according to the statutes of that year, the degrees offered by the college were: Doctor of Law, Doctor of Divinity, Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Law, and Master of Arts. While such degrees were more a proclamation of pretensions than of actualities, William and Mary lacking the faculty as well as the facilities for the accomplishment of the higher degrees, they did reflect sound intentions at
least for undergraduate learning. The Bachelor of Arts
degree, for example, required that a student must have
knowledge of Conic sections, the first six books of Euclid,
plain trigonometry, heights and distances, surveying,
algebra, the eleventh and twelfth books of Euclid; in
Natural Philosophy, general principles of matter, mechanics,
electricity, pneumatics, hydrostatics, optics, astronomy; in
the Humanities, logic, the belles lettres, rhetoric, natural
law, laws of nations, general principles of politics,
geography, ancient and modern languages. All of the
foregoing plus knowledge of civil history (ancient and
modern) and municipal law and police were necessary for a
Bachelor of Law.¹³

Some texts used in these courses of study were Smith’s
Wealth of Nations, Montesquieu’s Spirit of the Laws, the
"sacred trinity" of Locke, Rousseau, and Paine, Godwin’s
Enquiry Concerning Political Justice (1793), William Paley’s
Principle of Moral and Political Philosophy (1785), and the
"Common sense" works of William Duncan, Thomas Reid, and
Dugald Steward figure prominently on Smith’s listing.
Titles and authors, alone, do not indicate the impact the
study of such works might have on students. It is
impossible, moreover, to assess the extent of the impact or
whether it was negative, positive, or a combination of both
characteristics. That students were exposed to the works is
the only influence one can determine, in most cases. Four
of those students, however, would later serve on the Dew faculty -- Beverley Tucker (1801), Dabney Brown (1810), Robert Saunders (1823), and Thomas Dew, himself, (1820). Two of them, Tucker and Dew, would give written testimony to such influence in their personal belief systems and would, in turn, use it to shore up the values of their environment.  

The ideas presented in the texts of the early nineteenth century were essentially Aristotelian in their nature. They upheld the direct connection between objects of the real world and their perception, the credibility of the senses in transferring knowledge of objects to the mind, and the validity of such sense-obtained, or empirical, knowledge. Even though occasional encouragement of aspirations toward perfectibility, a kind of Platonic ideal, is sometimes apparent, as in the thought of Godwin, for example, the values presented in curriculum reading were rooted in the real world, attainable though the free and rational pursuit of self-interest, and applicable toward the greater good of the community as a whole. They underscored the Aristotelian bent with a construct of reason as the most significant human faculty, natural laws as the proper object of reason’s investigations, and progress, or prosperity, as the natural result of rational application of natural law to human institutions.
The English and the Scotch contributed a heady dose of principles abstracted from the real world to guide the embryonic scholar of William and Mary. To the aforementioned late seventeenth century work of John Locke was added the thought of the Scottish Common Sense philosophers. The common sense philosophy was Aristotelian in its focus on empirical knowledge, heavily influenced by Lockian epistemology, and a reflection of the Enlightenment's emphasis on the wisdom to be gained from the rational observation of the natural world. Its high priests were Thomas Reid, a Presbyterian clergyman who held the chair of moral philosophy at Glasgow and Aberdeen, and his friend and biographer, Dugald Stewart. Their value system was brought to America by John Witherspoon of Princeton (Presbyterian) when he landed in Philadelphia in 1768 and became the basis of standard curricula in American colleges through the first half of the nineteenth century. In its rudiments, the common sense philosophy was fairly simple. It held that men could rationally know the objects of the real world and not merely ideas of them (as the Kantian idealists or transcendentalists proposed), through their senses. Men, in other words, can see "what is" and need not doubt appearances. Mistakes can be made, but these are based on failures in perception not in understanding, failures caused by original sin which could be overcome by divine grace and education. The key components of this
doctrines are quickly apparent: reason, nature, the senses, certainty. By extension, "common sense" outlined an Aristotelian ethical system (Nicomachean Ethics) based on the pain/pleasure principle and an economic system of *laissez-faire*.

Adam Smith was not, strictly speaking, a "common sense" economist, but he clearly had an association with the school. His academic career began in 1751 at Glasgow, and an account of his life and writings was composed by Dugald Stewart to be read before the Royal Society of Edinburgh in 1793. The subject of political economy, eventually taught by Thomas Dew, was partly defined by Smith. He considered it a science designed to study the "nature and causes of the wealth of nations." Its purpose was "to enable [people] to provide such [plentiful] a revenue or subsistence for themselves; and secondly, to supply the state or commonwealth with revenue sufficient for the public services."

Political economy became enormously popular in the 1820s in American institutions of higher learning, just as the nation's economy was beginning a major shift from agriculture to manufacturing. It was only a matter of time before the young political economists -- men like Hezekiah Niles, Thomas Cooper of South Carolina College, and, of course, Dew, who instituted the course at William and Mary in 1826 -- expanded their theories on markets, distribution
and population to include an assessment of the value of slavery as a social, political, and economic institution. The results of these assessments were by no means uniform or relegated solely to the south. In 1827, for example, the Prize Essay, on the Comparative Economy of Free and Slave Labour by James Raymond of Connecticut proposed that free labor was cheaper than slave but that the American people were not yet ready to entertain a transition. One year later, however, the colorful Zephaniah Kingsley of Florida published a pamphlet, A Treatise on the Patriarchal, of Cooperative System of Slavery, which supported slavery as the best type of labor but asserted that blacks, slave or free, were in many ways superior to lower class whites and free blacks should be given property and the chance to join free society.

Dew's utilization of the methods of political economy and his perception of the investigative results so obtained will be dealt with in a later chapter, but the influence of Smith is an important key to comprehension of the values Dew's work represented. Of the two systems of political economy, agricultural and commercial, Smith saw commerce as the "modern" one. His views of the agricultural system, however, clearly reinforced Tidewater values. He emphasizes that "to cultivate the ground was the original destination of man" who, given the same return, would choose "to employ their capitals rather in the improvement and cultivation of
land, than ... in manufactures." His comparison between the "slow progress of those European countries of which the wealth depend very much upon their commerce and manufactures" and the "rapid advances of our North American colonies, of which the wealth is founded altogether in agriculture", his insistence that the regulation of trade in favor of domestic monopolies benefitting "merchants and manufacturers" was "useless or ... hurtful", and his designation of the work of the French Economists as "ingenious" could not have been lost on a "landed" mentality. Most significant of all Smith's nostrums, however, and the one which undoubtedly wielded the greatest impact on his readers was his explicit and implicit reiteration that the "natural effort of every individual to better his own condition, when suffered to exert itself with freedom and security, is so powerful a principle, that it is alone, and without any assistance, not only capable of carrying on the society to wealth and prosperity, but of surmounting a hundred impertinent obstructions with which the folly of human laws too often incumbers its operations...." His belief in what amounts to the pursuit of self-interest and its effect on society supplies critical ideological underpinning to the thesis that the "self-interest of slaveowners would not permit general emancipation." A dozen pro-slavery arguments notwithstanding, the greatest defense of slavery or, for
that matter, the entire economic construct of an agricultural South was the conviction that the pursuit of self-interest was the key to prosperity not only for the individual but for the community *in toto*. The role of government in this scheme was essentially passive and consisted in "protecting the society from violence," "protecting ....every member...from the injustice and oppression of every other member", and "erecting and maintaining certain public works."18

Like Smith, Thomas Paine asserted the significance of self-interest. In exhorting Americans to support the Revolution, Paine pointed out that "the line of our interest becomes the line of our happiness; when all that can cheer and animate the heart, when a sense of honor, fame, character....are interwoven not only with the security but the increase of property, there exists not a man in America....who does not see that his good...." Later, in the *Rights of Man*, he conjured up the spirit of Enlightenment progressivism in claiming that the "most effectual process is that of improving the condition of man by means of his interest...." Unlike Smith, however, Paine viewed commerce as the center of his economic system and industry as the least valuable economic pursuit because it changed so quickly depending on markets, politics, and fashion. While the "government" Paine envisions is somewhat less passive than that of Smith, it offers no hindrance to
free trade and has as its object the protection of every man's right to "pursue his occupation, and to enjoy the fruits of his labors and the produce of his property in peace and safety, with the least possible expense."^®

So much for a generous dose of eighteenth century rationalist ideology from the English and the Scotch. The French appear a little less pragmatic, a little more abstract, in the speculative sense. Montesquieu's theories regarding the impact of environment (geography and climate) on legal institutions and the corollary that laws "should be in relation to the climate .... to the quality of ... soil", his emphasis on the avoidance of tyranny by a strict separation of powers, and his belief in the inability of the common people to govern suggest, if considered within the context of their time, provocative ramifications. For Montesquieu, the "spirit" of the laws was not the wording or the execution of the laws but the "principle" or the moral impulse formed by environment which conditioned them. For him, in addition, separation of powers was a reflection of the Newtonian natural law that every force is met by a counterforce, hence, keeping the entire system in balance. Local legislation, therefore, was a direct reflection of natural local spirit, part of a Newtonian, creative (but not providential) God's great plan for the universe. Local legislation must be kept in balance with that of other localities within a confederation; otherwise the entire
system would lose its center and spin out of control into the void. Rousseau, who postulated a social as opposed to a political contract of government, added his always ambiguous doctrines to the intellectual compound. For him, a society agreed to be ruled by the "general will" representing what was best for all, bearing in mind that constructing a general will ideology was the work of everyone and the transmission of that will into law was not properly the work of representatives ("They are only agents") but of the people "in person".\textsuperscript{20}

It would be virtually impossible to determine the extent of the impact on education in such ideas as the above might have had on the students of William and Mary. Some students comprehend little of what they are taught; others comprehend but within the context of personal bias. It is the rare student who comprehends objectively and retains what he rationally considers valid in his own life. There are exceptions, however, to this generalization. It is not impossible to determine something of education's impact on Beverly Tucker and Thomas Dew, for example. Their published lectures, as will be shown, are the key to at least part of this retention. For the average it may be sufficient to say that they were exposed to an amalgam of concepts in which landed property, personal autonomy, the gratification of self-interest, \textit{laissez-faire} government, the right of revolution, the excellence of an agricultural economy, and
the particular validity of local legislation were prominent features. It requires no great leap of faith to perceive these conceptual features as a reaffirmation of their physical, social, economic and political environment, a reaffirmation of significant components of the Tidewater mentalité.

For the degree of "Batchelor" of Law at William and Mary, it was necessary to have the requisites for "Batchelor" of Arts, which would necessarily presuppose some acquaintance with the ideology summarized above, as well as knowledge of a law bibliography, introduced by George Wythe, including Blackstone's *Commentaries*, Matthew Bacon's *Abridgement of the Law*, *Acts of the Assembly now in force in the Colony of Virginia*, Coke upon Littleton, Sidney's *Discourses*, and Beccaria's *Crime and Punishment*. The contribution of these works must be considered within the context of legal training not only in Virginia but in the United States as a whole.\(^{21}\)

The subject of law had been introduced into the curriculum of British universities as recently as 1747 when Oxford invited one of its dons (William Blackstone) to give a series of lectures on English law. William and Mary was the first American institution (and the second in the English-speaking world) to follow suit. In Virginia as in other, first, colonies and, later, states most men studied law by "reading" texts in an attorney's office or in a
private school such as that of Judge Tapping Reeve in Litchfield, Connecticut. By the 1830s, however, there was a growing number of law schools (Harvard 1817, Columbia 1823, Yale 1824) and a growing emphasis on rigorous training in law as a science. These tendencies paralleled, unfortunately, a movement designed to counter negative criticism of law as an elitist profession. This movement attempted to confine legal training to the occupational skill, itself, circumscribing the broader humanistic education once thought sine quo non of the profession. The objective of the new training was to find common principles in state legal codes which would make for a consistent and uniform national law. Oddities or discrepancies in state laws were seen as aberrations in the evolution of a national pattern. (It could be conjectured that this objective, taken to the extreme, would contradict Montesquieu's postulate of an environment-based legal code.) During Beverly Tucker's tenure as professor of law at William and Mary, this national tendency was countered by his emphasis on Virginia state statutes to the actual avoidance of any reliance on national law. Supplementing this parochialism with Blackstone's conception of property as an absolute right and criterion for liberty, a viewpoint quintessential to the liberalism of his day, Tucker presented to his students an ideology of jurisprudence supporting the values for which the landmarks of their surroundings and the
activities of their daily lives stood as constant reminders.\textsuperscript{22}

The above summary, with minor exceptions, of the text-based ideology taught at William and Mary for almost a century and a half before the Dew faculty evidences a pattern of mutually reinforcing concepts and attitudes coming straight out of the late seventeenth and the eighteenth centuries from Britain and France. This pattern was supported by the visual metaphor provided in the surrounding landmarks and activities and offered wholesale as an intellectual justification for the meaningful components of life. A prominent institutional component, however, has not yet been addressed -- the institution of slavery.

It is a simple and verifiable observation that southerners, at least those with political power, considered slavery a viable and economically contributory institution. Some would have altered it, restricted it, expanded it, provided for its eventual elimination or in myriad other ways sought its transformation. Not one southern state (of the Confederate eleven or the border states), with the possible exception of Virginia in 1831, ever seriously entertained the prospect of abolishing it. Slaveowners, in particular, who constituted only about thirty percent of the population on the eve of the Civil War, all anti slavery rhetoric aside, stand indicted for their self-seeking
egotism, if not for greater moral offenses. The glaring truth remains that the "self-interest of slaveowners would not permit general emancipation."\(^{21}\)

Intellectual justification for slavery was most often tacit in the William and Mary curriculum, and, at times, anti-slavery doctrine seemed more genuinely acceptable. That is, until the advent of the Dew faculty or, more precisely, Dew, himself, as a member of the faculty. It would have been extremely difficult to employ the doctrine of Adam Smith on behalf of slavery. Smith pointed out in a remarkably cogent argument that "if great improvements are seldom to be expected from great proprietors, they are least of all to be expected when they employ slaves for their workmen. The experience of all ages and nations .... demonstrates that the work done by slaves, though it appears to cost only their maintenance, is in the end the dearest of any. A person who can acquire no property, can have no other interest but to eat as much, and to labour as little as possible. Whatever work he does beyond what is sufficient to purchase his own maintenance, can be squeezed out of him by violence only, and not by any interest of his own."\(^{24}\)

Unlike Smith, John Locke appears more than a little ambiguous in his position on slavery. Theoretically, for him, slavery is opposed to natural law. Property is defined as men's "Lives, Liberties and Estates." The expansion of
this tenet concedes that "every Man has a Property in his own Person. This no Body has any Right to but himself. The Labour of his Body, and the Work of his Hands .... are properly his." Locke continues, "God hath not left one Man so to the Mercy of another, that he may starve him if he please: God .... has given no one of his children such a Property...." Any attempt to enslave may have unfortunate repercussions. "And hence it is, that he who attempts to get another Man into his Absolute Power, does thereby put himself into a State of War with him; It being ... understood as a Declaration of a design upon his Life .... for no body can desire to have me in his Absolute Power, unless it be to compel me by force to that, which is against the Right of my Freedom, i.e., make me a Slave."25

Locke's lofty disclaimers of slavery fly in the face of a section from the First Treatise in which he is discussing the question of who should have rightful power in the world and the source of that power. Here, illustrating his postulate with a reference to a West Indies planter who exercised power over his "Servants" as an inheritance of God's ordinance originally entrusted to the Biblical Adam, Locke claims that the power of the master was "only from his purchase; and the getting a Dominion over any thing by Bargain and Money, is a new way of proving one had it by Descent and Inheritance." Now Locke, it should be remembered, was secretary to the proprietors of Carolina,
settled in this period from the West Indies, and also secretary to Shaftesbury's Board of Trade and Plantations. He presents his colonial planter in the mode of the Biblical patriarch with his "family formed on the basis of mutual obligation and service", a presentation not lost on the pro-slavery advocates such as Richard Nisbet of the eighteenth century and Bishop John Henry Hopkins of the nineteenth. He was, in other words, viewing slavery as an economic and a social institution. When he regarded it as a political institution affecting Englishmen, however, Locke's position was quite different. He was unalterably opposed to that variety, especially the kind espoused by his antagonist, Sir Robert Filmer, who supposed that men were not born free and could not have the liberty to choose a form of government. This kind of slavery was "so vile and miserable an Estate of Man .... that 'tis hardly to be conceived, that an Englishman, much less a Gentleman, should plead for't." All men were naturally in a "State of perfect Freedom to order their actions and dispose of their Possessions, and Persons as they think fit ...." Given his position in time and space, Locke was primarily concerned with the English gentleman, he who, so to speak, had the most to lose in the way of personal autonomy and material possessions. The West Indian or the Carolinian slave, on the other hand, had only his heathen fate in a Christian hell and a loosely communal
view of landed property to lose and much in the way of western civilizing characteristics to gain.\textsuperscript{26}

Slavery holds the distinction of being the first institution addressed in a publication by Thomas Paine after he came to America. He not only condemns it for Christian and/or reasonable (sometimes these descriptive terms are mutually exclusive for Paine) men but asks Americans to "consider" how they might complain of "attempts to enslave them, while they hold so many hundreds of thousands in slavery." Paine goes beyond a mere condemnation of the practice; he also suggests a plan for dealing with freed slaves. How much exposure \textit{African Slavery in America} enjoyed on the campus of William and Mary is almost impossible to determine. After the Revolutionary period, doubtless, it received virtually none.\textsuperscript{27}

The Revolutionary era, however, did engender a certain amount of anti-slavery sentiment at the College of William and Mary. The most notable exponent of the sentiment was probably Tucker's foster father, St. George Tucker, the personification of the well-rounded eighteenth century man of letters, who was graduated from the college in 1772 and, later, returned there (1790) as professor of law. Although Tucker was, himself, a slave owner, he published in 1796 \textit{A Dissertation on Slavery with a Proposal for the Gradual Abolition of it in the State of Virginia}. In his publication, Tucker proposed to "demonstrate that
incompatibility of a state of slavery with the principles of our government, and of that revolution upon which it is founded, and to elucidate the practicability of its total, though gradual, abolition." Borrowing liberally from the Spirit of the Laws, he offers proof that slavery was both unnatural and unreasonable. Though Tucker's admirable opinions may have been largely a result of Revolutionary fervor and would be betrayed by his foster son in following years, they were fundamentally inimical to slavery and in a different climate of opinion might very well have inspired a negative and heated response.28

This William and Mary curriculum seemed not entirely devoid of anti-slavery thought, at least in the years before the War of 1812. It did not, moreover, rest exclusively on the principles of a pro-slavery position. It did, however, obviously and without ambiguity present an extensive and credible, reasoned argument weighted on behalf of freedom as opposed to equality, the pursuit of self-interest, the importance of property in the various definitions of the term, and the admirable characteristics of a capitalistic (Genovese notwithstanding) agricultural economy. It would be surprising if this emphasis were lost on the youthful minds of William and Mary's student body, especially since most members of that body came from environments at least implicitly stressing those same characteristics.
The reading content of the college’s curriculum along with the ideas expressed and noted in lectures of the Dew faculty, visually augmented by the metaphorical landmarks of college and community, established a living context for students which, if not virtually closed, was severely circumscribed. Students found in higher education part of the intellectual sanction for the meaning of the life into which they had been born. There was, indeed, a close relationship between this idea-structure and the social value structure based, in turn, on an economic system considered meaningful for all. The few questions raised or suggested by the reading curriculum might enjoy a brief vogue during periods of crisis -- the Revolution, for example -- but liberal ideas, while they might "cause Americans to pause and consider the implications of their practice of slavery", "were not sufficient to rid" Virginians or the inhabitants of certain other new states of slavery. A society’s doubts could be explained away or simply ignored under conditions of relative normalcy or those which appeared to threaten or actually did threaten the regional value network. The rational and empirical metaphysical overtones of the William and Mary curriculum offered those societies the "certainty and stability" they craved.29
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Eugene Genovese has characterized the slave south as a precapitalist society in which slave ownership was the basis of power and status (hegemony). This opinion has been challenged by other historians, notably James Oakes in The Ruling Race who claimed that slaveholders were entrepreneurs in a capitalist economy with a materialistic ethic; Both Tucker’s and Dew’s lectures were published and are used in the following chapters; The term, "meaningful", is, again, used in Rhys Isaac’s sense as explained in chapter 1; "liberal" is used here to designate the ideas formally
expressed in Locke, Paine, etc.; The entire quotation read, "...preoccupation of students with rationalist and empiricist metaphysics and with the foundations of knowledge was expressive of a society anxious to acquire ... certainty and stability ...." N.T. Phillipson in an essay on the Scotish Enlightenment in Lawrence Stone, ed., The University in Society, Vol. II (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1974), 429.
CHAPTER 5

THE FACULTY: THOMAS DEW

The William and Mary faculty of which Thomas Dew was a member and over which he presided as president from 1836 to 1846 numbered six men including Dew, himself. Although by 1839 Harvard had twenty-one professors and Yale, sixteen, five teachers was a small but fairly representative faculty for most American colleges of any size. This faculty, by 1840, mentored a student body at an all time high of 140, a figure not exceeded by William and Mary until 1889 and one which characterized the school as having an above average enrollment for American institutions.¹

The limited faculty size of William and Mary for this period allows for the kind of investigation which has not been done before in an extended way. This dissertation explores the value systems of the Dew faculty, how they were acquired through experience, and how they were reflected in writing, teaching, and the actions of living. The preceding four chapters dealt with the tidewater, Williamsburg, and the college, the environmental context within which all six men lived and taught and four were, in addition, raised and educated. Chapter V calls upon the characters in this small drama to enter the stage and act out their perceptions of
what was meaningful in their lives. What they reveal could
enhance understanding of the relationship between experience
and ideology and stimulate new historical studies of
education's impact on a study body.

The kind of investigation described above will never
yield perfect certitude. Too much is simply not known.
Enough is known of the material and social reality within
which the Dew faculty existed, however, to gain some
understanding of its pervading influence which had its
seductive elements even for those not raised within its
boundaries. Would the personal ownership of a piece of
domestic architecture from the Enlightenment located in a
grid designed community with landmarks symbolizing a
tradition of power and prosperity affect an individual’s
values? Would a daily experience with personally owned
antique oak furnishings, ancestral portraits and the service
of hot whiskey punch in silver cups by a slave predispose
one to conclude that slavery was the necessary basis of all
worthwhile southern institutions? The answer to both
questions would have to be "not necessarily". Human beings
are not necessarily determined by their environments. Or,
are they? Would the daily exercise of power over family,
slaves, students, and community affairs tend to seduce one
into an almost impregnable self-righteousness? Again, not
necessarily. But, if it is known that certain individuals
within these contextual frameworks held such attitudes, it
is reasonable to assume that the attitudes were a positive, behavioral response to the environment which was presented to them for acceptance or rejection. Experience does account for a position, a stance taken by one who finds the experience either pleasant and beneficial to self-interest or unpleasant and destructive. If the experience prove unpleasant, its value-position will be rejected. But, if it prove pleasant, it reinforces the attitude that it is valuable. To a man, the Dew faculty demonstrated that their tidewater experience of Williamsburg and its college had value.

Analyzing the written remains of an historical figure for the ideas reflected therein requires one process. Analyzing what Fernand Braudel would call the "shadowy zone", the "elementary basic activity which went on everywhere", for the impact it had on ideology is another. It is "a long journey backwards" to the Williamsburg of the early nineteenth century, and it is a journey which can be only imperfectly made. "There are simply too many things to say. How shall I begin?"  

When Thomas Dew assumed the presidency of William and Mary in the summer of 1836, he inherited from his predecessor, Adam Empie, a roster of problems remarkably similar to those of late twentieth century college presidents - expenditures in excess of income, buildings in need of repair, faculty salary inequities, and equipment
deficiencies. He was apparently fortunate, however, in what was assessed as faculty of considerable quality and a growing student enrollment. The faculty consisted of Nathaniel Beverley Tucker, professor of law, John Millington, professor of chemistry, Robert Saunders, professor of mathematics, Dabney Browne, professor of humanity, and Dew, himself, professor of history and political economy. In 1842, the position of professor of humanity, vacated in 1841 upon Dabney Browne’s unlamented departure, was filled by Charles Frederick Ernest Minnegerode. Of these six men, four were born and raised in the tidewater - Dew, Tucker, Saunders, Browne. All four were, in addition, graduates of William and Mary. John Millington, an Englishman, was at one time an Oxford student, had taken a law degree in the Temple, and had studied medicine under the famous Sir Astley Cooper in London. Minnegerode was a German national from the University of Giessen. These are the men who supposedly effected something of a renaissance at William and Mary, a "golden period for the college" which raised enrollment to an all-time high and brought public attention to the small school in the quiet town once the hub of Virginia’s political life.1

Whether the Dew presidency was so "golden" will be seen, but state and national events provided it with a context which would have made almost any presidency of at
least minimal challenge and interest. The activism of the American Anti-slavery Society, the bank war, the controversy over the admission of Texas - all provided, before even the decade of the 1830s had expired, a setting in which Dew and Tucker, explicitly, Millington, Browne, and Saunders, implicitly acted out their ideologies. Minnegerode, with the exception of a major contribution to the traditions of an American Christmas in 1842, had to await a more public role until he became rector of St. Paul's church in Richmond and, incidentally, Jefferson Davis' pastor during the years of the confederacy. The attitudes these men displayed in their historical remains showed their lives to be reflections of their cognitive experiences as heirs and/or willing subscribers to a tidewater value system based on landholding, the production of a staple crop, and slavery. They perceived this agricultural base as necessary to a meaningful life in which class distinction, socially, and personal and state autonomy, politically, took precedence. For them, freedom and inequality were the key factors in that meaningful life, and it was made even more precious by the awareness that it was beleaguered on all sides - by the federal government, by Virginians west of the mountains, by the antislavery movement, by a failed tobacco economy, by fate, itself, which had removed the capitol to Richmond, and by the icon of ambivalent liberalism himself, Thomas Jefferson, who, within recent memory of most faculty
members, had betrayed his *alma mater* and set up a rival institution in the foothills of those same mountains which had come to symbolize a political threat to the aspirations of eastern Virginians.⁴

Nothing is so keenly felt as an attack upon an ideology, particularly an ideology so integrally related to what was once a viable and prosperous mercantile economy which, by the 1830s was in visible decline. Land used for tobacco had been exhausted in Virginia, and thousands of young men were leaving to farm farther south or in the west. Avery Craven in his *Soil Exhaustion as a Factor in the Agricultural History of Virginia and Maryland* dealt with this subject in 1926, while more recent studies by Thomas Breen and Allan Kulikoff point out that tidewater planters were already concerned about the effect of tobacco on the soil just before the Revolution, and some, like George Washington, were beginning to cultivate wheat. In the 1820s, 1830s, and 1840s, the land east of the mountains was described in period accounts as mutilated and devastated by agriculture, "riddled with gullies" and filled with "wasted fields" and "abandoned houses". The William and Mary faculty, especially those with family roots in the tidewater, were poignantly aware of this transformation. They were also aware of the literary efforts of Edmund Ruffin, Thomas Marshall, Hill Carter, and others to encourage rejuvenation of the soil by the use of marl, the
cultivation of wheat and alfalfa, and the construction of dikes and drains. They shared the alarm at the population migration to the southwest which intensified in the decade of the 1830s when "tens of thousands of white men" left. Beverly Tucker had participated in this migration but returned to the land of his fathers, an experience which gave him an unusual perspective on the process. They experienced the panic of 1837, originating in the failure of three English banking houses but intensified by speculation with government funds of Jackson’s "pet banks", which ended the western land boom and the risk-taking in land and slaves, two of its characteristic features.5

The panic of 1837 which so adversely affected the prosperity of the southwest did not affect Virginia in the same way. The southeast had not enjoyed the prosperity of the southwest and, consequently, did not suffer from the decline of that prosperity. The prayers of Virginia conservatives, like James Mercer Garnett, who had decried the flow of manpower out of the state were answered, and practical reasons offered incentive for youths to remain at home and improve what they had. The depression continued into the early 1840s, and migration decreased.6

Eastern Virginia’s economic decadence was greatly ameliorated in the late 1840s, and by 1850 there was a definite upsurge in agricultural prospects. This was due, in shared parts, to the use of gypsum, marl, and guano, the
organization of agricultural societies, crop diversification and the increase in livestock growing. In the 1840s and 1850s, northern farmers settled an area ranging from Fairfax County to and including the tidewater. These farmers reclaimed abandoned acres for the truck farming of onions, beans, squashes, and "antislavery sentiment". A series of articles by one of these settlers, a Quaker by the name of Samuel Janney, appeared in the Richmond Whig in 1845. These articles praised the farming methods of the northerners, especially the use of free labor. Such sentiments were not, needless to say, received with approval on all fronts. The Richmond Examiner which had first joyfully greeted the migrants now regarded them as "vandals". While the Dew faculty as a unit did not exist after 1846, it is highly probable that they were completely aware of this economic growth and the threat which lay only partially submerged beneath its surface of beneficence. It is known that at least two of them, Dew and Tucker, not only read but also published in the Richmond papers, and Dew, Tucker, and Saunders, as tidewater Whigs (a unique brand of whiggery, as will be seen), would surely take an interest in Whig publications. The rosy tints of the economic picture must have retained, for them, a spectre."

Within the changing environmental context of the tidewater in the 1830s and the 1840s the Dew faculty lived and taught, thought and wrote. And the ideas they expressed
reflected their perceptions of what was meaningful within their current and ongoing experience as it was built upon their pasts. The consideration of the faculty as a unit offers a challenge to Drew Faust’s interesting and seminal work, *A Sacred Circle*, which suggests that southern intellectuals formed a broadly based interstate network of empathetic alienation seeking justification in the politics of slavery. These results will more closely conform to Michael O’Brien’s contention that southern intellectuals identified more with their "locality" and their social group than they did with any wider intellectual elite. As Alison Freehling and Dickson Bruce have emphasized and O’Brien has reiterated, Dew wrote on slavery in Virginia not slavery in the South. The "south" for him and his contemporaries was south of Virginia. For him and his faculty, Virginia was their country.8

In 1939, an unusual memorial service was held at the College of William and Mary. The ashes of Thomas Roderick Dew having been removed from Montmartre Cemetery in Paris, were re-interred, with the rites of the Episcopal Church, in the crypt of the Wren Building where they would lie with the remains of Sir John Randolph, his sons, Peyton and John, Governor Botetourt, Bishop Madison, and others. In this way, Dew, at last, came to rest within the walls of the institution he had nurtured, in the homeland he had loved and defended.
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In his genealogy and from his birth to his untimely death, Dew represented the English inheritance as it was transformed within the colonial tidewater experience from mercantilism benefitting the nation to capitalism benefitting the individual. This transformation was marked spiritually by the liberalism of Locke, within the "country" whig interpretation, with its focus on freedom as opposed to equality, and the rationalism of the Enlightenment which gave it its justification. Dew was comfortable with his inheritance; his writings and his life testify to that fact. He was dedicated to its preservation.

Dew could trace his lineage to ancestors of English stock who had held land in Maryland and Virginia, on his father’s side, and in Virginia, on his mother’s. His mother’s family, the Gatewoods, had had "standing" since the seventeenth century. John Gatewood, his great, great, great grandfather, was styled as "Mr.", a title used infrequently in the seventeenth century. This John Gatewood, born circa 1680, accumulated a large estate originally in an area of Rappahannock County which became Essex County in 1692. He was undoubtedly the possessor of some political clout (as well as the "vote"), living as he did during a period when the growth of large plantations in the tidewater was emphasizing the distinction between wealthy and small, or yeoman, planters and gentlemen were consolidating their power.
Primary sources of Dew's life and background are, unfortunately, limited (see footnote), but it would appear that the Gatewoods carried their landed position into the eighteenth century with another John Gatewood, probably the eldest son of the first John, who was a prosperous planter of South Farnham Parish, Essex County, and into the nineteenth century with Chaney Gatewood, Grandfather of Thomas Dew, who sold the mansion and the plantation inherited from his father and moved to Drysdale Parish, King and Queen County, circa 1777. The acreage held by Chaney Gatewood exceeded that ordinarily held by a yeoman farmer. Chaney is recorded as having paid taxes on 866 acres in 1782 and as having increased his estate in 1785. The Dew family, for its part, also held land going back to the seventeenth century, and Thomas Dew, the president's father, was, according to his will, the owner of the plantation, Dewsville, and other tracts of land.10

There are traditions in the Dew-Gatewood family, other than that of landholding, which indicate superior social status. Elizabeth Gatewood (born Leaman), wife of Chaney Gatewood and President Dew's grandmother, descended from an English noble family, the Lemans of Suffolk, who possessed a coat of arms featuring three swimming dolphins. Several Lemans were clergymen in the Anglican Church, the state church in England and in Virginia (before 1786), and one was Lord Mayor of London circa 1616. President Dew was
reinstated in 1939 as an Episcopalian (The Anglican Church became the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Anglican Communion.), a traditional role probably sustained by his mother, at least, and he was thus, the heir to an English as well as a Virginian religious tradition. His father, on the other hand, joined the Baptist Church of Christ, Upper King and Queen County, 20 June 1784.

The Anglican Church in America was frequently the first "neighborhood institution" on the Virginia frontier. Attendance once a month was required of all adults. Church membership before the Revolution and afterward until 1786 was not only a religious experience but also a social one reflecting the gradation of authority in a hierarchical society. Gentlemen, for example, purchased the best pews and entered for services after ordinary planters had already found their seats. They conversed together before and after services, conscious of their class solidarity. Even though by the mid-eighteenth century gentlemen knew that patronage of and accommodation with the yeoman class was necessary for maintenance of the power base, they consciously constituted an upper class marked by a well-defined sense of personal, social, and political autonomy. Gentry rule was challenged only once after that period; that challenge lay in Revolutionary liberal ideology which gentlemen, like Dew, were able to adapt to self-interest.12
To the upper-class characteristics of landholding and membership in the Anglican-Episcopal Church can be added that of military service. Both the Gatewood and the Dew families demonstrate this mark. The Gatewoods participated in the French and Indian War, and the Dews, in the person of the president's father, in the Revolution and in the War of 1812, in which he held the commission of captain. Some record of official public service also survives, a recommendation of Chaney Gatewood for the office of Justice of the Peace for Drysdale Parish. In Virginia counties there were a considerable number of justices of the peace, a minor judicial office. Justices were referred to as "squire" and were responsible for settling cases of debt for small amounts, instituting lunacy proceedings, and ordering the arrest of lawbreakers. At least in some quarters, Chaney was considered of sufficient stature and talent to attend to these procedures.  

The most interesting characteristic of status which the Dew-Gatewood clan demonstrated and the one which made Thomas Roderick Dew a worthy subject for this dissertation was the regard and desire for an education. Thomas Sr. and Lucy had ten children, nine boys and one girl. Of the boys, six attended William and Mary; four of the six received bachelor degrees, and two of the four, Thomas and Benjamin, received master's degrees. This appears to be an impressive showing at a time when the majority of William and Mary students did
not remain at the college long enough to earn degrees. Less than half the students actually stayed for more than a year, but a classically-based professional education of some kind was considered a distinguishing class characteristic and essential for the children of gentlemen. Education increased the social difference between gentlemen and yeoman whose sons attended school probably only a year or two. A gentleman’s son usually began his education with home tutors and continued in private institutions. William and Mary, of course, was one of those institutions in which the sons of gentlemen associated with the sons of gentlemen in a network of class solidarity and acquired the intellectual justification for their existence.¹⁴

Even though primary source material on Thomas Dew is scarce, it is evident that he was a well-educated upper-class son of a plantation and slave owner and that he came from a background in which landholding, religion and English lineage indicated a high degree of personal status. The Dew-Gatewood families must once, if not at least partly in the 1830s and 1840s, have been tobacco growers with the attendant attitude of what Thomas Breen would call personal autonomy. President Dew would almost certainly have been exposed to this attitude in his male role models and probably acquired some of the traits associated with that attitude. His education and subsequent positions as a teacher and president of the institution designed to provide
consciously a component of class distinction would reinforce those traits, producing an individual who, while known among his familiaris for his affability, had a well-defined sense of that famed Virginian "presence" which turned heads upon the entrance of one of that state's male elite into a room. At the core of that "presence" was the at least subconscious unalterable conviction that what "was" was right and reasonable and would continue to be thus.\(^\text{15}\)

Thomas Dew's education at William and Mary certainly exposed him to the Lockian - Smith - Paine emphasis on self-interest and provided him with the ideological justification for his experience. His two-year European tour following his graduation in 1820 added to that educational-cultural base. During his tour, Dew met "the black princess", widow of Christophe, king of Haiti. In the course of their conversation, he referred to slavery as the "great opprobrium of our country." That statement in itself did not set him apart from other Virginian slaveholders. Thomas Jefferson, himself, had characterized the institution as a "great political and moral evil", but neither Dew nor Jefferson or a host of others ever moved beyond a self-righteous moral posture to the activism which would make that posture viable. Early in 1832, after his appointment to the William and Mary faculty, Dew wrote a series of unsigned articles on internal improvements. In these articles he mentioned that slavery was "the most dreadful
curse of the fairest portion of our most happy land." He concluded that the black race "formed the most intelligent of the different species of man." Ancient Egypt, producer of an impressive civilization, had, indeed, been inhabited by "a black race with wooly heads." This statement indicates a major characteristic of Thomas Dew which has been ignored or has not been known by such as Eugene Genovese or Larry Tise who present him only as one of the progenitors of the "positive good" argument. Dew, at this point (early 1832) did not display any particular penchant for racism. Slavery was a universal human condition, unfortunate for those in its clutches but beneficial for society as a whole. Later, in his Review of the Debates in the Virginia Legislature, Dew will depart somewhat from this enlightened position, but, as will be shown, it is debatable whether, for him, inferiority was genetic or cultural. His "defense" of slavery was largely a defense of property rights and, even more specifically, the property rights of Virginians east of the mountains.¹⁶

Dew received the master of arts degree from William and Mary in 1824, and in 1826 he was appointed to the chair of political law to teach the subjects of "National and Natural Law, Political Economy, Political History, and the Philosophy of the Human Mind." His salary of $1000 was generous for the time period and more representative of those immediately before the Civil War. The salary,
moreover, created hostility on the part of other faculty members and revealed an area of contention between the "gowns" and the "town".  

As William and Mary continued to have annual deficits, the Visitors cut other faculty salaries to pay all but a small portion of Dew's wages. The Visitors cut salaries again in 1830 and stipulated that those salaries would be paid only after all other expenses had been met. The Visitors, in typical American fashion, put the faculty between "the rock and the hard place," making faculty remuneration dependent upon economies which the faculty might be unable to effect.

Into an already trying situation a third controversy was injected. Dew's appointment was intended, in part, to resolve that controversy which related to the role of the president. It was expected by the good people of Williamsburg that when John Augustine Smith of "move to Richmond" fame resigned, he would be replaced by a man in holy orders. This was in keeping with William and Mary's chartered purpose and indicative of the initial tremors of the Second Great Awakening. The president's traditional course of moral philosophy had come to embrace, however, such secular subjects as politics, political economy, and national law. Many thought that these subjects should be taught by a layman, in the best tradition of church and state separation. Dew was hired to fill that secular role.
According to college statute, each professor was to have a normal assignment of two full-year courses for which he received his salary. Some faculty members and some of the Visitors had assumed that Dew would teach only one course, namely that part of the moral philosophy course not being taught by the new president, Reverend William A. Wilmer. Dew believed that the subjects of national and natural law, political economy, philosophy of the mind, and history were too many for one course. The faculty agreed, two members dissenting, that Dew be permitted to offer a half-time history course not required for a degree and a half-year course in metaphysics which would give him the equivalent, with his other course, of two full-year courses. In the 1829-1830 school year, the faculty retracted part of its decision, permitting Dew to teach the history course only if he would do so without the attendant student fees. This retraction evidenced dissatisfaction over salary arrangements and over another matter of controversy in the American educational scheme, the payment of student fees.

Each professor at William and Mary was entitled to receive a fee of $20 from each student over and above the professor’s salary. Fees could make up a large percentage of a professor’s income, sometimes more than his salary. Teachers popular with the students for whatever reasons held the advantage, needless to say, in this system. Students were supposed to take a regular course of studies, but, as
it was financially necessary to maintain enrollment, many exceptions were made. In 1829-1830, half the students were "irregular" as exceptions. Dew's troubles began when quite a few students asked for exemptions from the regular course to take his history course.

The student request for exemptions produced an unpleasant situation within the faculty, as might be expected, and Dew, in a fit of altruism, asked the visitors to consider pooling all fees and dividing them among the faculty, a request which the board refused until after Dew's death. The entire incident was reflective of the view held by the members of the community that competition for fees was a useful incentive for a faculty to work harder. The incentive would only be intensified if salaries were reduced. The reasoning supporting this is, of course, fallacious. Not only does this prescription place "education" squarely within the market place as a commodity to be bought on a competitive basis, but it also places teachers in an untenable position. Such a cretinous approach is still prevalent in the United States in the late twentieth century. Thomas Jefferson, incidentally, supported the fee system which was not only destructive but insulting to those students and faculty it controlled, and it was in effect at the University of Virginia with similar unfortunate consequences for many years.¹⁸
The "fee" controversy revealed Dew as a person who, at the very least, attempted to avoid conflict with his colleagues. It also revealed his popularity with the students. The reasons for this popularity seem to be worthy. One of his students wrote "how interesting Prof. Dew was in general conversation and in the classroom. A question would be asked pertinent to the day’s lesson, and Prof. Dew would unwind his long legs, with his hand plaster down his curly red hair, and rising, exclaim, ‘An intelligent question, young gentleman. I am glad you are thinking.’ Then the delightful answer was forthcoming. Prof. Dew’s chief attraction as teacher and lecturer was his bracing and invigorating manner of thought and speech. The boys would forget to take notes lest they miss his elusive facial expressions or the fascinating flow of words." Here was a teacher exhibiting many of the characteristics so appealing to the young - intelligence, vitality, enthusiasm, and respect for a student body which, to say the least, frequently displayed youthful high spirits verging on the ungovernable. The reader has the impression that the young gentleman of the classroom would have much rather been apprehended in the act of drinking a round at the Raleigh Tavern by Professor Dew, acting in his required American role as student policeman in addition to mentor, than by just about anyone else.¹⁹
Dew's methodology in the classroom certainly added to his appeal. Most colleges, at the time, taught history along the lines of classical methodology - the reading and memorization of a text by the students. Dew was very modern in lecturing topically to his classes on laws, manners, customs, and institutions, specializing in such areas as feudalism, the rise of towns, and the French Revolution. It is thought that this system was actually introduced at William and Mary and, at the same time, into the British colonies by Mr. William Small, professor of natural philosophy and mathematics and Thomas Jefferson's teacher, between 1758 and 1762 when Small returned to England, his birthplace. There are no exact descriptions of his teaching methods, but the enthusiastic reports of Jefferson and others would indicate that Small went beyond the rote method of learning to interact with the students and stimulate their curiosity. Dew's teaching elicited a similar student response which would certainly at least reinforce any well-defined sense of "presence" his environmental experiences had already bestowed upon him. Approbation by the young is approbation and justification by the "future," a heady dose for any academic, especially a young one like Dew who could easily see himself in the student body from which he had only recently emerged.20

Dew's reputation grew, not only among the students but also within the tidewater general community and even outside
the state of Virginia. In 1829 he published his Lectures on the Restrictive System, delivered originally to the senior political class and prompted by the Tariff of Abominations and Calhoun's Exposition of 1828. After the Nat Turner rebellion of August 1831 and the debates in the House of Delegates, 1831-1832, regarding the abolition of slavery, he was encouraged by Governor John Floyd to produce the essay upon which his twentieth century reputation is largely based, the Review of the Debates of the Virginia Legislature of 1831 - 1832. This is, unfortunately, the primary source used continuously and, most often, solely in modern research. It was also Dew's publication which attracted the most widespread audience in his own time. Two former Presidents, John Quincy Adams and James Monroe, corresponded with him regarding its contents, and he received an invitation to accept a new chair of political economy and history from South Carolina College. He declined the invitation as he did one from the University of Virginia, eleven years later. He did not appear anxious to break his ties with William and Mary and to leave the immediate vicinity of the tidewater.21

The letter Dew drafted to decline his appointment to the faculty of the University of Virginia reveals his close ties to and reverence for a critical factor in his environment, The College of William and Mary. He acknowledges that the University of Virginia would provide
him with a "larger theater" for his principles, but he
claims that his feeling for William and Mary is the "firm
attachment of a boy for his mother." It is the institution
attend by his older brother and the one his father would
have selected for all his sons, even if he had "begotten as
many ... as Old Price...." His connection to the school is,
therefore, genetic as well as affectional. It has been
virtually organic, a part of his adolescence and his
maturity. In the following statement, Dew indicates the
enormity of the impact William and Mary and all it
represented has exerted on him:

From the age of 16 my whole life with the exception of
a few years has been spent in connection with this
College either as professor or student. The little
fame which I have won in this world has all been won in
the service old Wm. & M. ... I have made my daily
pilgrimage [sic] to that ancient building and wandered
through her halls for so many years that this habit had
grown into routine ... my affections are entwined
around that building ... which has almost become
essential to my existence....

With a particularly romantic flourish, Dew then draws a
comparison between his ardor for William and Mary and that
of Victor Hugo's character, Quasimodo, for his bells, an
ardor so great that the hunchback could never leave the
"precincts" of Notre Dame. So intense a passion, if Dew's
own words are to be believed, is the emotion of a man who
found a landmark in his environment reflective of great
meaning.22

Thomas Dew's loyalty to his environment was justly
recognized in 1836 when he entered upon a prominent actual
and symbolic institutional role in the tidewater. He succeeded Adam Empie (who took the rectorship of a Richmond Church) as president of the College of William and Mary. Now, at last, the well-educated male product of an upper class, landed, Episcopal background would fill a position of leadership which brought together the meaningful elements of a tidewater style of living and showed them to be conditioning factors in molding the untutored vigor of a youthful present into the reasoned strength of a mature and prosperous future.

William and Mary's college session of 1836-1837 opened on Monday, October 10, with its new president's inaugural address. In the address, Thomas Dew informed his colleagues and his young charges that young Virginians whom he identified as slaveholders and sons of slaveholders had a "cause." The complete ideology of that "cause" will become obvious as his lectures are examined. It is sufficient, here, to indicate that the values of slaveholding, states rights, a landed economy, free trade, and the free pursuit of self-interest were among the prominent characteristics of such a value system. Dew already perceived that the "cause" was under attack and would need a defense against "demon fanaticism." Clearly he stipulated that William and Mary had a mission on behalf of that defense, to provide its students with an education in morals and politics along with religion and statesmanship enabling them to counter opposing
currents of thought. In the words of William and Mary's president, a William and Mary education was to be presented as an intellectual justification for a way of life, a justification to be used as a tool in the defense against fanaticism. If Dew's historical allusion to the Persian War is considered, the analogy of a "tool" might be expanded to include "weapon". One might even begin to imagine the faint tolling of a distant bell. If students were prepared, he asserted, they (presumably) would "stand firm and resolute as the Spartan band at Thermopylae." This observation has its pessimistic overtones, for anyone with a classical education (and in 1836 that was just about anyone with even the rudiments of a formal education) knew that the legendary "300" had died at Thermopylae. Was this a reflection of Dew's tacit conviction that all was already lost? In his speech he admitted he did not know the result of the conflict. He did, however, intensify the gloom, suggesting that the students be inspired by the contemplation of the ruined revolutionary capitol in the town, much as Edward Gibbon had been inspired by contemplation of the Roman Forum. Was the young president suggesting that the cause would be lost? Was he simply indulging in a momentary burst of romantic drama? Was he, perhaps, prophetically envisioning a day when students might return to William and Mary after the national debacle of war and sit among the ruins of the Wren building? Such a day would come.²³
Dew's address was not an unmitigated success among its auditors. Several individuals were apparently sufficiently incensed to express themselves publicly. In the February 1837 *Southern Literary Messenger*, a contributor criticized William and Mary for encouraging such obsessive "political distinction." Signing himself "N", this dissenter asserted that young Virginians felt it their duty to enter politics, a "morbid desire", the result of too much emphasis on political studies. This theme was expanded the following summer at Fourth of July observances in Fredericksburg where there was talk that faculty members were "Nullifiers", the extremists that morbid political desires could produce. It was Nathaniel Beverley Tucker who responded to these criticisms, claiming that the college course was essentially what it had been for thirty or forty years and that it had proved its excellence. Tucker, as will be demonstrated, held provocative views on the purpose and impact of teaching, and he and his friend, Dew, through the material presented in their lectures, were clearly attempting to influence their students to accept specific political, economic and social values.²⁴

Formally, Thomas Dew subscribed to the political and economic values of a peculiar form of Whigism closely akin in form, but not necessarily content, to the English country Whig philosophy and heavily imprinted with the self-righteous Quidism of a disgruntled John Randolph. Tidewater
Whigs shared little with the supporters of Henry Clay save their dedicated opposition to the "tryanny" of Andrew Jackson. They were generally opposed, as well, to internal improvements (with the exception of those deemed beneficial to the local economy), a national bank, and higher tariffs. They advocated a strict construction of the Constitution, a slave-based agricultural economy driven by staple crop production, federal support of capitalism, and states' rights. A more broad-based Whiggery, however, did not share the tidewater Whigs' aversion to the power of the federal government, espousing loose construction, a national bank, internal improvements, and a higher tariff in fostering the industrial-commercial development of the economy.

Whigs, nationally, tended to be the monied and social elite, although in the Northeast recent Protestant immigrants and Protestant unskilled laborers gravitated toward the party. Tidewater Whigs followed the national trend in their elitism, and that shared elitism, in part, explained the shared basis of all Whigism - namely the conviction or the ideology that those who wielded economic power (agricultural or industrial and commercial) must control political power on their own behalf, in pursuit of their own self-interest. Very few Whigs (or Democrats, for that matter) were more concerned with maintaining a pure ideology than winning elections. It was primarily a
competition to control the power of the state, and, in that respect, all Whigs owed homage to their English roots.

The Tidewater Whigs, more than most, bore the ideological imprint of English Whiggery which they had inherited through the Quidistic Jeffersonian Republicanism of John Randolph. They were rural-based, and they paid some service, however superficial, to the value of civic humanism or virtue, the belief that self-sacrifice on behalf of the commonwealth was a public virtue or good. English country or "real" Whigs, who traced their origins to the generation of the Glorious Revolution, the generation of Milton, Sidney, Harrison, and, of course, John Locke, had trenchantly criticized and actively opposed the Whig ministry of Robert Walpole in the early eighteenth century, considering it politically and ethically corrupt in its attempt to increase the power of central government. They regarded history as a long conflict between freedom and the power of the state which needed to be controlled by representation, not in the sense of direct democratic participation by all but in the sense that males having a large, vested (landed or propertied) interest in the country should exert, through their representative, control over the tendency of the state to supplement its power continuously and to wield that power corruptly. It was the civil duty of such males, as John Randolph clearly demonstrated in the early nineteenth century, to stand as watchdogs, ever
vigilant over the moral fibre of government, ready to sound
the alarm at the slightest transgression.

The English "real" Whigs' republican ideology was a key
element of the American colonial argument for separation
from the British empire and became, for Bernard Bailyn, the
primary cause of the American Revolution. Thomas Dew,
Nathaniel Beverley Tucker, and Robert Saunders, as will be
shown, were among the inheritors of this revolutionary
tradition and would contribute in their own ways to the
ideology of the Second American Revolution, the Civil War.²⁵

What better forum could there be for the study of
statecraft and its morality than an educational institution,
especially one with a tradition of political arbitration?
What better legions could be mustered than a landed faculty
learned in the English liberal ideology of property
protection and prepared to instill that ideology in the
minds of its students? And this muster included legions
extending beyond the faculty. Dew probably belonged to a
select political circle of tidewater Whigs which
demonstrated in its membership the close ties between
academia, the tidewater, and the national scene. Although
the evidence linking Tucker is considerably more extensive
and direct, Henry A. Wise claimed that Dew was also a close
associate of John Tyler, former governor, former senator,
future President of the United States, scion of an old
tidewater family, graduate of William and Mary, and one of
the college’s "visitors" and of Judge Abel P. Upshur, a state superior court judge from the eastern shore, future Secretary of the Navy (Tyler’s), and a boyhood friend of Tyler. Upshur and Tucker along with Dew constituted a "kitchen cabinet" for Tyler, during his Presidency, which, as will be shown, exerted critical influence over the admission of Texas. This "cabinet" had, additionally, personal and political connections with Edmund Ruffin and Thomas Gilmer, a former governor and the congressman who would die with Upshur in the explosion of the "Peacemaker" on board the U.S.S. Princeton in February 1843.26

While Dew and the political position the college was coming to represent enjoyed support in some quarters, they clearly had none at all in others. William and Mary was becoming known as a proslavery, disunionist stronghold, a view strengthened by the publication of Tucker’s novel, The Partisan Leader, in 1836. There was clearly something intangible known as the "Williamsburg influence" which had elicited negative criticism, on the national level, in the orthodox Whig organ, The National Intelligencer, and in the tidewater, itself, which, from time to time, necessitated a public journalistic defense. The controversy had an unfortunate impact on the college’s finances.27

When Dew became president, the Board of Visitors petitioned the legislature for financing to establish a medical school in Richmond, a new interpretation of an old
project, and to pay a debt owed the college (£2,013.8.3) dating back to before the Revolution. The petition came to nothing. The issue of the medical school was postponed indefinitely, as was the request for debt remuneration. The state auditor refused the reimbursement in 1839, and the college, which had been certain of a positive outcome and had begun spending on building repairs, had to resort to the professors to pay for those repairs out of their salaries. This may partly have been a result of the panic of 1837; Virginia was not helping her other private colleges at the time. The reputation which Dew (and Tucker) were making for William and Mary, however, probably did not help with orthodox Whigs. Governor David Campbell, in the summer of 1837, had referred to the financial crisis and the ignorance of certain gentlemen. "A Kentucky horse or hog drover," he said, "would in a few minutes conversation show you that he knew more about the matter than professor Dew of Wm. and Mary." Tyler’s peculiar Whig position during his administration and his political "death" in the Whig party served only to aggravate the situation. The aforementioned enrollment increase in the late 1830s may have resulted from sympathy for the Dew-Tucker position bred by the sectional tensions of the decade, but both Dew and Tucker remained at the college in 1845 when the enrollment fell to 68.28

As the spring of 1846 wound to its close, Dew was distracted from William and Mary’s financial needs and the
state of the union by other matters. He was going to be married at what was for the time the somewhat advanced age of forty-three. His lengthy status as a bachelor was not for lack of trying to change that status. It seems that the tall, lanky man with poor health had never been considered too attractive to the ladies. While his portrait, currently hanging in the second floor gallery of the Wren building, might belie that assessment, Tucker reported that his wife, in reference to an earlier Dew flirtation with a certain A.E., was "horrified to hear that A.E. is to marry Mr. D...." She softened sentiment by adding that if a woman got to know Dew and could bring herself to love him "she should marry him, for there is no better man, & none more amiable." 29

Dew apparently considered himself, his single state notwithstanding, something of an authority on women. He had written an essay on the role of women which had been serialized in the Southern Literary Messenger in 1835. In the essay, he subjected women to the enlightenment concept of the "law of nature" which had ordained that they should be concerned only with marriage, children and making "the home of her husband a paradise on earth." Women, Dew continued in accordance with the values of his time, were "dependent and weak; but out of that very weakness and dependence springs an irresistible power." Dew does not really explain this almost fearful commentary on the role of
women, a view which Tucker will pick up and develop later in the novel, George Balcombe. By 1835, slavery was on its way to becoming one of the great moral issues of the day, but emancipation of women, as the second issue, had, as yet, no form and no direction. The Grimké sisters had, indeed, gone north, but they dated their involvement with the antislavery movement from a lecture given by the British abolitionist, George Thompson, on March 3, 1835, too early for them to serve as a glaring example for Dew of females run amuck. The celebrated "Pastoral Letter of the General Association of Massachusetts to the Congregational churches under their care" would not be read from the pulpit until the July of 1837. Was he, then, at least subconsciously aware as early as 1835 of the crucial female role in supporting white landed male supremacy in the tidewater? Did he fear women who seemed to eschew, even for a time, such a role? Or was he merely reacting against the power of sexuality and his failure to realize its potential?

Whatever Dew's feelings on the opposite sex, he eventually found a woman who, unlike Miss A.E., could bring herself to the point of love and allow the college president a glimpse of his paradise on earth. On June 17, 1846, Dew married Miss Natilia Hay, and they embarked upon a voyage to Europe for a honeymoon. The sea crossing was rough, and Dew became ill in Paris with a kind of bronchitis. On the morning of August 6, his bride awoke to discover that he had
died in his sleep. He was buried in Montmartre Cemetery where his remains would lie until 1939.
CHAPTER 5
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CHAPTER 6

THE FACULTY: NATHANIEL BEVERLEY TUCKER

In the August of 1851, Nathaniel Beverley Tucker died while on a sojourn to the Virginia resort of Capon Springs, and his family buried him in the dooryard of Williamsburg's Bruton Parish Church. A tall, slender obelisk standing above the church wall marks his grave and is easily seen from Duke of Gloucester Street for two blocks in either direction. The tombstone epitaph, which may have been composed by Tucker, himself, commemorates him as a judge, a professor, and a gentleman "descended from the best blood of Virginia." Like Thomas Dew, his friend and colleague, Tucker represented the American transformation of the English inheritance within the spatial crucible of tidewater Virginia. Like Dew, in addition, Tucker descended from landed first families, which had the requisite experience of Episcopalianism, military service and education, graduated from The College of William and Mary, and returned there as a faculty member in 1834. Tucker's life, however, evidenced a number of characteristics dissimilar to those of Dew's.

Establishing some fundamental dissimilarities between Dew's and Tucker's lives is not difficult. Tucker married three times, for example, while Dew married but once and
into a union quickly dissolved by his death. Tucker's specialization was the law, while Dew was essentially an historian. Tucker, after personal and professional failures, sought success for a time on the Missouri frontier, while Dew remained in Virginia until his death. Tucker, born in 1784, was the older, while Dew, born in 1802, was the younger. Tucker left five direct heirs, while Dew left none. Establishing dissimilarities which are more qualitative is, on the other hand, a more complex issue for the reason that so much is known about Tucker and so little about Dew. Tucker's marred relationship with his famous father, St. George, and his love for his quixotic half-brother, John Randolph, are well-documented. Virtually nothing is known about Dew's relationship with either parent or any of his siblings save for a few surviving letters which indicate mutual family affection and support. Tucker's intellectual exchange with such men as William Gilmore Simms, James Henry Hammond, John Tyler, and Abel Upshur is available for investigation, while, again, Dew archives are lacking. This lack leaves Dew a rather flat, two-dimensional figure but one who is infinitely easier to handle as a product of his environment than Tucker who emerges as a complex, multi-faceted reflection not only of a particular time and space but of specific personal associations, as well.
This chapter is not intended to be a biographical summary of Tucker's life. Robert J. Brugger has already produced a detailed and thoughtful "life", while the late Percy Turrentine has contributed a multi-volume dissertation on the same subject. These excellent works were preceded by two master's theses, one, in 1947, on Tucker's published works, by Noma Goodwin, and one, in 1969, on his value system, by the author of this dissertation. This chapter, as did Chapter V, will use biographical data to demonstrate that Tucker's ideas had an environmental source and were formulated to defend what he considered to be meaningful in his society. It will have as a broader purpose the intention of laying a base for showing how well Tucker's value system complemented that of the others in his academic circle and contributed to the presentation of a common institutional ideology.

Tucker, like Dew, was born on the right side of the plantation "blanket" on 6 September, 1784, at his mother's estate, Matoax, about two miles west of Petersburg near the mouth of the Appomatox River. The white frame house was surrounded by pines and stood on a bluff overlooking the river. The estate in its entirety had once been a Randolph holding comprising some 1300 acres of Chesterfield County and employing dozens of slaves. Young Beverley's early leisure childhood was spent in a world of dogs, horses, slaves, cock fights, and sling shots, a world of sunny
gardens and soft winds, tall trees and cool clear water—all revolving around a "kind and admirable" father and an "affectionate and excellent" mother. Natural delights and engaging activities were not, however, the only components of the Matoax "world". It also provided books and music, stimulating conversation and access to the powerful, dancing and the refinements of the drawing room, in short, the lifestyle of privilege with all its meaningful attributes.²

St. George Tucker, Beverley's father, had immigrated to America from Bermuda in 1771, at the age of nineteen, and was heir to an illustrious name and an admirable array of talents. According to legend, the Tuckers, of Norman descent, bore the original name of Tout Coeur (all heart) which had been modified to Toukere, Toucker, Tuckere, and, eventually, Tucker.³

William Tucker, a Norman yeoman who crossed the Channel with the Conqueror in 1066, established the English branch of the family; and his son was granted the estate of Lamertin in Devonshire. All the Tuckers, henceforth, traced their earliest Anglo-Saxon locale to this area and that of Kent, both in Southeastern England. The Conqueror granted the family a coat of arms in 1079, guaranteeing its hegemony over its own fraction of English land and life.⁴

The story of the tidewater Tuckers properly begins with Daniel, who was appointed Master-of-the-Port-of-the-Thames by Queen Elizabeth and granted an estate on which he built
Milton Manor. Daniel's brother, George, was a member of the Warwick party in the Virginia Company, and his son, George Jr., immigrated to Bermuda in 1648. The Bermuda Tuckers, in the person of St. George Tucker, Beverley's father, fostered the Virginia branch of the family.®

Beverley's mother, the beautiful, brilliant and vivacious Frances Bland, boasted a tidewater extended clan which included the crème of the First Families - the Bollings, Beverleys, Harrisons, Carters, Burwells, Pages, Nelsons, Careys, "ad majorem et gloriam Virginiarum". Frances' father, Theodorick, owned Cawsons, a plantation in Prince George County near the juncture of the Appomattox and the James Rivers, and her first marriage, to John Randolph of the Turkey Island Randolphps, had netted her several sizable estates including Matoaks, Bizarre and Roanoke upon John's death in 1775, providing a landed patrimony for her three sons, Richard, Theodorick, and the famous "quid", John.®

The children of Frances' second marriage to St. George Tucker did not fare so well as did their half-siblings. St. George was not a major landowner but a lawyer, jurist, and academic, albeit, one with a national reputation for erudition. Those children, Ann Frances, Henry St. George, and Nathaniel Beverley, were raised in a privileged environment, however, and came to associate privilege with land, social position and, of course, slavery. Certainly,
their days at Matoaks before their mother's death in 1788 were halcyon and representative of whatever genuine meaning life might have for them. Beverley remembered his childhood before his mother's death within the context of a place "where love was sincere and artless." Such reminiscences were probably woven into Beverley's memory - fabric of his lost mother's relationship with her youngest child, but the identification of property with lineage, power, intellect, love and pleasure suggests a more powerful influence on Beverley who in later years sought his own property on which he might reside with family and friends, reading, writing, and providing sage counsel in the administration of public affairs. Frances might well have said to small Beverley as she did say to her older son, John, "When you get to be a man you must not sell your land; it is the first step to ruin for a boy to part with his father's home; be sure to keep it as long as you live. Keep your land and your land will keep you."

Frances Randolph's admonition to John holds much more meaning than is obvious on first reading. It is not simply the land which is at stake, here, for the land symbolizes more than material possession. It reflects values of the fathers and the transferal and protection of those values inviolate to succeeding generations. Land supported a family and that family's fortune. Loss of land was a betrayal not only of trust but of value patterns and would
surely lead to the ruination of material foundations as well as of moral fibre.

Beverley Tucker did acquire land and the slaves to work it. After unsuccessful attempts to establish a lucrative law practice in Charlotte County, he received from John Randolph, with whom he enjoyed a close relationship, 300 acres of land, fifteen slaves, and livestock. At the same time, his father gave him the family's 500 acres in Lunenberg County, two male slaves and $500 in cash. In later years, after Tucker had joined the expatriate Virginians searching for a prosperity Virginia no longer fostered, he owned several hundred acres on the Missouri frontier near Florissant, an old French town located north of St. Louis in the right angle of the Missouri River northwest of its confluence with the Mississippi. In this area of an energetic and expanding new "southern" society, Tucker seemed anxious to preserve the landholding values implicit in his mother's words. He held, for example, a christening service for his new home which he named "St. George" in order "to record the lineage" of its owner, namely, himself. Here, at last, was the land which would keep him if he kept it.

Tucker's landholding experience expanded with the purchase, in 1819, with several friends, of a 6000 acre tract near St. Charles a half-day's ride northwest of St. Louis. On this bottomland between Dardenne and Peruque
creeks, Tucker and his friends with their families were to live on adjacent plots, the men spending their time reading, writing letters, and authoring papers on state affairs. It was Tucker's dream to establish an intellectual community which would supply the ideology for the "shaping" of Missouri. The men who joined him in this enterprise were notable and would constitute another and, perhaps, more perfect "sacred circle" of southern intellectuals than that of Drew Faust. There were two professors from South Carolina College, Dr. David Means, a planter champion of southern rights, William Harper, who in 1820 became chancellor of the Missouri equity courts, and others. Tucker regarded himself as a "patriarch of old" who would "become a great nation." Here, as the leader of the community, he would reconstitute Matoaks with its neighboring plantations owned by gentlemen who held liberty dear and did not hesitate to consider rebellion, this time against the United States government not the British, as a means of preserving it.  

Illness, the gradual dissolution of the Dardenne community, and personal tragedies (the deaths of his father, his first wife in 1827, and his second, in 1829) led Tucker to sell the land near St. Charles in 1830 and purchase property in Saline County about a hundred miles west of his Dardenne holding, in rolling country between the Salt Fork and Arrow Rock. Tucker named the site "Ardmore" and likened
the estate to "the Family seat" of a "powerful and noble family." Here, again, in his own words, were the characteristics of what Tucker considered to be the meaningful life - land, lineage, power, and nobility. His entire Missouri experience had, therefore, a common theme - acquire land, establish lineage, and wield or, at least, influence power. Such a theme was consistent with the English country whig (see chapter 5) tradition which fostered the Revolution and shaped the tradition into which Tucker had been born. And he was more than just a case in point he was, perhaps, the most dedicated heir of John Randolph's "Quidism".10

Tucker's association with his half-brother, John Randolph, is one of the most fascinating and, certainly, crucial episodes of his life. He deeply loved that romantically rationalistic, sentimentally cynical, madly sad and morbidly glad liberal conservative (who proudly exclaimed, "I am an aristocrat; I love liberty, I hate equality."), that brilliant and eloquent Tertium Quid, John Randolph. From 1809 to 1812, Tucker and his small family lived at "Roanoke", and Beverley had the opportunity to associate with Randolph on a daily basis. Randolph enjoyed flattery, attempted to arouse jealousy, and with cunning perception played off one admirer against another. He encouraged his half-sibling to resent and to criticize others by making him feel that only he, John, understood him
and that only they revered the memory of their mother, Frances. Randolph’s influence over Tucker grew to such an extent that it prevailed over Beverley’s inclinations toward his father (see footnote) and unquestionably crystallized much of his political, economic, and social thought. He advocated, as did Randolph, "the rights of the States against Federal encroachment....and the liberty of the citizen ....against all encroachment, state or Federal...."

He abhorred what he perceived to be the evils of a growing federalism and a rigid party system and regarded himself as the guardian of a public virtue fast approaching obsolescence. He saw the plantation system as protecting the old English-American concept of personal autonomy for the holders of the land, and he dedicated himself to its preservation.¹¹

Tucker’s religious experience, unlike that of his landholding, evidences more ambiguity as part of the environmental structure supporting his ideas. Frances Bland was an Anglican and was known to have instructed at least her Randolph sons in the Anglican catechism and seen to such personal ritual as the observance of morning and evening prayer. Here, again, is the identification with what, at Beverley’s birth, would soon become the disestablished religion of Virginia. St. George, on the other hand, held true to his Enlightenment principles and was a confirmed and vocal deist. Beverley, himself, died a vestry-man of Bruton
Parish church, although he had engaged briefly but significantly with the frontier evangelical Presbyterianism of the Second Great Awakening which left him with an abiding faith in a loving God desirous of opening pathways to salvation and supportive of self-determined free will as opposed to the wrathful God of Calvinism who predestined few for eternal happiness and suffered no alternative to the many He had marked for eternal damnation. Tucker characterized his childhood religious experience as one in which boys were encouraged to "hate kings, despise priests, and deride religion." Such injunctions apparently caused an adverse reaction on Tucker's part. He regarded the rationalism of his father's deism as "perverse ingenuity" and his father, as an "infidel". This bitter criticism may well have been only a byproduct of a deep misunderstanding between father and son in which failed expectations on both sides provided the larger context for more specialized conflicts.  

To the upper class environmental characteristics of land-holding and Anglicanism must be added, as in the case of Thomas Dew, that of military service. St. George had participated in the Revolution, aiding in the capture of British supplies on Bermuda and serving as a staff officer during the Yorktown campaign of 1781. Beverley emulated his father and, unlike Dew, whose age did not allow for participation, saw action during the War of 1812, first as a
lieutenant and, later, as Adjutant General on the staff of Major General John Pegram. A substantial record of public service survives, as well. The Randolph family's account of contributions to the commonwealth is subject matter for the most desiccated of public school history textbooks. St. George Tucker, for his part, was a delegate to the Annapolis Convention of 1786 and a delegate to the Virginia Constitutional Ratifying Convention in 1787. Interestingly, he opposed the Constitution because he felt it did not provide for sufficient state autonomy, a view closely akin to that of his son and John Randolph. After his Bland wife's death in 1788, St. George accepted a seat in the state judiciary as a circuit judge. It was at this point he moved his family to Williamsburg where he purchased the home described in chapter II. Beverley, again like the father of whom he was so critical, became a circuit judge in Missouri. Territorial Governor Frederick Bates, a Virginian, appointed him to succeed David Barton as judge of the northern circuit in 1817, and in this position he acquired a reputation for remarkable vitality, riding thirty or fifty miles at a gallop, holding session, and riding back as rapidly, and able adjudication. In 1820, Governor Alexander McNair appointed Tucker judge of the state's third circuit which included the city of St. Louis. In this capacity, Beverley displayed courage in striking down popular state legislation designed to ameliorate the depression in Missouri following
the Panic of 1819. For him, this legislation presented constitutional dilemmas regarding the impairment of contractual obligations and prohibition from issuing bills of credit. Property and its protection along with the development of discipline and virtue were the fundamental issues at stake, as Tucker perceived the situation, and he took pride in being the first judge to offer those republican institutions the guarantees they deserved. No circumstance more clearly revealed the judge's values, however, than the controversy over the admission of Missouri to statehood.\textsuperscript{13}

For Tucker, the Tallmadge amendment to the statehood enabling act raised all sorts of spectres - an attack on property which government was intended to protect, a violation of the "original" sovereignty of a state, a power-grab on the part of the federal government. In a series of five essays appearing in the Saint Louis Missouri Gazette, Beverley, Edward Bates, a St. Louis attorney, and a third party who remained unidentified attempted to alert Missourians to the threats to their constitutional liberties. Tucker signed himself "Hampden", and the third party signed "himself" "Sydney". The use of those two pen names confirmed Tucker's subscription to the political ideals of the English "country" whigs. John Hampden and Algernon Sydney were "country" or "real" whigs of the seventeenth century dedicated to defending liberties against
the venal power of the monarchy and promoting the philosophy described in chapter V. Tucker, as will be shown, clearly saw himself in the same role as Hampden and Sydney, with the federal government assuming the guise of a monarchy. He did not hesitate to draw parallels between the Revolution and the controversy over statehood and publicly, for the first time, held out the alternative of an "uprising" on the part of Missouri, supported by the other southern states, to preserve her freedom.

Tucker's suggestion of revolt did not meet with the favorable reaction he might have anticipated. He was ridiculed, some of his opponents making use of his father's arguments against slavery as a basis for the amendment, and, after one of his letters testifying to his abilities as an arbiter of public opinion and to the excellence of the Dardenne community was published in the Richmond Enquirer and reprinted in the St. Louis Missouri Gazette, he and his community, well described by Brugger as "a slaveholder's Valhalla", came under fire for their apparent pretension and condescension to ordinary people. The same attitude of hostility evidenced itself, again, in 1831, when Tucker ran as a self-appointed democratic candidate for the congressional seat vacated by the death of Spencer Pettis. His espousal of the states' rights position, after Calhoun's public acknowledgement of the authorship of the Exposition and his open break with Jackson, was considered a divisive
element too controversial for the already fragmented Missouri Democratic party to assimilate, and he was overlooked in favor of Robert William Wells. ¹⁴

Tucker's public "failures" in Missouri undoubtedly influenced his acceptance of an opportunity to return to Virginia which presented itself in 1832. He had always "pined for Virginia." As early as his illness of 1823, he had expressed the desire to return, and in 1832 three elements combined to make that option irresistible - the nullification controversy, John Randolph's final illness, and the offer of a faculty position at the College of William and Mary. ¹⁵

The South Carolina state convention had already adopted an ordinance of nullification when Tucker published an essay in the Saint Louis Free Press encouraging easterners to support her stand. In the article, Beverley announced he would be returning to Virginia to rally support for South Carolina's stand. His love for his native state was evident. Rhapsodically he observed that "She is my mother and to be with her in her hour of trial is a duty..."

While psychologists may find important linkages between Tucker's metaphor and the early death of his mother, his love of that state, as in the case of Thomas Dew and even Thomas Jefferson, was always a potent force in his thinking. The drawing power of that force was firmed by a summons from John Randolph and confirmed by an offer from William and
Mary of the professorship of law which he accepted. And, in that manner, Tucker returned to Williamsburg where he had spent most of his youth and young adult life. He would reside in the home on Nicholson which he had inherited from his father and take up a position which, in a sense, was also a part of his inheritance. He had, indeed, come into his father's "land" and, figuratively, into his father's "domain" as a jurist and as an intellectual. The extent to which his value system and its ideological underpinning emulated that of his father, however, was another matter.  

Tucker, without question, came from a family environment in which learning was highly valued and associated with status. St. George Tucker, the personification of the eighteenth century man of letters, was graduated from William and Mary in 1772, studied law under George Wythe, and obtained a license to practice. Even though St. George was, in effect, an immigrant and not officially a member of landed tidewater aristocracy, his Revolutionary War service, his marriage to a Randolph, née Bland, and his profession, the law, quickly, within ten years, gave him prestige in Virginia. Lawyers had the opportunity to gain much respect in colonial and new national society. First, their specialized knowledge was indispensable in legal questions and disputes centering around landholding, land population, farming, trade, etc. Thus, if they did not own land themselves, and many tried to
acquire it through marriage and/or purchase, they were intrinsically tied to property. Second, they had the expertise to express verbally the "general will" and to serve as a buffer between the people and the government. As long as lawyers responded to popular values in a positive way, they were virtually assured of prosperity so long as their social group was prosperous. When the tidewater economy moved into the "dog days" of the late teens, twenties and thirties, the story was different, but in St. George Tucker's time, the future was more than promising.17

St. George went far beyond reflecting the popular value system and, at times, seemed even to hold an opposing system. This contemporary view of Tucker's father, however, rests largely on his authorship of A Dissertation on Slavery with a Proposal for the Gradual Abolition of it in the State of Virginia. Bred of the Enlightenment whose legitimate child St. George surely was, his views on slavery parallel those of Montequieu whose words emblazoned the title page of the "dissertation". "Slavery not only violates the Laws of Nature and of Civil Society, it also wounds the best Forms of Government...." St. George had not missed or chosen to ignore the message of two members of the William and Mary triumvirate, Smith and Paine, regarding slavery. He recognized rightly that the "great increase of slavery in the southern.... states in the union, is therefore not attributable, solely, to the effect of sentiment, but to
natural causes; as well as those considerations of profit which have ... an equal influence over the conduct of mankind in general...." It is true that he softens the phrase, "considerations of profit", by typical references to a climate conducive to the perpetuation of slavery, for it increased the "value of the slave to the purchasers", but the rationalization always winds back to the premise that slavery was perceived as profitable, as the economic base for what was meaningful in life. St. George openly admitted the hypocrisy of Americans in "offering up vows at the shrine of Liberty" while "imposing upon our fellow men... a slavery ten thousand times more cruel than the utmost extremity of those ... oppression, of which we complained." Thomas Paine, recently released in 1796 from imprisonment in the Luxembourg Palace for his opposition to the French Jacobins, would have exclaimed, "Well said!" 

St. George, in his Dissertation, made his opposition to slavery concrete by proposing a plan for the abolition of slavery in Virginia, a plan which, incidentally, pointedly circumscribed the civil rights of free blacks. His plan was generally ignored by the Virginia General Assembly to which it had been addressed, but the Dissertation won for its author a prominent position in the annals of the anti-slavery movement, a position seemingly directly antithetical to that of his son. Upon closer inspection of St. George's ideas, however, it would appear that he was not quite so
removed from the popular will or even the position of his son.

St. George Tucker may have opposed slavery in theory, but so did Thomas Jefferson and John Randolph. John Randolph, for example, was a major slaveholder in his county and generally regarded as a "good master". He made a reputation defending slave interests with a country whig philosophy but considered slavery a curse. He, at least, manumitted his slaves on his death in a will finally legally recognized. Thomas Jefferson and St. George Tucker enjoyed no such ultimate vindication. They, on the other hand, had descendants who, within the system of perceived values, should inherit the property of the fathers and continue to enjoy the traditional benefits of the institution. Randolph had no direct heirs.19

While a real distinction between Tucker, Senior, and Tucker, Junior, may be seen in their view of slavery, their ideas of the general philosophical context in which slavery was a component were virtually identical. Once St. George had remarried and settled down to life as an academic, he became, for example, head of a small literary circle for which he wrote rationalist poetry glorifying the democracy of Greece, opposition to despotic central government as exemplified by Algernon Sidney and John Hampden, liberty, the laws of nature, public virtue and public responsibility. He expressed alarm, in addition, at the growing power of the
federal government and what he saw as the "apparent conspiracy of commercial and manufacturing interests against the general welfare." Here were the views of the real whigs, again, the Quids, and, of course, his son, Beverley.20

Beverley Tucker, as a child, was exposed to his father's values on an everyday basis and to those of John Randolph for lengthy periods of time. He would come to the position of slavery as a necessary and beneficial institution partly because, during his lifetime, the "slave" society came increasingly under attack but also because he recognized, as did Dew, the advantages of owning slaves. Ownership of slaves gave power. It perpetuated a society with a class structure in which ownership guaranteed high rank and in which ownership provided the leisure time for intellectual pursuits, without the simplification of lifestyle necessary in the twentieth century world, and time for attention to public "virtue" and the observance of political obligations necessary to maintain control of the state. The lessons of feudalism were not lost on two such historical-minded individuals as Tucker and Dew. The knight, theoretically, was invested with land, to which workers were attached, so that he might have the leisure to perform his public duty of militarily supporting a power structure. Even though Tucker never became a major landowner, he perceived his life as an exercise in the
intellectual dedication to public duty, and such a
dedication within the lifestyle he preferred would have been
impossible without some kind of supportive and inexpensive
labor force. He had, of course, a wife or, rather, three
wives in succession who cared for home, children, and slaves
in his many absences, including those devoted to summer
vacation retreats at White Sulphur or Capon Springs. In
this, too, he was like his father who, at least during his
marriage to Frances Bland, spent long periods of time away
from home, even in the weeks of her last illness. Wives,
alone, however, could not maintain the lifestyle considered
meaningful. A young artist from western Virginia has
provided a glimpse of that academic life which any
contemporary academic, male or female, might find appealing.

The Professor was genial and courtly in his manners to
all, and conversed as few men could talk even in Old
Virginia. Anon an elegant old negro servant entered
with hot whiskey punch in silver service.... the supply
of punch into our silver goblets never diminished.... I
stood bewildered and alone. There was my coat and hat
hanging near a luxuriously covered bed. There also was
my trunk and valise, and there on the hearth and mantle
were all my shells and botanical specimens, neatly
arranged ...."Leave your boots at the door, if you
please, Sir," said Ganymede [the slave] .... We
remained at Tucker’s several days and left steeped in
dreamy traditions and lubricated with the most graceful
and engaging hospitality the world can afford.21

Another account, this time by a colleague, exemplifies the
Tucker lifestyle.

He had some 20 slaves - men, women, and children -
about his house and garden who were made as happy as
dependents could possible be .... It was a beautiful
sight to contemplate when he came from his room usually
about ten o’clock in the morning and walked around his
premises to see his servants at their several occupations.  

In both of the above accounts there are highly attractive elements, for who could resist the appeal of an evening's intellectual conversation, hot whiskey punch, the extension of perfect hospitality to valued friends and acquaintances, a morning's stroll around a well-tended piece of personal real estate? But the attractions rest upon the premise of slavery. It was not Tucker, himself, who prepared and bore in the punch, or carried the trunk, or who polished the boots. Life consisted, largely, in the meaningful indulgence of self-interest, and the price of that indulgence was slavery.

Tucker's education at the College of William and Mary where he was one of his father's students, provided the ideological support for his dedication to self-interest. Like Dew, he was a student of Smith and Locke and the Scottish philosophers. He was also a student of Paine, but the natural rights, the freedom, the equality he prized were good only in the abstract or when applied to an elite. They were not for the public consumption of women, slaves, the landless, the less privileged of society. These were the elements which threatened the planter hegemony and which Tucker and Dew were at great pains to control. The opportunity to support and extend this control was presented by their positions as teachers or masters for a privileged male youth which was to inherit the power structure.
In the summer of 1834, after John Randolph's death, Tucker with his family was visiting Richmond while awaiting settlement of Randolph's will. He was about to embark upon the final stage of inheriting the "estate" of his father. They key to that stage was presented by Thomas Dew who arrived with an offer from William and Mary's Board of Visitors of St. George's old position as professor of law. Tucker accepted the offer and took up residence in his boyhood home, which he had also inherited, in the town where he had been raised.

Beverley Tucker was, in some ways, doubly imprinted by the experience of Williamsburg. Unlike Dew, he had, from the age of four to the age of eighteen, lived in its environs. Many times he must have passed the Governor's Palace, now, on his return, burned and fallen into shambles, stopped, perhaps, to peer through the tree box hedges at what once was the bowling green, or invaded the holly maze. Many times, too, he must have passed the Wythe house, the college, itself, and the paw-paws arching over the graveyard wall of Bruton Parish church. Here, the scent of hyacinths in the spring, the patchwork shade of grape arbors, the rosy hues of Flemish brickwork created a timeless charm which a city of "rational" design might work upon its inhabitants. The memories of Jefferson, Spotswood, and Patrick Henry, the associates of his father, the traditions of balls, fairs, races, coupled with those of public service, personal
authority and slavery created an environment self-evident in the historical and logical justification for life in the 1830s. True, the community was in decline (One of the first public affairs Tucker attended on his return was a commemorative ceremony held on the ruins of the capitol which had been completely destroyed by fire in 1832.), but Tucker was satisfied. He felt the appearance of Williamsburg had not changed and that he was "literally sitting in my father's seat, exercising the same functions that he made the business of his life." He would soon begin imparting to his students the sanctioning ideology he had constructed for the values the city symbolized and sustained.23

What Tucker taught his students about freedom, equality, slavery and the state will be shown, but he made it clear in his inaugural lecture, 27 October 1834, that his course would focus on Virginia laws and court decisions and on the common law basis of both. Unlike the prevailing methods at Harvard and Yale, those at William and Mary would not emphasize comparative state laws as developing into national statutes. Tucker's approach would emphasize diversity as opposed to unity, and he would be concerned with providing a broad, not narrow educational background necessary to the position of "statesman" not merely that of "lawyer". The college, itself, in the lecture, became the
"nurse of heroes" which Tucker vowed to restore to "all its former prosperity." 24

Tucker's feeling and regard for Virginia and its oldest institution of higher learning is apparent in his words. And it was Virginia, perhaps, more specifically, the tidewater, which would serve as the context for his political, economic, and social ideology. The major human influences on his life - his father, St. George, his half-brother, John Randolph - belonged to the context of the tidewater. Beverley, himself, enjoyed the most pleasant experiences of tidewater life, and he, in his turn, would reinforce the value of those experiences and the necessity for political devices to protect them, for his students.

Tucker's inaugural lecture was well-received by his students, and a committee of them sought to have it published in the new Southern Literary Messenger. His students continued to respect and even, in some cases, revere him. He was popular as a speaker for college societies and youth groups. He gave young men, in those troubled times, moral fortitude and a mission - to save Virginia and preserve the traditions which gave meaning to their lives. One student wrote, crediting Tucker with all his ideas of government and hoping that all his students could "wrest Virginia from her mire ....and exhibit her/ ... cleansed and purified." Tucker assured his students that he wanted "to reverse the course of things." He gave them a
common enemy against which they could direct their dissatisfaction; the common "enemy" was northerners and the federal government. Some students verified in writing their empathy with the judge's approach. Richard Cocke characterized him as a man with a "higher destiny", a noble "aim"; another student saw him as a comrade. "You are, he said, "54 in years but not more than 21 in feeling." 25

Tucker had, at last, come into his own. He had failed as a young lawyer in Virginia and, like his native state, had lost credibility. He had enjoyed only fragmentary satisfaction on the frontier. Now he, like his father, had an all-embracing cause: the state.

In 1836, Tucker published two novels mythologizing his ideology. The first, The Partisan Leader: A Tale of the Future, was secretly published in Washington by Duff Green, owner and publisher of Washington's Telegraph and an intimate of John C. Calhoun. The Partisan Leader, a narrative of the future secession of Virginia, was fictitiously dated "1856", and the author was given as a certain Edward William Sidney, supposedly an artilleryman who "witnessed and partook" in Virginia's "struggle for freedom". Six or seven years after publication, Tucker admitted he was the author. He had permitted the novel's publication in hopes of influencing the election of 1836 against Martin Van Buren. He had hoped in vain; Martin Van Buren, Jackson's candidate and the heir to his "democracy",
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captured 170 votes out of 294 and became the eighth President of the United States. The book was a financial failure, and Tucker thought that it might in some way have been suppressed.  

The second novel, *George Balcombe*, was published by Harper & Brothers in New York and evaluated by Edgar Allen Poe, William Gilmore Simms, and Thomas Dew as one of the best of American novels. It was superficially the story of a Missouri gentleman-pioneer and his adventures. The gentleman was a thinly disguised portrait of Tucker, and the novel offered a more subtle exposition of his philosophy. Both novels indicated the attempt on the author's part to popularize a political idea through the medium of fiction, a technique demonstrated to Tucker by the success of the Waverly novels. He thought of himself as a lawyer, first, and a novelist "only by avocation". This self-designation was confirmed in 1837 when William and Mary conferred on him an LL.D.  

Tucker soon maintained, in addition to his teaching, a considerable literary output. Letters and essays began to appear in newspapers under the pseudonym of "A States Rights Man". The *Southern Literary Messenger*, one of the three most distinguished periodicals of its kind to circulate in the antebellum south, published his articles on states' rights, the importance of studying political science, oratory, and the Constitution, and a novel, *Gertrude*. The
Southern Quarterly Review, a Charleston publication and the second of the southern literary triumvirate, provided another outlet for Tucker's writings. Increased involvement in the political and literary world brought increased contact with the exciting and fascinating men of that world. Thomas Willis White, owner of the Southern Literary Messenger, counted the judge among his trusted advisors; and William Gilmore Simms, newly appointed to the editorial chair of the Southern Quarterly Review, regarded him as a fast friend. Legendary names from the rolls of the United States Senate frequently appeared in his correspondence - John C. Calhoun, John Tyler, James Henry Hammon, and Henry A. Wise -- and met their literary counterparts - Edgar Allan Poe, Thomas Caryle, and the publisher, Duff Green.

Teaching, letters, essays, and novels were not the extent, however, of Tucker's influence. He was also part of an intellectual/political circle which included Thomas Dew, Judge Abel P. Upshur, a state superior court judge, and John Tyler, former Virginia governor, national senator, and future President of the United States. This circle would have impact on national policy dealing with Mexico, the acquisition of its territory as a goal of manifest destiny, and the admission of Texas to statehood.

The members of the "Tyler" circle had similar characteristics. Tucker and Dew have already been established as members of tidewater society in good
standing. Tyler belonged to an established tidewater family and was a graduate of William and Mary. He also served on William and Mary’s Board of Visitors. Upshur was a friend of Tucker, a boyhood friend of Tyler and eventually Tyler’s secretary of state, a position he would retain until a tragic explosion on board the U.S.S. Princeton claimed his life in 1844.

In 1836, John Tyler retired from the Senate and determined to "establish myself in Williamsburg." He purchased a large house from his friend, Beverley Tucker, and settled down to the pleasant pursuits of a privileged position in a small community. Tyler must often have encountered Tucker and Dew at meetings and at social gatherings, especially that of the traditional July college commencement. In 1835, Tyler’s oldest son had begun law studies with Tucker, and contacts between the two Williamsburg establishments of Tyler and Tucker were probably frequent. Tucker may also have visited Tyler at his Gloucester County estate, Sherwood Forest, more than once. Tyler’s son, Lyon, who also would graduate from William and Mary and eventually, in 1888, become its president, testifies that Tucker, Tyler, and Upshur constituted a close-knit group. They must often have enjoyed cards or backgammon and most certainly engaged in conversation, at Tucker’s home or in Tyler’s "large and very airy and pleasant" home, perhaps, in the "sitting and
reading room" behind the parlor and dining room. William Ancher Cocke, a student at William and Mary in 1840-41, substantiates Lyon's view in a letter written to Lyon. He claimed that he often joined Upshur and Tucker at Tucker's home on Nicholson for tea and that "your father was often present." It would be very difficult, however, to verify any direct influence this nineteenth century "kitchen cabinet" might have had on John Tyler, once he assumed the Presidency on the death of William Henry Harrison on 4 April 1841, save in one notable situation - the admission of Texas to statehood.28

Tucker, Tyler, Dew, and Upshur must have expressed their common political beliefs in their personal contacts. And those beliefs, as did those of Dew [expressed in chapter 5], reveal the regional bias which made the Virginian political scene fluid and very difficult to categorize.

Virginia politics fell into three divisions at the time: Jacksonian democrats, the orthodox Whigs, and the so-called Whigocrats or Jacksonians in the Jeffersonian tradition who had broken with Jackson over the Nullification Proclamation and the Force Bill. Dew and Tucker were Whigocrats in their espousal of the Old English real or country Whig philosophy. Theoretically, John Tyler was, as an official candidate of the orthodox Whig party, an orthodox Whig. He, of course, would eventually be "read out" of the Whig party for his unorthodoxy in a series of
events which pointed up what many thought at the time was a
gross case of political dissembling but which, in reality, was only a reflection of his (and his friends') tidewater values harkening back to those of John Randolph.29

The annexation of Texas had been a political issue since Andrew Jackson, on the last day of his term, several months after the election of Van Buren, had recognized its independence. Texas had formally offered itself for annexation, but Van Buren rejected the proposal because he had no desire to arouse a debate over the question of slavery. Southerners were divided over the issue. Some, like Tucker, desired to acquire Texas and, perhaps, other areas in the Spanish borderlands. These individuals viewed the Missouri Compromise as inadequate because it left only Florida as potential slave territory. Others from the South feared the possibility of a Mexican War and potential competition from a western cotton kingdom.

Tucker’s interest in preserving and expanding a slave-based culture was evident in his "Essay on Texas Annexation of June 1844". He wrote that expanding into Texas would bring land necessary to a stable society and was worth a war, for "to a stout heart and strong will in a good cause nothing is impossible." Tucker had, in addition, personal and financial equity built up in Texas. In March of 1839, his friend, Albert Burnley, had taken fifty of his slaves to the Lone Star Republic to work on land Burnley hoped Tucker
would settle. Later, when Burnley joined the Texas bond commissioner on a trip to Europe to establish credit for the new government, Tucker encouraged them and offered ideas for a paper currency system. Burnley suggested that Tucker might make a European voyage as a Texas diplomat. Little chance existed that Tucker would seek or accept such a post. His interest in the situation broadened, however, as he actively promoted the appointment of Waddy Thompson as minister to Mexico in 1842.

Waddy Thompson was a Clay Whig congressman and slaveholder from the Greenville District of South Carolina. He was an advocate of annexation and had, in fact, moved the resolution of March 1837 which resulted in the recognition of Texas. Tyler did appoint Thompson to the Mexican posting "out of deference to the previous choice of General Harrison and the wishes of Judge Tucker," a decision he confirmed in a note to Tucker.

Tucker’s choice of Thompson as his nominee raises some interesting questions about the latter’s intentions regarding the Spanish borderlands and Tucker’s knowledge of those intentions. From his arrival in Mexico City on 16 April 1842 to his departure on 9 March 1844, Thompson deported himself ably and conscientiously. His personal views on the Texas-Mexican situation are, however, candidly revealed in his Recollections of Mexico published in 1846. This work more than any amount of tactfully rendered
diplomatic correspondence marks him as an ideological "brother" to those instrumental in his appointment.

Thompson, first was an apologist for the institution of slavery as a positive good. He was quick to point out that even though black slavery was ended just after the Mexican revolution the "Negro is regarded and treated ... in Mexico as belonging to a degraded caste...." Mexican Negroes exhibited the characteristics of laziness, filthiness, dishonesty and viciousness which only the benefits of bondage could ameliorate. Second, Thompson, despite his own denials, was unquestionably convinced that Mexico or a part thereof including today's Texas and California would one day belong to the United States. He offered a number of detailed and appealing arguments for this position capped by the categorical pronouncement that he believed "the time is not at all distant, when all the northern departments of Mexico .... will gladly take refuge under our more stable institutions ...." He did not hesitate to add "that our language and laws are destined to pervade this continent, I regard as more certain than any other event which is in the future."32

Thompson's ambitions on behalf of "manifest destiny" notwithstanding, there is no verification that Tucker played any role at all in furthering designs on Mexico south of the Rio Grande. Nor, for that matter, is there verification that Thompson took active steps on behalf of such designs.
They all, however, Tyler and Upshur included with certainty, had a hand in the annexation of Texas.

A treaty of annexation was negotiated by the Tyler administration in 1844 as any textbook might reveal; every southern Whig senator except John Henderson of Mississippi voted against it, and it went down in defeat, 8 June. The machinations involved in the negotiation of the treaty, however, suggest that some "southerners", Tucker, Tyler, Upshur, and Thompson were very favorable to annexation. From the beginning of his administration Tyler had it in mind to annex Texas. In a letter of 11 October 1841 to Daniel Webster, his Secretary of State, he wrote that nothing could "throw so bright a lustre around us .... the great interests of the North would be incalculably advanced .... Slavery, I know that is the objection, and it could be well-founded, if it did not already exist among us; but my belief is, that a rigid enforcement of the laws against the slave-trade would in time make as many free States South as the acquisition of Texas would add slave States, and then the future .... would present wonderful results." Tyler, here, seems to be speaking in broadly national terms contradictory to, for example, the charge leveled by John Quincy Adams the following year against "The Slave-breeding conspiracy" for desiring to add plantation land and pro-slavery states in order to maintain its political viability. He was, however, writing to Daniel Webster who, while
certainly no annexationist, was not indifferent to the possibility of territorial expansion.  

By 1842, Waddy Thompson sensed the political climate in Mexico to be conducive to favorable negotiations over Texas. In a letter of 19 April to Webster he indicated that he perceived a willingness for "this Government ... to cede to us, Texas and the Californias ....", a perception he also presented in a letter of 9 May to John Tyler in which he claimed to "have but little doubt that I shall be able to accomplish your wishes and to add also the acquisitions of Upper California -- This latter I believe by far the most important event that has occurred to our country --."  

Tyler's "wishes" were much encouraged in 1843, first by a stream of editorials in the Madisonian, the administration organ in Washington, supporting his policy; second, a report that Santa Anna had received a letter from a minor Texan official captured in a recent raid which proposed that Texas would consider re-unification with Mexico; third, the intrigues of the English to gain control over Texan affairs. (Unable to achieve annexation to the United States, Texas, compelled to make its position less vulnerable, had sent agents such as Tucker's friend, Burnley, to Europe to work for "recognition of their independence, to negotiate treaties of commerce, and to borrow money ...." England was particularly responsive to these overtures because it hoped to prevent the United States from acquiring an imperial
domain, to use Texas as a constant confrontational wedge between the United States and Latin America, to relieve itself from the danger of dependence on American products by purchasing cotton and tobacco from Texas, and to encourage the liberation of slaves in the republic. A "suspicious" crisis in July of 1843 gave the final impetus to the initiation of secret discussions with the Texans in summer and autumn of 1843.35

The crisis of July 1843 was suspicious because it was initiated by a possibly false report from Duff Green, a Washington publisher and close friend of John Calhoun and John Tyler (and, incidentally, the publisher of Tucker's first novel and an "occasional visitor" to his home), who had been sent by Tyler as an unofficial agent to Europe to report on the international situation. Green revealed that Lord Aberdeen, secretary for foreign affairs, had promised a government guarantee of interest on a loan to Texas on condition that Texas would abolish slavery, consequently destroying competition with Britain's slaveless tropical colonies. Whether the report was factual or conjured up for the purpose of encouraging a favorable vote on annexation, it did cast the project in a more favorable light. Upshur, on 18 September 1843, made an official proposal to negotiate with Texas. When the Texans, with justifiable reluctance, gave little encouragement, Upshur, who "had been busily lobbying among senators in behalf of a Texas annexation
treaty ..." and by 16 January 1844 felt certain of a two-thirds majority, hastened to reassure them. He had already asked Tucker to draw up a preamble and transfer clause of an annexation treaty. In February, Sam Houston, apparently now convinced of serious intent on the part of the United States government, sent J. Pinckney Henderson, an experienced diplomat, to assist Isaac Van Zandt, the Texas minister. Upshur, meanwhile, mollified Mexico with promises of "full justice" if she presented a damage claim for the loss of Texas. The secretary of state, at least in his own mind, seemed on the brink of accomplishing his and Tyler's purpose when he lost his life in the catastrophe on board the U.S.S. Princeton. Waddy Thompson departed Mexico City on 9 March of the same year, having "sometimes since" sent his resignation to Tyler; and, despite Tucker's helpful essay of June 1844, annexation was defeated. Texas was admitted to the union only after the election of 1844 demonstrated support for the step and then, only by a joint resolution of Congress pushed through by Tyler in the last days of his administration.16

Whether Tucker participated in an actual conspiracy to annex Texas or whether there actually was a conspiracy is a moot question. Certain northern senators and congressmen thought there was or, at least, made the accusation. A publicity campaign after Upshur's death, in, for example, the National Intelligencer and the New York Post, raised the
spectre. Southerners, for their part, suspected a northern conspiracy to keep Texas out of the union. Upshur had written Tucker in 1843 that there was a "systematic Conspiracy against the South & its institutions", and Tucker accepted that assessment. Charges of conspiracy, aside, there is a mass of evidence, correspondence, essays, and lectures, which testifies to the fact that Tucker knew individuals like Tyler, Upshur, Burnley, and Green and knew them well. He associated with them on a fairly regular basis and shared their ideology. He also took steps to support actively the realization of that ideology. He wrote essays, developed a plan for a federal banking association (as an alternative to a national bank which, as a "real" whig, he denigrated), offered ideas, and sponsored a candidate for public office. These factors, alone, may demonstrate how influential he may have been in federal policy. The impact on his students and, through them, on their families, the majority of whom were Virginians of the upper class, is impossible to evaluate. What he taught and how much of it reflected his value system will be investigated in the next chapter, but his role as a Tyler advisor reveals the extent of the activism he was willing to invest in making his ideas a reality.37

The Tyler "kitchen cabinet" did not survive the Tyler administration. Upshur had died in 1844, and Dew would do so in 1846. Tucker gradually became estranged from Tyler,
possibly as a result of what he considered to be Tyler's indifference to the advice he constantly proffered. Tyler, himself, never returned to Williamsburg. He retired to his estate, "Sherwood Forest", on the James River about thirty-five miles from Richmond and outlived them all to die, on a Saturday morning, 18 January 1862, about a month before the opening of the first session of the Confederate House of Representatives in which he was to take a seat.

Tucker did not survive to witness the formation of the Confederacy, an event he had predicted, in another form, in the Partisan Leader. He continued as professor of law at William and Mary until he passed away in 1851. Just before his death, in the summer of 1850, the Virginia Assembly passed resolutions that the state send delegates to the proposed Nashville Convention (see footnote), and Judge Beverley Tucker was named as one of these.¹⁸

In the oppressive heat of that summer, delegates from nine slave states met in the terminal of the famous Natchez Trace. The extremists, of whom Tucker was one, under the leadership of South Carolina's Robert Barnwell Rhett, were intent on increasing support for secession. Tucker, himself, addressed the convention on behalf of disunion and the formation of a Southern Confederacy. It was said he imitated the oratorical style of John Randolph and proved himself "one of the most violent delegates present."³⁹
Beverley Tucker must often have walked south on Palace Green to Duke of Gloucester Street, made a right turn at Bruton Parish Church and proceeded west to the College of William and Mary. He might well have encountered John Millington, passing along the same route, or Thomas Dew emerging from the president’s house on his way to the Wren Building. For Tucker, this familiar route presented a metaphorical confirmation-composed of right angles and broad linear arteries, Georgian architecture and boundaried tracts of landed property, a British liberal institution of higher learning and the church of a once-established religion - for what he considered right, reasonable, and, hence, meaningful in life. Environment confirmed ideas which it had created and which Tucker would pass to his intellectual heirs, his students. His father’s "land" had kept him, and the "land" of their forefathers would keep them.
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CHAPTER 7

THE FACULTY: SAUNDERS, BROWNE, MILLINGTON AND MINNEGERODE

Four members of the William and Mary faculty during the Dew presidency remain to complete a composite of the whole. Two, Robert Saunders and Dabney Browne, like Thomas Dew and Beverley Tucker, were tidewater natives, associates of the landed aristocracy, affiliates of the Episcopal church (Dew may have been an exception.), and graduates of William and Mary. John Millington and Charles Minnegerode, on the other hand, were different. Millington was born in England and did not leave his native land until he was fifty years old. He spent nearly three years in Mexico before moving to Philadelphia and, from there, to Williamsburg. Minnegerode was born in the German state of Hesse-Darmstadt and came to the United States in 1839 when he was twenty-five.

Saunders, Browne, and Minnegerode left no pedagogical publications reflecting their value systems or ideology. Millington produced several textbooks - *Epitome of the Elementary Principles of Natural and Experimental Philosophy* (1823) and *Elements of Civil Engineering* (1839) - hardly the type of work to reveal specific personal beliefs. In their lifestyles, however, their associations, their actions
(sometimes substantiated by their public addresses, journals or letters), they endorsed what was considered meaningful in their social context. For Saunders and Browne, this acceptance was scarcely surprising; for Millington and Minnegerode, such an easy acculturation was probably occasioned by what they perceived to be agreeable characteristics in their adopted environment similar to or compatible with those in environments they had left behind. An academic circumstance, for the most part, entirely pleasant, certainly heightened that perception. It will be the purpose of this chapter to demonstrate that these four faculty members complete the portrait of a social-intellectual unit overwhelmingly homogenous in its value system. In the course of this demonstration, certain cultural and accultural dynamics - class stratification, property-holding, political philosophy, etc. - will be explored to determine how this homogeneity came to be.

The reading room of the old William and Mary library was donated by the Saunders family and dedicated to Robert Saunders. On the memorial table, Saunders was described as "an able soldier, a sterling citizen, an accomplished gentleman .... with a worthy name." Like Beverley Tucker's epitaph, Saunders' table recorded for posterity the characteristics considered worthwhile by the class from which these gentlemen came. They were both from families considered highly reputable, families which held or had once
held considerable land; they subscribed to the appropriate religious affiliation, esteemed education and contributed public service. They were also the families which held slaves, feared the growth of federal power, and supported states rights.¹

Robert Saunders was born in Williamsburg 25 January 1805. His birthdate made him three years younger than Thomas Dew and twenty-one years younger than Beverley Tucker. As the son of another Robert Saunders, he inherited a comfortable position in one of the families considered "first" in the tidewater. If Saunders, himself, was not a major landowner, his social and genealogical ties would certainly classify him with that group. His wife, Lucy Burwell Page, whom he married in 1828, was the youngest daughter of John Page, governor of Virginia from 1800 to 1804, lifelong friend of Thomas Jefferson, and the owner of the celebrated "Rosewell" plantation. The marriage allied Saunders with a genuine "cavalier" dynasty whose progenitors had come to Virginia during the English Civil War and the Cromwellian Protectorate. His great, great grandfather, John Saunders, in addition, had lived in York County and had owned a large estate in land and slaves. John Saunders' son (Robert's great grandfather), also named Robert, apparently made the move to Williamsburg where his son, another John (the faculty member's grandfather) was a contractor.²
If not originally, then certainly by the time of Robert Saunders' father, a second "Robert", the Saunders family had become part of the "old guard" or power elite in the old capital. It would be difficult to ascertain father Robert's financial worth, but he had the wherewithal, in 1801, to purchase a prominent local residence in a prestigious location, the stately Carter house, built sometime before 1746 and located on the west side of the Palace Green, the first house to the right of what had been the palace, itself. Robert Saunders bequeathed the "Carter" house to his son, the Robert of this dissertation, who was probably born there. That Robert resided there during his tenure as mathematics professor at William and Mary and as her president is certain. There he died of typhoid, 11 September 1868.³

Affiliation with the Episcopal Church was a second significant credential for membership in the upper class of tidewater society. Robert Saunders' father was described by Bishop Meade as a "lawyer of distinction in Williamsburg" with a good religious character, and Robert Saunders, himself, served as a vestryman of Bruton Parish Church. Public service, too, was not neglected. Robert, senior, had served under General Nathaniel Green (whose close friend he became) in the southern campaign during the Revolutionary War and, later, in the state senate and on the William and Mary Board of Visitors. Robert, junior, followed along in
the family tradition, becoming, upon his resignation from
the William and Mary presidency in 1848, head of the Eastern
State Hospital (Williamsburg’s "lunatic" asylum), a state
senator (like his father), mayor of Williamsburg, city
magistrate, and city councilman. During the Civil War, he
was a captain in the Quartermaster’s Department of the
Confederate army.

Robert Saunders’ education furnished the final
criterion for status in the tidewater, and at least as far
back as his father’s generation education was accorded
proper regard by his family. His father studied law
sufficiently to allow him to pursue a practice. Robert went
his father one better. He graduated from William and Mary
in 1823 and even studied law for a brief period at the
University of Virginia. Such an academic background gave
Saunders the qualifications for a faculty appointment at the
college, but the tale of his candidacy and election to the
mathematics chair in 1833 reveals the ingrown and nepotistic
character of local collegiate politics.

At the time of Robert Saunders’ candidacy for a faculty
position, both his brother-in-law, John Page, a lawyer, and
his (Robert’s) father, also, of course, a lawyer, were
William and Mary "Visitors". His father-in-law, the former
governor, had served in the same capacity. The vote on
Saunders was six to five in favor of his appointment; five
of the six, among them John Page, were Williamsburg
residents. Although Robert, senior, properly abstained, he may indeed have had an accurate estimate of the results which would ensure his son's success. Saunders would remain at William and Mary until 1848, accepting the position of the presidency upon Dew's death in 1846. He resigned in 1848 in protest against the election of Archibald Peachy (another Williamsburg resident and a former student of Tucker) to teach moral philosophy, metaphysics, belles lettres, and logic. Saunders, failing, perhaps, to recall the circumstances of his own appointment, regarded Peachy's ascendancy as "a matter not of academic credentials .... but of favoritism and political jobbery." His adverse reaction may not have been so much directed against the custom of using influence to achieve objectives as it was against the agency and nature of the acts realizing the custom. Saunders was known to be an old guard, "genteel and well-born scholar." He and his family were powerful, certainly not above using influence, albeit seemingly in a gracious manner, as was evidenced by their position in promoting the election of brother-in-law, John Page, to the William and Mary faculty in 1827, a campaign which failed, their espousal of Robert's appointment in 1833, and their participation in the contest over control of the Eastern State Hospital's Court of Directors in 1850-52.4

The contest over control of the Hospital's Court of Directors reflected the large and growing antipathy between
those unique tidewater Whigs (see chapter 5), more representative of John Randolph's Quidism than even old-line Jeffersonianism, and Virginia's new Democrats chiefly from central and western Virginia but also lying in wait in small tidewater pockets to do in the old regime whose roots lay in the colonial past. The Saunders family was deeply offended in 1849 when the Democrats, led by the young, self-made lawyer, Lemuel Jackson Bowden, demanded that Democrats be included in the Court of Directors. Their demand was particularly timely and potent because of the recent election of Democrat, John Buchanan Floyd, to the governorship of the state. The controversy split Williamsburg and continued until the Civil War. It was all the more divisive because jobs and contracts were at stake as well as social and political status. Governor Floyd appointed Democrats to the Court, and the General Assembly reinforced this Democratic wedge by abolishing life tenure of directors and limiting their terms to three or four years. Bowden, adding insult to injury, along with two other Williamsburg Democrats brought charges of mismanagement against the Court which resulted in an investigation. Robert Saunders, himself, was not implicated in any questionable dealings of a financial nature. He was believed to be a gentleman and above such behavior. He was, however, known to be extremely conservative, critical of democracy in the broad sense and even favorable toward
monarchy, and the Hospital struggle only reinforced his views.

Robert Saunders clearly fit the faculty pattern of the Dew presidency. His ties to the land/slave-holding elite, his ownership of slaves, his conservatism, his role in local politics, his religious affiliation, and his education, liberal and legal, marked him as a product of his environment, an experience unchanged by the imprint of any external forces. Such an assessment does not imply negative criticism for the time and place or cast Saunders' genuine intellectual capacity and teaching skill into shadow. His students thought "well" of him, and his colleagues respected him for his intelligence. He simply represented to an even greater degree, perhaps, than Dew and Tucker the colonial inheritance, and he could not countenance the leveling direction the new nation was taking.

The one member of the Dew faculty who did not seem to enjoy his colleagues' respect, at least for his academic prowess, was Dabney Browne. Browne was provisionally appointed to the position of Professor of Humanity September 5, 1825, an appointment confirmed by the Visitors on October 16, 1826. The Visitors also appointed Dew to the Professorship of Political Economy on October 16. Browne appears to represent the same characteristics which were
almost a prerequisite for faculty membership, but very little is known about him.

The Browne family "almost certainly" had its origin in New Kent county, immediately adjacent to James City county in the tidewater. Bishop Meade describes it as one of the old and leading families in eastern Virginia in colonial and post-Revolutionary times. Dabney Browne's most immediate, verifiable ancestor was his grandfather, William Browne, who established the family in James City county. William owned slaves, and, most probably, the family owned or once owned land. Dabney's uncle, John Browne, was Commissary General of the state during the Revolution, in service to the public, and his brother, William, was Chancellor of Williamsburg district. William was married to Sally Galt, daughter of Dr. John Galt of the locally prominent Galt family which had furnished at least one visitor to the college board, Alexander, who was elected in 1808. Dabney's father, another William, married twice, and Dabney was a child of his first marriage.  

Like Dew, Tucker, and Saunders, Dabney Browne was a graduate of William and Mary, receiving the Bachelor of Arts degree in 1810 along with Ferdinand Campbell, George Croghan, Francis Gilmer, Homer Inman, and William Taylor. A Page, William B., received a law degree in the same year. These names do not rank with those of Madison, Jefferson, and Randolph, but they certainly entwine in a network of the
elite which included Dabney Browne, a network reinforcing status with education. Browne’s academic capacity was, however, not greatly appreciated by some of his colleagues. When the Grammar School was phased out in the mid-1830s, Browne, whose responsibility it was, resigned, in 1840, to accept a position as headmaster of an academy in Brunswick County. Dew, at the time, told William Barton Rogers that he wished to fill the vacancy "with a much more efficient scholar than our old friend Mr. Browne, who is pretty much like the old steamboat Columbia on the North River, going at the rate of 4 miles an hour. And the best of the joke was, you know, that Browne swore to the last that all systems of teaching besides his own, was [sic] d--- humbug."10

Though of dubious academic stature, Dabney Browne displayed a sufficient number of appropriate characteristics for inclusion within the category of William and Mary academic "types". He belonged to an old tidewater family of standing which owned slaves; he had ties to other families of the class; he was educated at William and Mary, and he was considered acceptable for a position on the faculty. Like Dew, Tucker, and Saunders, he conformed in certain significant ways to a mold which, like some procrustean bed, simply did not accommodate those too "long" or too "short" for its confines. It would appear, at first glance, that the last two faculty members of the Dew presidency would unquestionably be too "long" or too "short" for the fabled
couch. Neither, as far as is known, had owned much land or slaves or even advocated slavery before immigration to the United States. Neither was related by blood or marriage with any tidewater family when they chanced upon the scene. Neither was a native-born American. The first, John Millington, was an Englishman; the second, Charles Frederick Ernest Minnergerode, was a German.

It is not the primary purpose of this dissertation to explore the process of acculturation for William and Mary's two foreign-born academics of the Dew administration. It is, however, part of a larger purpose to demonstrate how quickly two immigrants to the tidewater "bought into" the prevailing value system and came to regard themselves as cultural and political brothers of their colleagues. Both Millington and Minnegerode furnish the finishing, albeit slightly irregular, strokes which complete the portrait of a faculty unified in its subscription to and participation in a culture in which they assumed a dominant status and consciously or subconsciously used their status to sustain that dominance.

John Millington's grave is in the Bruton Parish church-yard in Williamsburg, beside the wall which separates the churchyard from the backyard of the Wythe House which he owned and loved. His tombstone commemorates his academic and professional accomplishments, his qualities as a friend and the value he assigned to his religious faith. From all
accounts, as will be shown, he was, according to most standards of western civilization, a genuinely "good" man. Such an evaluation, however, does not distract from the characteristics which made him "at one" with his colleagues in the acceptance and support of his adopted environment's conception of life's priorities.

John Millington was born in London during the Revolutionary War on 11 May 1779. He was the third son of an attorney, Thomas Charles Millington, and by the circumstances of birth a member of the English middle class. He received, in his own words, "a liberal education and was bred to the law, which I studied in the Temple during five years, and practiced during two years afterwards." He had previously spent some time at Oxford, but he left before obtaining a degree because of financial troubles. This did not prevent him from achieving something of a reputation in learned circles, although that reputation, oddly enough, was related to his second career as an engineer and a doctor.\textsuperscript{11}

Millington seemingly found the law in some way unfulfilling, and he turned to a field which he claimed he had found appealing "from youth". He probably acquired his engineering training as a pupil studying under an unknown master. The pupilage system was the accepted method of professional preparation in England, at the time, to meet the demand for engineers produced by the acceleration of industrialization with its focus on improving national
internal transportation systems between factories and from
factory to merchandising depot. Millington fit this milieu
well, obtaining a patent for a ship’s propeller and
preparing papers on hydraulic rams and street illumination.
He began lecturing at the Royal Institution of Great Britain
in London in 1815. He was appointed Professor of Mechanics
there on 7 July 1817. He helped found the London Mechanics’
Institution in 1823 and served as one of their vice-
presidents until he left England.¹²

Engineering and law were not sufficient to Millington’s
considerable reservoir of talents and skills. He also
studied medicine with Sir Astley Cooper in London and
lectured on natural philosophy and chemistry at Guy’s
Hospital, London, and on mechanical philosophy and civil
engineering at the University of London. He held, in
addition, the Chair of Natural Philosophy in the Royal
Institution of Great Britain for sixteen years.

According to the above description, John Millington was
a man of considerable erudition and education, a man
respected and trusted by his peers, a man who had associated
with such as "Davy, Hatchett," and "Faraday", a man who was
soon to leave his homeland and, via Mexico, come to
tidewater Virginia and find an environmental niche which, if
not splendidly fulfilling, was, at least, sufficiently
satisfying to compensate him for the rewards he had left
behind. What characteristics, then, did he find in his
adopted circumstance which served to meet his emotional and intellectual needs, and how did he come to find that circumstance?¹³

Millington left England for Mexico in October 1829. He intended to take a position as engineering superintendent for a mine at Guanajuato, one of those owned by the Anglo-Mexican Mining Association which also owned a mint. Millington’s reasons for accepting the Mexican position are clouded. Apparently he was one of the owners of the Hammersmith Ironworks which might have sold three boilers to the Bolanos Company. The Bolanos Company had leased or just left the boilers at Guanajuato, and Millington may have been retained to repair, install or in some way service these boilers. Whatever his reasons, he did go to Mexico, selling all his household goods, and taking with him his wife and three children. His "bright expectations", however, "vanished into air", and he and his son Tom, left Mexico in the April of 1832. His two daughters, who had married, remained behind along with his wife who intended to join him in Philadelphia and return to England with him.¹⁴

Some interesting questions arise about the Millington family sojourn in Mexico. The departure from England seems rather precipitous, especially so since Millington had been appointed to build a suspension bridge at Great Marlow in the April of 1829. That work could scarcely have been completed by October. He might, of course, have left the
supervision of the project in perfectly competent hands. Why, though, did he sell all his household goods? He had perhaps, as he, himself, stated, "brilliant pecuniary prospects" which could allow for a refurnishing in the grand style. The prospects were never realized, however, and even before he left England Millington was aware of this possibility and had attempted a release from his commitment. The Anglo-Mexican Association had apparently offered him or promised him some "bonds", but a draft of his contract with them made those bonds useless. And, yet, he sailed for Mexico. In later years, he claimed he was "foolish", and this may be an entirely valid explanation for the immigration.\textsuperscript{15}

It is not surprising that Millington found Mexico uncongenial. The visual environment of the old colonial silver capital, Guanajuato, would not have provided landscape or architecture in any way similar to what he had known. The city clung to the walls of a narrow, rugged canyon, its streets, steep and broken by stairways, its houses piled on top of one another, literally rooftop-to-foundation. Early buildings were Andalusian in design, with a Moorish touch, and hidden among them were little plazas named for angels, saints, and ethnic groups. The jumbled architecture and the precipitous and circuitous streets did not allow for the open vistas of the new English cities or of parts of London, itself, and Millington might very well
have felt the impact of confinement and confusion. The situation was not improved by unhealthful living conditions which prostrated his wife with cholera and by the imminent possibility of revolution.

When Millington left Mexico, his life took a turn which yielded results bearing remarkable similarities to certain characteristics of Beverley Tucker’s life. Like the judge in Missouri, he experienced some kind of failure in his Mexican project. What it was exactly is not known, but it involved a lien against his mathematical instruments by the Anglo-Mexican Mining Association which was not released until after he had left the country. His wife, in addition, would die in 1833, on her way to Philadelphia, and Millington, like Tucker, would be left a widower.¹⁶

In Philadelphia, Millington, instead of returning to England, compounded past mistakes (by his own admission) and opened a scientific equipment store. This venture was a "complete failure" because he knew little about the practicalities of merchandising or dealing with employees. He was more successful in his personal life, however, and, like Tucker, made a happy remarriage with Sarah Ann Letts with whom he began a second family of, again, three children.¹⁷

In 1835 Millington was working as chief engineer for the Rappahannock Mining Company at their mines located about ten miles southwest of Fredericksburg, Virginia, when he
decided to apply to William and Mary for the chair of chemistry and natural philosophy about to be vacated by William Barton Rogers. On October 11, he recorded in his diary that he had received a letter "inclosing one from Mr. Page" [Rector of William and Mary and Robert Saunders' brother-in-law] informing him he had been appointed to the position.18

Millington's first contact with William and Mary came through the Page-Saunders connection which would become a lasting bond. His first visit to the college, in the same October, was mentored by Page and Robert Saunders who conducted him on a tour of the facility including the laboratory and his lecture room. Before Millington could sever his ties with the Rappahannock Mining Company, he experienced what had come to be for him habitual difficulties in changing his employment status. The owners of the company resisted his departure and demanded a settlement. The misunderstanding was negotiated to a successful conclusion through the auspices of Mr. Page, and Millington began his teaching career at William and Mary in the second half of the 1835-36 session.

Millington's dedication to his teaching was public knowledge, if Robert Saunders and Benjamin Ewell are to be believed. He wrote a textbook, Elements of Civil Engineering, based upon lecture notes compiled to meet the need for some kind of standard text (when none, at the time,
existed) and invested personal funds in the purchase of apparatus and specimens which composed what was a "superb collection". Even his students testified to his commitment. In the Richmond Compiler they compared him to a Professor Silliman and stated that "during the last three years" he had "lectured twice in every day except Saturdays and Sundays .... during 40 weeks in each year; making 1200 lectures in three years; and as the average duration of each lecture is 1 1/2 hour; this amounts to 1800 hours of speaking, or 25 days of 24 hours each of unceasing talking in each year." Dedication to the actual "work" of teaching was not, however, Millington's sole recommendation. His "kind and genial manners and his integrity and simplicity of character... won the confidence and respect of his classes and was regarded by them - not only as an instructor but as a friend." Here, apparently, was a teacher with a genuine "aptitude for imparting knowledge" who devoted time and energy to the construction of his scholarly presentation and, in addition, earned the affection of those for whom he labored.19

As Millington's new environment responded positively to his personality and skill, so did he respond to Williamsburg, finding the town extremely congenial, so appealing, in fact, that while he had once dreamed of returning to England, he now believed he "should have ended my days in this place." He and his wife reinforced their
ties to the old colonial city by purchasing a prominent residence on prestigious Palace Green. It was the Wythe House (see chapter 2) just north of Bruton Parish Church and one house removed from that of Robert Saunders. Across the street, at the corner of Nicholson and Palace Green stood the residence of Beverley Tucker. Millington and his wife, Ann, loved their new home, returning to it during "vacation time", when they dined with the Saunders and other old friends, even after they had moved to Oxford, Mississippi. He expressed their joint wish, as late as 1859, to return "here to end our days", and they actually had planned that return, never realized, as late as 1861.\textsuperscript{20}

Dew's death and the controversy over the Peachy affair in 1848 disposed Millington, who sided with Saunders in the matter, to accept a position at the, then, new university in Oxford, Mississippi. During the controversy, Millington and Saunders (with apparently some support from Minnegerode) went so far as to entertain prospects of revitalizing the dream of organizing a "college in Richmond." When the Visitors asked faculty to resign, Millington did so, not expecting to be re-elected. He was greatly surprised, therefore, when the Board did re-elect him, an appointment he was forced to decline as he had already committed himself to Oxford.\textsuperscript{21}

In Oxford, Millington's commitment to teaching was, again, evident. In his own words, he considered his
students his friends. He apparently took enormous care in seeing they possessed not only factual knowledge but also a social, more specifically, an ethical philosophy of its implications. He felt the responsibility to remind them that knowledge was not for the bearer, alone, but to promote the "welfare and happiness of those around them." The practice of civil engineering, like any other profession, was accompanied by certain responsibilities, a solid grasp of the basic subject matter as well as new developments, the "firmness" of character to insist that no risks be taken in construction jeopardizing safety in the name of economy, and a sense of fairness in the engineer's role as "arbiter or judge between the employer and the employed." The pitfalls of an engineer's environment were not beyond Millington's notice. He warned students against carrying any "intimacies" which might arise in "thinly populated or even unfrequented places....beyond the limits of propriety", against wasting money, "borrowing money from contractors or workmen" which would literally upset the fine balance of power the engineer must maintain.²²

In addition to a social conscience, Millington displayed a humanistic regard for other disciplines. He knew his Adam Smith, being fully conversant with the economic dynamics in which the professions arise "out of the necessities of society, for they all spring from the mutual dependence of men on each other, and the advantages that
accrue to individuals from a division of talent and labor." John Locke was included in the pantheon of heroes to whose "lights" Millington hoped students would aspire. In leisure moments, he read Greek drama, proving himself a worthy product of the liberal education he claimed he had received at Oxford.23

The shortcomings of the American educational system were not lost on John Millington, with his background in the best of English schools. In discussing the history of the relatively new Memphis Medical College whose faculty he joined in 1853, he pointed out, in comparing the Memphis school to certain European institutions, that American professors might feel a sense of pride if they ever experienced "even the smiles, much more the gratitude of their fellow-citizens. But half of them (or more) are unconscious of the existence of such an institution in their midst, and the majority of them do not care whether it exists ... or is defunct .... Another singular point about our institution is that, notwithstanding its acknowledged utility .... it has not, since its foundation, received the slightest pecuniary aid from the State, the corporation, or any individual ...."24

John Millington’s dedication to his profession, his students his church and his community, his friends and his family is well-documented. He was, very probably, the gentle, amiable, sincere soul he was portrayed to be,
possibly the most likeable of the contemporary William and Mary masters. Sadly, only in death would he be allowed to return to the Williamsburg home he had loved. He died during the Civil War on 10 July 1863, at his daughter’s home in Richmond, waiting to return to Williamsburg, then occupied by Union troops. He supported the Confederacy, and his son, George, served in the Confederate army. Clearly he hoped for victory for his adopted homeland and openly advocated war between England and the United States to take pressure off the South. He had transferred his filial duty to a new environment he found reflective of his desire for well-being, and, like many native sons of the South, he was accorded an honorable burial in the graveyard of his parish church, Bruton Parish Church, near the wall separating the grounds from those of his old home.25

The acculturation of John Millington may have been supported by the similarities he found between his English and his American environments. To what extent the design and architecture of Williamsburg, an English colonial town, and its Georgian architecture imprinted his mind and emotions is a matter of conjecture as is the extent to which the crown-chartered institution of William and Mary presented itself to him as a thoroughly English reflection. Certainly, in his later days, he had no illusions about the control which community exerted over American institutions as opposed to those of Europe, and his experience with the
heavy, controlling "arm" of William and Mary's Board of Visitors merely underscored his perception of the distinction. Slavery was not sufficiently repugnant to him to prevent his ownership of "servants" nor was a slave society an unknown experience for him. Until 1833, almost a year after Millington left England for Mexico, slavery was legal in the British Empire, although not in England, itself.  

While John Millington's affinity for the South can be rationalized, it is extremely difficult to find the same characteristics of identification between the native and the adopted country of his colleague and the last faculty member to figure as a subject for this dissertation, Charles Ernest Minnegerode. Minnegerode was hired in 1842 to fill the classics chair vacated by Dabney Browne. The Visitors preferred a Southerner or a Northerner or an Englishman, if a Southerner could not be found. They did not want an Irishman or a German. And, yet, the very "German" Minnegerode was chosen from over thirty applicants. He must have been impressive. He certainly impressed President Dew who considered him the "most thorough classical scholar he had ever met."  

The "impressive" Charles Frederick Ernest Minnegerode came from a background amply furnished with the "stuff" of romantic legend. He was the son of the president of the Hesse-Darmstadt Superior Court. Hesse-Darmstadt was one of
the thirty-nine states of the German Confederation created by the Congress of Berlin in 1815. It lay between the western and the eastern sections of Prussia and in the early 1830s was touched by that peculiar brand of German romantic liberal fervor which produced a good deal of political ferment. A few rulers in northern Germany, in Saxony and Hanover, specifically, were forced to grant their subjects a constitution. These examples heightened the tension, and in May 1832 twenty-five thousand revolutionary sympathizers gathered in Hesse-Darmstadt in honor of Lafayette and to demand the union of the German states into a republic. In 1833, revolutionaries attempted to seize Frankfort which lay between Hesse and Darmstadt and was the seat of the Diet, the chief organ of the Confederation composed of diplomats (not representatives) from the sovereign states. All this revolutionary activity in Germany was, in great measure, student-based and, consequently, the activity of a small minority influenced by ideas which had not yet filtered down to the grass roots level. Charles Minnegerode was apparently one of these students.

Minnegerode was enrolled at the University of Giessen and was at least suspected of seditious activities. He was imprisoned for eighteen months and spent some time under house arrest. In 1839 he immigrated to the United States, landing at Philadelphia, and found work teaching ancient and modern languages. The extent of his alleged revolutionary
activities and the impact of his father's role on the punitive measures taken against him are undetermined.\textsuperscript{28}

In Williamsburg Minnegerode quickly acclimated himself to his new environment in the usual ways. He allied himself with the first families and, forsaking his Lutheran persuasion, became an Episcopalian. He was taken in by the Tuckers, serving for a time as a tutor for their children, and married into the land-and-slave-holding Carter clan. He would eventually have a falling out with Tucker over the celebrated Peachy affair, but that did not deter him from immersing himself in the local lifestyle. He later became an ordained Episcopal priest and served as rector of St. Paul's, the denomination's primary church in Richmond, for thirty-three years. He was Jefferson Davis' pastor and friend during the years of the Confederacy and until the end of Davis's life in 1889. He was instrumental in Davis' conversion to Episcopalianism and officiated at his baptism. On that fatal (for the Confederacy) Sunday of 2 April 1865, when news of Lee's retreat from Petersburg arrived at the Richmond War Office and Jefferson Davis was summoned from his pew in St. Paul's, Minnegerode was, undoubtedly, crying "aloud in anguish", as he had taken to doing in the last months of the war, those words of the Litany petitioning the Lord to deliver "us" from "pestilence and famine, battle, murder and sudden death." The Lord, unfortunately, did not see fit to deliver, but Minnegerode did not desert his post,
remaining in Richmond during those tumultuous days of fire and pillage when the Army of the James first occupied the city. Nor did he hesitate to visit Davis during his imprisonment at Fortress Monroe or even "beard" Secretary of War Stanton in his Washington "den" seeking greater liberty for Davis who was in failing health. When Davis died in 1889, it was Minnegerode who delivered the memorial address at St. Paul's.29

Minnegerode's seeming acceptance of an extremely conservative, socially stratified culture appears incongruous given his liberal-revolutionary European background. A better understanding of Germany's peculiar brand of liberalism, however, will demonstrate that precisely by reason of his European heritage Minnegerode was an ideal candidate for the role of honorary Virginian.

German liberalism of the 1830s, the time-frame of Minnegerode's seditious activities, was a belief system placing a far greater emphasis on freedom that it did on equality, a sentiment very similar to Jeffersonian or even "Quidistic" thought. Minnegerode was no stranger to strictly structured classes. The "manor" in Germany, as the southern plantation, served as an economic, political, and social administrative unit. It was not until after 1850 that the German states began to revise the legal relationships of those who lived on such estates who, in general, exchanged obligatory service for land tenure.
Peasants were not slaves, but southerners, in their mythmaking, preferred to represent their slaves as "servants" legally bound to serve in exchange for life's necessities and, moreover, completely incapable of directing their own lives as responsible individuals. There was enough of a reality-base for that myth for Minnegerode to accommodate comfortably to the tidewater lifestyle. He would, in addition, have had little difficulty in adjusting to an agriculturally-based economy. When he left Germany in 1839, it had not yet embarked upon the rapid industrialization of the next decade.

German liberalism, in addition to its agricultural and class-based characteristics, featured a hard nationalistic core which gave it incredible strength. The desire to unite the "Germanies" in a single political, economic, and social unit in order to overcome the distinct and disadvantageous vulnerabilities of Germany's geopolitical position has something in it akin to the South's attitude that it had been badly used by a malevolent "North" and only in strong unified action did salvation lie. Minnegerode clearly supported the South and the Confederacy. He referred to the "South" as the "land of the South" and a "country" in its own right. In his very European mind, the immensity of a continental American union could conjure up the specter of oppression while a confederation of eleven states could seem
a reasonable political unit. His actions indicated his acceptance of a region's right to unite and assert itself, and in this acceptance the rector of 1861 hearkens back to the student of the 1830s.¹⁰

As a German student in the 1830s and particularly as a classicist, Minnegerode would have been unique if he had not in some way been exposed to the doctrines of Hegel, probably Germany's best and most influential philosopher of the first third of the nineteenth century, "the greatest teacher at the most important university [Berlin] in Germany." Whereas liberalism and Hegelian idealism are distinct and, superficially, at least, Hegelian thought appears anti-liberal, yet, such liberal institutions as constitutional monarchy, local government, representative assemblies, etc. found a responsive note in Hegel's system. Hegel's ideal "state" was a rational creature based on rational laws and individual rights derived from the community which was the sole justification and guarantee of those rights. If, indeed, Minnegerode was influenced by Hegel, and he could scarcely have avoided such influence, his support of the Confederacy might be perceived as support of a rational and righteous political construct against an irrational and oppressive force. If Hegel's influence on Minnegerode was essentially negative i.e. eliciting his opposition against its perceived totalitarian implications, then, the "north" would have assumed, in Minnegerode's value system the very
same position of usurper and arch-antagonist. Regardless of Minnegerode’s reaction to the philosophical systems projected in his university system, the nationalistic spirit of Hegelianism and the German environmental context could not help but serve to affect his perceptions as to what was politically as well as economically and socially meaningful in life, and his actions clearly demonstrated, in the end, that this lay, for him, in Virginia.  

The extent of German liberalism’s and Hegelianism’s impact on Charles Minnegerode is impossible to determine as is the extent of their influence on his support of the Confederacy. Both belief systems, however, shored up one another, and both contained tenets which were not inimical to the general values upon which the Confederacy was structured. Both systems were, moreover, inextricably mixed with the cultural values of the environment in which Minnegerode was raised, and for one system, at least, liberalism, he was willing to endure imprisonment and expatriation. He was prepared intellectually, therefore, for his adopted Virginian environment, and he found it not only acceptable but also compatible with meaningful existence.

Minnegerode’s memorial sermon delivered upon the death of Jefferson Davis, fifty years after Minnegerode’s arrival in the United States, is indicative of his mature grasp of what held value for him. His affection for the
Confederacy’s president is apparent. As he describes it, the "acquaintance....soon grew into friendly intercourse that became closer and closer, till an intimacy sprung up which ripened into companionship in joy and sorrow, and bound us together in terms of mutual trust and friendship that was to last as long as life, and which will remain forever one of my dearest remembrances." He describes Davis as a man who stood by "what is right, even unto death." He was a "noble son of the South" who had suffered "martyrdom" for a cause, serving "God and his country". In the context of the memorial, Davis assumes heroic proportions, a custom reminiscent of most public memorials of the period; but the references to the South and the rectitude of its cause would indicate along with Minnegerode's sustained residence in Virginia and identification with what had once been the established religion where his sympathies lay and the values upon which they were based.32

Three of the four William and Mary faculty members constituting the focus of this chapter clearly demonstrate their unity with Dew and Tucker in their perceptions of life’s elemental values. Consciously or subconsciously they affirmed landholding, class stratification, an appropriate religious affiliation, an education of a certain kind, and public service. The fourth member, Dabney Browne, would appear from the material available, to have shared their perceptions. Together, they presented to their students in
the years of the Dew presidency a solid "front", a living testament on behalf of the basic value construct from which they and most of their students came. They did not always agree on matters of academic administration, as in the Peachy affair which post-dated Dew's lifetime, but with Dew and Tucker they provided a sometimes mute but always eloquent commentary on life which was as intense as any words heard in a classroom.
CHAPTER 7
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CHAPTER 8
WHAT THEY TAUGHT: THOMAS DEW

The author of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire tells us, that he first caught the inspiration which gave rise to his great work, while gazing from the modern capitol of Rome on the ruins that lie scattered over the vallies [sic] and the seven hills. May we not hope then that many of you will catch a similar inspiration amid the interesting objects which surround you while breathing in this old and hospitable city, a political atmosphere that still retains all the ardor and patriotism of former days!

With these ringing phrases, Thomas R. Dew, newly made president of William and Mary, addressed his student body at the opening of the term, Monday, 10 October 1836. Consciously and pointedly he made a classically-framed reference to their environment of college and community. He reminded them that they would "assemble daily in these classic halls, which have witnessed the collegiate labors of some of the greatest and noblest men who have ever lived" and that "at the other end of our street, and in full view, stand the interesting remains of the Old Capitol of
Virginia, which every true Virginian must gaze on with mingled emotions of pride and pleasure. " It would have been evident to the students, most of them Virginians, that Dew's sentiments were heartfelt and that for him the college and the community, past and present, represented much of what was meaningful in life. They would soon discover, if they had not done so already, that their new president's substantial scholarly accomplishments and interesting and informative lectures, delivered in a most congenial manner, were designed to sanction and promote a world view which college and community represented in concrete form.  

Thomas Dew's world and his rudimentary view of its meaningful characteristics have already been presented in this dissertation. The purpose of Chapter VIII will be to analyze the ideas he offered his classes (and his reading public) which supported what he considered meaningful in his environment and to demonstrate how these ideas formed part of a holistic experience provided by the William and Mary faculty for its students. The basis for this analysis will be two sets of lecture notes, both printed for use in his classes. The first is A Digest of the Laws, Customs, Manners, and Institutions of the Ancient and Modern Nations; the second is the Lectures on the Restrictive System. Incidental reference will be made to two of Dew's published essays, the Dissertation on the Characteristic Differences Between the Sexes and the more famous Review of the Debate
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in the Virginia Legislature, 1831-32, on slavery. Neither of the latter two works will be considered in their entirety, however, as they were essays intended for the reading public. They contained, undoubtedly, elaborations of material presented originally in the classroom, but this chapter will maintain its focus on the academic experience in a southern institution of higher learning. As such, it may not only partially fulfill Eugene Genovese's charge that Dew's work deserves "careful study for its intrinsic value and not merely as a document of southern intellectual history" but also offer some insight into the academic origin of the ideas "that had an inestimable influence on the minds of those who would lead southern slave society."

Thomas Dew, as will be shown, believed he was educating some of those leaders, and he defined "education" as "not only the moral and intellectual discipline which we derive from our parents and teachers, but to include the influence of physical organization [body structure] of the physical circumstances by which we are surrounded, of opinion - in fine, all those influences which are extraneous to the mind itself, but capable of forming and directing." In his own words, Dew indicated his awareness of the impact made upon his students not only by his words but also by the public manifestation of his personal life as a "master" at the College of William and Mary, as a resident of the community.
of Williamsburg. It was his legacy to his academic "children".3

Dew's Digest of the Laws, Customs, Manners, and Institutions of the Ancient and Modern Nations (hereafter, Digest) should be approached solely as a set of classroom lectures and not as a scholarly, interpretive work, although it displays some of the best characteristics of both types as to organization, presentation and contents. It is a work of about 662 printed pages organized into two main divisions: ancient history and modern history. The ancient section begins with the cosmogony of the ancient world and ends with the fall of the western Roman empire. Dew's focus, here, is on the Biblical base of the humanistic world, the development of Babylonian, Egyptian, Grecian, and Roman civilization; he does not fail, however, to broaden his scope with pertinent references to eastern societies, their religious and political institutions. The second division of the work begins with the development of the feudal system in western Europe, moves through the political entrenchment of Christianity, the development of the nation state, the Reformation, the formation of the English constitutional system, and ends with the French Revolution, specifically, the fall of Robespierre and the institution of the Directory.

In its presentation, the Digest is essentially "Socratic," structured as a series of questions followed
immediately by their answers, for example, "What are the two revolutions, according to Dr. Robertson, which have exercised the greatest influence on Europe?" These questions deal not only with political, economic and military issues but also with those that are social, cultural, religious and artistic. This method indicates Dew's Voltairian grasp of the historian's appropriate subject matter most broadly indicative of a society's belief system.¹

The content of the Digest is not solely factual but interpretive, as well, including a surprising grasp of cause-effect significance and the impact of class dynamics on social movements. Dew continuously refers to the historical authorities of the time - Carlyle, Alison, Theirs on the French Revolution, Guizot on feudalism, Hugh Legaré on Greece, Humboldt on Latin America - and impresses upon his students the importance of primary sources - monuments, in the broad sense, from pyramids to canals to piles of stone, and literature, The Canterbury Tales, troubadour poetry, the Divine Comedy - as reflecting the mind - set of the civilization being explored. He, in addition, emphasizes the importance of ethnographical studies, geography and geology, accepting and utilizing the theories of geologists who laid the foundations for Darwin's work by asserting the principles of evolution - that geology proved "an antiquity greatly beyond the period at which Moses fixes
the creation of man "in which animals and plants existed previous to the creation of present specimens. Dew, in short, was an able historian and conscientious teacher, making use of the resources of his time to bring his students to some comprehension of the development of their societal environment. In this process there are certain themes which he emphasizes - the linear and natural law mandated evolution of freedom through the development of representative government, the intrinsic relationships of property - holding to this development, and the continuous, general progress of western society as a consequence. This particular concentration, of course, places him squarely not only within the ideological heritage of eighteenth century rationalism but also securely within the metaphysical environment of his college and his community. Interestingly, the institution of slavery is not presented as a focal theme; rarely does the Digest serve as an apologia for its introduction and/or maintenance. There are, however, telling references to its beneficial characteristics which, again, reflect the positive influence of environment. As for the place of American caucasian civilization within his framework, Dew views it as a direct outgrowth of European civilization (most specifically English), which is clearly superior to eastern civilizations and a natural result of caucasian mental processes."
The spirit of a type of liberty (of freedom) first appeared in the Greek democracies, and Dew is careful to outline its characteristics. Grecian governments of antiquity (monarchical or democratic) held all power. The individual and his property were regarded as belonging to the state. Here, Dew points out that "Now-a-days the state is considered as created for their protection." Ancient liberty "consisted principally in the share a man had in the government, not freedom from its action. Perfect equality was perfect liberty." A male citizen, simply put, had an equal share in the government whether that government were a despotism or not. Such a general circumstance was an advance over earlier civilizations such as the Babylonian or Egyptian, and the institution of slavery served as a supporting factor for the advance.®

The origin of slavery, as Dew addressed the issue, lay in the laws of war which gave "the captor right to put prisoner to death or to enslave him." Civilizations in the hunting state (the eighteenth century view of societal development) ordinarily executed captives because there was no need for their labor. As soon as a civilization became agricultural (Dew would allow pastoral in his Review) there is a use for captives because their labor is "valuable". This is a beneficial condition, for "slavery is first cause of mitigation of horrors of savage warfare ...." Slavery had other advantages. In war-like city-states such as those
of Greece, "unless there had been a large body of slaves .... freemen could not have devoted themselves to civil and military life; all history has shown that the nation with most slaves in ancient times was .... the most powerful in war ...." The existence of menials allowed the time for pursuing the business of the state, whatever that might be, and "without slaves in Greece the upper classes would never have obtained great mental pre-eminence." The Greek democracies, while allowing for the "development of individual energy" through government, did not continue to advance. They were "not fit for duration" and became static.

Becoming static was, in eighteenth century thinking, a terminal condition for any nation. The Enlightenment concept of continuous progress depended on social movement; once a society stagnated or lost its impetus, it withered away. The threat of withering away, as exemplified by the Greek states, was of special importance for the American student. One can imagine Dew's own class pricking up its collective ears at this prefatory remark. In the history of Greece, the student can "learn the true value of the democratic principle, and acknowledge its energizing influence, whilst he sees its corrupting tendency when not restrained." Dew, at this point, offers an interpretation which markedly supports the social conceptions of his own tidewater environment. Representative legislatures and
"select, independent and disinterested judiciaries" are "blessings". But, most important are the "great blessings" of the federated system which "in our state governments secures all the stimulating influence of small independent commonwealths, while in the federal head we behold just power sufficient to keep the peace throughout the system: thereby preventing those family jars and civil wars which hastened the downfall of Greece." This, clearly, is the threat to progress - the "evil of consolidation, which extinguishes individual energy and greatness of soul." And Dew cannot resist making a contemporary application - "And, lastly, should that evil hour ever arrive .... when this great/union shall be sundered, and our confederacy separated into its original elements, the history of Greece will shed a twilight over the dark scene .... by showing that, bad as is the system of small, divided, and hostile states, it yet produces a compensating energy, which generates more of what constitutes the true glory of man, than can ever be found in the greatest empires of the world."

The core of the conservative position on the balance of political structural power is laid out - the states should be independent units with the federal government having only sufficient power to keep the peace, not direct economic, political or social affairs within state commonwealths. Loss of state prerogative and, conversely, consolidation of federal power, would lead to stagnation or civil war, the
latter more preferable to the decay of a preserved and despotic union. That particular lesson could not have been lost on Dew's students; it confirmed for most what was meaningful in their environments and what must be protected.

Dew's treatment of the Roman republic is essentially factual, with minimal interpretation. He admits that the absence of a written constitution allowed for error in assessing the nature of governmental practices, although he did point out the significance of the people's legislative power and the election of magistrates. Such a democratic character was modified by a combination of the "rights of the people, of the senate, of the magistrates" which "fitted so nicely into each other." Here, again, the spirit of freedom evolves, although, with the advent of the empire and its eventual destruction, that spirit is quenched. It is in his account of the feudal system that Dew appears to demonstrate ambivalence on the nature of freedom, who should have it, and how much.  

After dispelling some erroneous interpretations, largely British, of feudal development, Dew concludes that the possession ("holding", in feudal theory) of land "in absence of commerce and manufactures" was "almost the only kind of property." The holding of land, allodial, feudal, and tributary, produced a "system of insulation" which encouraged "the spirit of individual independence" which literally dissolved "all union" in continental Europe. The
economic and social picture was "wretched, no trade, no
manufactures, no occupation independent of the land, [the
people] thrown into state of abject dependence on the
landholders, constant tendency to degenerate into mere
serfs." Dew, in this train of thought, surely saw some
parallels, unexpressed, to landholding in his own society.
He does emphasize that the feudal lord, unlike the Roman
patrician, "was purely individual", not a citizen, not a
member of a senate or a corporation. The feudal lord "must
have been the proudest being on earth." Dew, perhaps,
detected in his feudal lord some of what Thomas Breen
perceived in his colonial Virginian tobacco planters, a
well-defined sense of personal autonomy.\textsuperscript{10}

Dew does not hesitate to portray the evils of the
feudal system. It destroyed national government, produced
private wars and periods of anarchy and oppression. He also
does not hesitate to indicate the system's "compensating
advantages", and his interpretation of those advantages
suggests an appreciation of his own society with which his
students, his social peers, could identify.\textsuperscript{11}

Feudalism was: a period of brilliant history ....
of great events and great men .... Even the
oppression not without antidote - oppressor and
oppressed close together ... a collection of
individual despotisms - not one great despotism
where all are reduced to a common level .... The
spirit of liberty was kept alive in the aristocracy, and by them communicated to the subvassals, thus the whole mass was leavened.\textsuperscript{12}

Without the fall of the Roman Empire, the barbarian invasions and the breaking down of Europe into multiple political units "the principle of immobility might have reigned." And for Dew, again, this meant stagnation, decay, death.\textsuperscript{13}

Not only did feudalism provide the energizing influence which kept the spirit of liberty alive, it also "first gave notion of sacredness of property .... the reciprocity of obligations, of obligation between lord and vassal, consent of all required measures, and the administration of justice by one's peers." Modern students of southern history, if not specifically of Virginia's history, could not fail to see in this view significant components of the plantation myth. And Dew continues - "In the reciprocal services of lord and vassal [there was] ample scope for magnanimous energy, and the exercise of the kindliest feelings of our nature - from this relation sprang that sentiment of personal reverence and attachment towards the sovereign, called loyalty .... this feeling has had its day, it was the conservative principle of society."\textsuperscript{14}

The conservative principle of society is crucial to Dew's long-range historical grasp as well as to his grasp of the more immediate circumstance of his own environment. It
arose in the middle ages; it was based upon the holding of land; it conditioned a society of hierarchical interdependent relationships, and it was intrinsic to landed tidewater Virginians' conception of what was meaningful in life. Dew's generalization is made specific and given application to his society when he says, in contradiction to Guizot's interpretation, that the dependent relationship of lord, laborer, and tenant was one of "kindness and harmony". Only when "This tie began to be severed, and the serfs and coloni to gain their liberty" did the "period of hatred" come on. Dew makes the same observation about "negro slavery" in his Review. Where slavery is "complete, [the] relation [is] one of kindness, but when the law interposes and inspires negro with notions of freedom, then there is insolence on one side and revenge and cruelty on the other...."

In his markedly biased analysis of feudal institutions lies the core of Dew's defense of slavery. The institution is humane, even kind, natural in the sense of eighteenth century natural law mechanics, and tied, paradoxically, to the evolution of the spirit of liberty, the premise for all progress. Here is Dew's historical base for that contradiction endemic in the southern conservatism of his time - the emphasis on liberty and equality for some at the expense of the liberty and equality of others. Any attempt (legal or otherwise) to upset this system would result in
direct consequences, the disruption of society and the
devastation of what Dew and his society felt to be valuable-
landed property and slaves.

Dew’s exploration of historical development takes on an
even more conservative cast in his reflections on the
evolution of the democratic spirit in European civilization.
This spirit should not be confused with his spirit of
freedom which has an elitist character inimical to the
intent of broad-based democracy. He begins with Greece.
The Athenian government of the fifth century B.C. was
"extremely democratic" with an assembly composed of "all the
freemen of mature age." Slavery was an institution in this
democracy, the number of slaves estimated at 400,000 (with
the entire Athenian free population estimated at 105,000).
The term, "democracy", therefore, should be understood in
its application to freemen, only; for all others, the
government was "aristocratical". Such a political structure
was, on the one hand, disadvantageous. It resulted in "bad
laws bad decisions, and a capricious tyranny of the
multitude not unlike that of a Turkish sultan" simply
because all citizens were "legislators and judges." There
were, however, some advantages - an "exuberance of energy,
genius, and real greatness .... every man in state
stimulated by government to do his best..." The holistic
result, notwithstanding, was "disorder and insecurity of
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both persons and property", a circumstance Dew could not countenance under any circumstances.\(^\text{16}\)

In his presentation of Athenian democracy, Dew evidences true "moth and the flame" characteristics. As a man educated in the classical tradition, he cannot reject the "glory that was Greece". As a human being within a given time and space, however, he cannot approbate the democratic form which encouraged the "glory". The laws were "bad"; the decisions were "bad"; tyranny of the multitude offered no security for person or poverty.

Dew expands his treatment of democracy in his investigation of European urbanization beginning in the eleventh to twelfth centuries. The cities "form the democratic element in the governments of medieval ages; it was by their influence that the aristocracy of Europe was conquered, and the power of the kings established." The rise of the cities and consequent development of the democratic spirit went hand in hand with the "rise of commerce and manufactures." Dew, here, is referring to the twelfth century renaissance, the origins of the middle class, etc. In his view, the cities should have allied themselves with the aristocracy. It was in the best interests of both "to unite together and form a league capable of maintaining their power." The cities' tragic mistake was to ally themselves with the monarch against the aristocracy, hence, with some exceptions, the rise of the
nation-state and monarchical power. In addition to their alliance with the king against the nobles, the cities displayed a second major flaw in the character of their government. "These little democracies extremely turbulent; property miserably protected/ .... faction, misrule, and constant and violent changes ...." Yet, Dew ambivalates; the effect of city democracy on the character of the city's residents was "most wonderful". It "awakened genius and stimulated energies of the people," but government was "factious, turbulent, etc., and property badly protected...."\(^\text{17}\)

Thus far, in Dew's perceptions of urban democratic development, democracy has been good for character but bad for business. He does allow for exceptions to the rule which he illustrates with references to the Italian city-states. Florence, for example, was at one and the same time the "most turbulent democracy on earth" and, yet, "contained more great men within its walls than all Europe north of the Alps." Italy as a whole, in this period, "never possessed more wealth .... in spite of proscriptions and mobs and revolutions ...." How to explain this is Dew's dilemma, and the resolution of it depends largely upon location and size.\(^\text{18}\)

The beneficial characteristics of the Italian city-states "are in part due to the fortunate position of Italy, for carrying on commerce of Europe with the east ...." But
this only partly accounts for such prosperity. Most ambiguously, Dew contends that "small democracies ... very favorable to development of energy and character, stimulus of government is applied to all, and energy thus awakened sometimes more than compensates for badness of government." These governments, however, quickly become the "most complete despotisms on earth - they were not limited by law, or constitutions .... but then they were despotisms of people over themselves." They had repeated the great mistake of the Grecian democracies - broad based democracy creates its antithesis, not the monster in the shape of the king but in the shape of the people. The lesson Dew holds out for his students is clear. Democracy can produce some beneficial results, but it conditions situations which are chaotic or, as he would prefer, "volcanic" and which would lead to disruption and death. Democracy, in the short run and limited circumstance is promising; in the long run, it destroys itself.\(^{19}\)

One other characteristic of the rise of cities bears a direct relationship to Dew's own environment. That is the opportunity the cities "furnished in the emancipation of serfs of Europe." Dew saw the difference between the European serf and the slave of his own society, but he uses the term, "slave," interchangeable presumably to underscore the best feudal characteristics which he was trying hard to perceive in his own society.\(^{20}\)
The commerce and manufactures of cities provided an enormous demand for labor which was met by "emancipated and refugee slaves into their bodies." Dew continues by noting, as he does in the Review, that Europe's example has been "urged in favor of emancipation of our negroes - but cases totally different." Dew's reason for this difference suggests a color-based racism which he did not reveal in his early career (see chapter 5). "Their slaves were white, therefore refugee slave in a city could soon throw off all badges of former condition, and mix with free men; not so here, color is a badge which cannot be thrown off." Is Dew implying that differences in color offered any kind of sanction or facility for slavery? If so, is his implication a conscious one? He continues that "no legislation in our country can conquer the antipathy to any intermixture of the two colors." Why, one might ask, a student, perhaps, would intermixture necessarily follow emancipation? Is Dew expressing the southern white male cultural fear that white women (not black) would prefer a mate of a different color? Or, perhaps, the extreme fear or paranoia that potential race war would leave white women no options? His own words confirm the first question's response; "the white woman in this country who shall conquer it [antipathy], and consent to marry a black man must be corrupt at heart before she can do it." Was Dew purposely ignoring the visual confirmations in his society that the intermixture had begun through the
agency of white men (not women) who sought an illegal assignation with enslaved black women? He, of course, does not address this question, but he does offer other arguments against emancipation, even in the course of a classroom lecture which does not require any reference to the South's "peculiar institution" whatsoever. In the South, there are no such cities to serve as receptacles for freed slaves, no cities which have become so wealthy through trade and commerce that they could support all kinds of labor. And, "the southern climate and southern productions, will ever make slaves in the south the best labor which can be used ...." After this concession to self-interest, Dew concludes the discussion with a reference to serfs who acquired land and paid rent. "Such a result can never take place with regard to our blacks."21

Even though Dew resisted any possibility of "our blacks" acquiring land or paying rent, he did not rule out the possibility of Virginia's becoming a non-slaveholding state in the Review which was published some years before the Digest. In the Review, he designated internal improvements as the "great panacea by which most of the ills which now weigh down the State may be removed." One of those ills was slavery, and the improvement Dew had in mind at that moment was the James River - Kanawha River canal, which, Dew felt, would vastly improve Virginia's financial affairs. The canal would "raise up larger towns" in the
eastern part of the state which would attract northern capital and free labor. This would, in turn, "destroy the proportion of the blacks." The division of labor would become "more complete", and "large farms" would be broken down into small ones. As a consequence, "less slave, and more free labor will be requisite." Dew was unquestionably prophesying, in euphemistic terms, the end of the plantation system at least in Virginia and tying it to the development of internal improvements, a facet of his thought which no one has, as yet, pointed out. He certainly knew better than to advocate internal improvements publicly for any other reason than their potential for effecting state prosperity. He could not openly propose them as a means of destroying landed estates. He uses Maryland as an illustration of his proposal, stating that it was quickly becoming a "non-slaveholding State." Perhaps, in moments of private introspection, he saw this scheme as a salvation for Virginia, as well.22

The spirit of liberty which has languished in Europe after the rise of cities, Dew finds to be alive, well, and soon to be flourishing in England. He devotes all of Chapter VIII, some 109 pages, the longest of the lectures, to the formation of the English constitution which is for him "perhaps the most beautiful political phenomenon of modern times, and particularly interesting to the American
student, as our own institutions are the result of English civilization."

Dew obviously intended to make this section a highlight of the course, the stage of his discourse at which, figuratively speaking, one might expect him to come out from behind the lectern, employ a few hand gestures, and raise the voice level to indicate the importance of what he was about to reveal. And for him and his student body it held enormous significance, for in the development of the English system Dew perceived the more immediate background of the fortuitous relationship between liberty and landholding, the basis for his conviction that the independent landowner was the guardian of liberty.²¹

Dew initiates his discussion of the unwritten English constitution with the usual references to the Saxons and the Danes who brought with them to England certain elements of the democratic principle, for example, the Wittenagemotte, the assembly of "the wise or knowing men", the prelates, earls, certain of the thanes, whose advice and whose consent by acclamation was customarily given to the chief. In England, the Wittenagemotte became an assembly of landholders and, finally, of great landholders. When many of the latter became so powerful they preferred to eschew any "restraint imposed by king and council," the Wittenagemotte "almost disappears from Anglo-Saxon history."²⁴
While the number of landholding aristocrats did grow and the number of freemen seeking protection did expand, a complete system of feudalism, as it existed on the continent, failed to develop until the Norman invasion. The reasons for this were, in part, the insular character of the country, its small size, and the maintenance of vestiges of kingly power. The democratic principle, here, was much more active than in Europe.²⁵

After the Norman conquest, the Anglo-Saxons, though defeated, were still a "powerful people, equal in civilization to their conquerors, and hating them with a most fervent hatred." The Norman aristocracy, fearing insurrection or a breakup of the political relationship between England and Normandy leading to loss of property, allied themselves with the king, a step which did not occur on the continent. Later, the "power and oppression of the king" caused the aristocracy to ally themselves with "the subject party - the people" and led to the creation of a house of lords and a house of commons. Dew details this process, moving from the great councilor parliament of the first Norman kings, which met three times a year, to the meeting of the body first "officially called parliament" and its production of the Provisions of Oxford.²⁶

The English aristocracy sought to confirm certain rights against the power of the crown by obtaining charters from the king, beginning with the charter granted by William
the Conqueror to the Anglo-Saxons in which he promised, among other things, the conquered the enjoyment of the laws of Edward the Confessor. The great charter or Magna Charta of 1215 confirmed all the immunities and privileges previously granted and defined the main feudal rights and relationships. Above all, for Dew, the "essential clauses of Magna Charta are those protecting personal liberty and property." As he expressed it, a "new soul infused from this time in British nation - her liberties before in abeyance now tangible possessions."

Having established the origin of representative government and the statuted protection of liberty and property, Dew proceeds through the summoning of the burgesses to the de Montfort parliament during the baronial wars of the late thirteenth century to the division of parliament into two houses in the mid-fourteenth century. Both houses became necessary for legislation, and this consolidation of interest "was best calculated for preservation of liberty." With the inclusion of the burgesses, "all interests in England," Dew concludes, "were properly represented."

Whether there might have been some other interests in England not quite so properly represented is a moot point for Dew. Given his own historical context, it simply would not have occurred to him that the unpropertied or minimally propertied or females should rightfully have some type of
representation. He found even the possibility of such representation distasteful. In discussing Wat Tyler's insurrection of 1382, Dew reiterates an observation he has made several times before. The insurrection took place at the time, in the progress of slavery and villanage toward emancipation, when "the hope of freedom produces sullenness and insubordination on the one side, and revenge and cruelty on the other." The cities had, again, offered opportunity to the enslaved and made them discontent. "Let us only for a moment suppose", Dew suggests, "in every considerable district of our southern country, a populous and powerful town, adverse to the landed interest... in such need of labor, that even that of the runaway slave was eagerly sought for, and we may form some notion of the condition of Europe during the fourteenth century." That condition was not conducive to progress and would end only in "catastrophe". (What, one might ask, about the cities in eastern Virginia which would result from the construction of the James-Kanawha canal? Might they not provide the same haven for the enslaved?)

The spirit of liberty in England, throughout its development from the War of the Roses to the Tudors and forward, was generally on the side of a legitimate monarchy. Struggles for liberty had been "produced by resistance to pecuniary exactions." It was not until the seventeenth century that the English would take "their stand" on
anything but the "money principle". Thus, with the sanction of economic determinism behind him, Dew introduces the "new principle of action" which would impact the expansion of liberty. That principle was the religious zeal of Puritanism which ultimately would lead, by century's end, to a constitutional monarchy.30

In his treatment of the English Civil War, Dew makes some interesting observations on Anglicanism, certainly in its current (for him) American form, the Protestant Episcopal Church, and in its colonial form, a pillar of the institution in which he taught.

The Church of England, unlike denominational products of the Reformation on the continent which were "urged forward by religious men," was begun "and carried on by the government." This origin was, in part, beneficial, for it provided the church with "moderate articles, her decent ceremonies, and her noble and pathetic liturgy." This did, on the other hand, make the church "the servile handmaid of monarchy, the steady enemy of liberty." It is difficult to tell whether this passage reflects the Methodism in Dew's family heritage or whether, in such an Episcopal bastion as William and Mary, he was merely demonstrating the advances of the Episcopal church over its colonial predecessor. The Reformation's "spirit of free inquiry" which had favored liberty in Europe, however, failed to do so in England because a king had simply been substituted for a pope. In
the zeal of puritan opposition to this circumstance lay the impetus for what would follow, the "Grand Rebellion" and the execution of Charles I.  

Dew significantly alludes to property as a moderating force in the English Civil War. He introduces the topic by explaining, rightly, that revolutions are not an outbreak of violence by men who have no property against men who have property. As he interpreted the situation, "the great revolutions of modern times have been brought about principally by the agency of the property." When the English Civil War began, "a majority of the property was on the side of the parliament," and the contest was "pretty generally the unprivileged against the privileged property." Property of whichever side is "always opposed to excesses", and, therefore, the revolution assumed a "humane and temperate spirit." This circumstance, Dew observes, was not true for the French Revolution which was begun by "property" but taken up by the unpropertied, a development leading to terror and chaos. The good credential of property, in a revolutionary situation, is supported by the credential of good behavior (with few exceptions) on the part of those who owned it. The "parliamentary troops were remarkable for good discipline and perfect subordination" while the genuine cavalier, we find ... to be a noble character."  

Dew's description of the cavalier, in this passage, contributes his imprimatur of historical validity to that
component of the plantation myth dealing with the cavalier heritage. It would suit any Virginian's fantasized or actual conception of gallant ancestry. The cavalier was not only of noble character. "Well may an Englishman feel pride in comparing him with the vile instruments used by despots in other lands.... They scarcely entered into the merits of the mere political question; but it was for the old banner which had waved in so many battles over the heads of their fathers and for the altars at which they had received the hands of their brides. They had more of the graces of private life than their adversaries .... They had more profound and polite learning - their manners were more engaging, their tempers more amiable, their tastes more elegant, and their households more cheerful." The cavaliers were, in short, ideal. And, thus, Dew provides his support to the structure of a "lost cause" myth. He would not have the opportunity, given the short duration of his life, to provide support for the "lost cause" myth of his own society."

Dew concludes his exposition of the formation of the English constitution with its settlement by the Glorious Revolution of 1688. This settlement brought together "all the great forces, religion, monarchy, aristocracy and democracy, negotiated and compromised their pretensions and interests; and thus was formed the present British constitution, a complex but harmonious whole, in which all
the elements of power meet and blend, and subsist in full and fair proportions to each other."\[34\]

When Dew moves to the French Revolution, his careful, objective, accurate (as he knew it) analysis of the events and circumstances precipitating and impelling it demonstrates his considerable value as an historian. His conclusions about its results are creditable and surprisingly "modern". His application of his interpretations to his own society are provocative. In order to understand them as a reflection of Dew's own environmental influences as well as his careful investigation of the facts, it is necessary to probe a bit into the material he presents in what just may be the best piece of historical work in the lecture series.

The French Revolution was produced by the "increasing wealth and talents of the tiers etat"; it was not in the beginning a revolt against the "rights of property." Dew qualifies this valid interpretation by explaining that in the long view "the manifold evils flowing from the vicious organization of the government may be considered as the principle causes of the revolution"; he does not, however, suggest that these constituted a more immediate cause. The revolution was "an insurrection of the unprivileged against the privileged property", and Dew makes such a significant distinction between these two categories that one might question whether, in an unpublished aside to his class, he
might not have suggested the possibility of southern property holders finding themselves in the same position as the tiers etat.35

The agency of the philosophical ideas which influenced the third estate and formed their conceptions of liberty took, in Dew's opinion, a different course of action in the English Revolution. Simply put, the English already had in place "a great deliberative body and the representation of the democracy in that body...." New political theories, therefore, had a practical outlet; they would be debated, modified, accepted or rejected with caution and an eye to the past. "Thus do philosophy and government, in England, act and re-act on each other." In France, the situation was different. No such regular forum as the British parliament existed for the airing of ideas, and a "direct attack on the monarch would have been instantly followed by a place in the Bastile." In France, therefore, these ideas became "utopian" and raised expectations to a degree that could not be practically realized. As long as the revolution is in the hands of the "better classes in whom resided all the vigor of liberty and all the grace of former politeness" the revolution followed a reasonable, constitutional course, but, once it had fallen into the hands of the Jacobins and the Paris commune and their mobs in the summer of 1792, the excesses began. Dew was horrified by the September massacres and the terror, but his horror, surprisingly, does
not preclude his attempts to explain and to justify them. Of the September massacres he cautioned, "we can scarcely appreciate the influence of the panic which prevailed in Paris at the approach of the Duke of Brunswick.... We forget how, at such a crisis, the apprehensions of the people can torture the most innocent and frivolous accidents into proofs of guilt ...." Dew's treatment of the terror took on a different caste. It was largely the work of Robespierre, "universally regarded as the dictator of France." This dictatorship was one of "terror", and a "government like this, based on terror, must soon become absolutely insupportable."^36

Dew saw clearly that successive French governments succeeded only "whilst revolutionizing." As soon as the royalists set up a constitution or "system", as Dew terms it, for example, they were overthrown by the Gironde. He concludes from this successive rise and fall of governments that for "all governments based exclusively on popular support, the party in power, where there are manifold and complicated interests to provide for, labors under a great disadvantage, because they always have a system to defend. In such countries it is really extremely difficult to rally, on any one well-defined system of measures, a decidedly national majority. But whilst the government, de facto, labors under this disadvantage, it is, perhaps, in such countries as England and the United States, more than
compensated for by the power which patronage confers. In France, this compensating advantage was lost amid the hurry and whirl of the revolutionary movements."  

Dew continues by explaining that the revolution in France was "too great and too violent" to be restrained by "technical formalities". There has never existed since the Roman Empire (republic) a "popular government in the world, save that of England and the United States, whose excesses have been permanently restrained by constitutional checks, and whose aberrations have been corrected within the prescribed form of law, by the peaceful action of a sound, temperate, public opinion." This proclivity for constitutional limitation gives "us more hope in the grand experiment we are trying / in our own favored land ...." In the United States, the "silent, but mighty power of public opinion" has, thus far, forced "our government from a bad position" and enabled it "to regain a good one ...."  

Dew does not substantiate his reliance on government by "public opinion", in moments of crisis, with any concrete data save a reference to the circumstance he uses in the above context and one other he has referred to, earlier, dealing with Lafayette's position in the revolution (French). (Lafayette's support of a constitutional monarchy was, according to Dew, "impracticable" because such a government would have been headed by an "executive, at heart opposed to the whole system which he headed, and disposed,
whenever he could do it without danger, to embarrass it by his vetoes ....") In both of these contexts, Dew makes lengthy reference to an individual lately acceded to the "Presidential chair" (of the United States) upon the "demise of the incumbent." This individual could only have been John Tyler, Dew's friend, who succeeded to the presidency upon the death of Benjamin Harrison. This "nameless" individual has the support of neither "of the great parties" in the country or the press, yet, this new president has been able "to use his veto with the utmost freedom, and to defeat the most cherished schemes of most triumphant majorities in the two houses of Congress ...." This example, alone, Dew contends, should demonstrate "the strength of our institutions and the capacity of the people for self-government."39

Dew's references to contemporary politics and the parallels which could be drawn between them and those of the French Revolution provided no mystery for his students. They would have known exactly who John Tyler was and how ambiguous his nominal position within the whig party really was. If the students followed Dew's line of reasoning, they might have agreed, spontaneously, that the strength of American institutions had preserved equilibrium, but, then, Dew poses a hypothetical case. The "greatest strain on our institutions has not yet taken place; that must come when our land shall be filled up with a dense population ...."
When this Malthusian circumstance has taken place, a "strong line of demarkation shall be drawn between those who have and those who have not .... When the day shall come that this class shall form the numerical majority, as it did in France, then will the high pressure come on our institutions; and the reign of terror in France has presented, I fear, too faithful a picture of what a government may be, that shall fall exclusively into such hands." With this dire warning, Dew demonstrated his own fear of that twist in the spiraling of class dynamics which would bring the social structure tumbling down around his aristocratic ears. His fear, expressed, explains his role (see chapter V) in advising United States hegemony in Mexico. Acquisition of new land, in Malthusian thinking (of which Dew was quite cognizant), would provide an outlet for excess population and any latent hostility which might at any time burst forth in uncontrolled fury within a more circumscribed situation. Here was an excellent argument for Manifest Destiny with Mexico as the object of its drive forward.40

Dew's outline of threats to the existing structure did not go without reassurances for his students. Appealing to their regional loyalties, he counseled that "there can be no texture of society better calculated to [ward off danger], than that which exists under the much reviled, much slandered institutions of the South." Dew does not mention
slavery, here, but he must have had in mind the institutional safeguards which controlled the lowest class of southern society and preserved the autonomy and power of landholders. 41

Dew begins the conclusion of his lectures by noting the benefits of the French Revolution, and his interpretation of these benefits may seem surprising. The revolution demonstrated, in quick succession, all the "phases of democracy .... both the strong and the weak points of democratic rule." Statesmen (and Dew taught in an institution which prided itself on producing statesmen) may profit "by the history of the French revolution; and may we not hope that its lessons will prevent the recurrence of so awful a catastrophe in future. It has taught the true value and the true danger of the popular element, which will henceforth be the moving force in every civilized government, no matter what may be its form." As other nineteenth century historians were coming to realize in their investigations of contemporary events, there was a fourth estate, a proletariat as it would be designated several years after Dew's death, and that class would become a force to be reckoned as the centuries turned. Dew feared it but offered to his students southern institutions as a protection for status and the status quo. An institutionally stratified society was, at least for the
moment, the bulwark against excessive change which would destroy the valued prerogatives of the elite.⁴²

After warnings and reassurances, Dew, in the historian's guise of seeing several sides of an issue, proceeds to analyze the advantages of the French Revolution. The Revolution, he says, destroyed "the abuses and evils consecrated by the sufferance of a thousand years .... it seized / .... on the property of the noble, the priest and the corporation, and distributed it amongst the people .... it diffused the blessings of free trade over a great nation [It broke down the system of custom houses which interrupted trade between French provinces.]." The revolution, too, purified the morals of the French court so that when the Bourbons returned they "were ashamed to act as their ancestors had done." Dew's position is, in effect, that the revolution was extreme in its scope, but only by being extreme could it have eradicated the fundamental and institutionalized abuses which had precipitated it. He concludes by asserting that if a final judgment had to be made, "we can scarcely for a moment doubt that it would be in favor of the revolution and all its attendant horrors, if these were the only condition on which the benefits could be obtained."⁴³

Dew's conclusions might seem inconsistent coming, as they do, from a man suspicious of change, particularly of too much change, in his own society. But, then, as he
observed, only in England and the United States had constitutional institutions and public opinion served as functional checks on excess, and, perhaps, he believed that, even under the "greatest strain on our institutions", the constitution and common sense would prevail.

The selection and arrangement of content in the Digest plus the interpretations it contains demonstrate much of Dew's own value system, the direct outgrowth of his pleasurable environmental experience. He perceived the history of western society as the working out of the spirit of liberty which reached its apex in the British and, subsequently, the American political systems. This spirit of liberty, however, was best left the sinecure of propertied interests which would abide only gradual and reasoned change. Democracy, in the broad sense (as Dew defined it, limited by gender, race, and property), is beneficial, but the lower its scope in the social hierarchy the greater the risk of excess, the greater the possibility the "have nots" will run rough-shod over the "haves" until once more restrained by institutions and reasoned public opinion. Clearly, it is those institutions, of which the Constitution is primary, and good public sense which will maintain the equilibrium in society.

The institution of slavery, as Dew presents it, has historical justification and is actually part of the progress society has made in the interest of liberty.
Slavery is an improvement over death in a hunting-belligerent society. It is also a foundation stone in the structure of a hierarchical society. It conditions the circumstance allowing others to be equal by providing a class of menials unequal to all others but themselves. Raising the expectations of the slave is injudicious and dangerous to social equilibrium, for only a relationship of complete dependence, on the part of the enslaved, and complete control, on the part of the enslaver, can generate the "kindliest feelings" and "personal reverence" in the relationship.

Even though Dew's spirit of liberty, marshalled by the landholding elite, marches on through the English Revolution, the American Revolution, and the French, there is an argument to be made that his heart may well have lain with the Middle Ages in which the aristocracy kept alive the spirit of liberty, the sacredness of property was established, reciprocal relationships were defined, all great men were despots, and all despots were equal. Dew, like John Randolph, championed the independent landowner as the guardian of liberty and mainstay of rational, minimal central government. Unlike Randolph who was not so influenced by Malthusian principles, Dew had come to see the advantage of Manifest Destiny not only for the expansion of southern institutions but also for the relief of excess population pressure. The nameless masses who might, in
future, exert this pressure were, one suspects, also unequal in Dew's estimation and should remain so. Like Randolph, Dew loved liberty and hated equality, for in a broad-based equality lay the potential for the downfall of the lifestyle he valued.

The perceived threats against Dew's society took on a more specifically economic tenor in his Lectures on the Restrictive System Delivered to the Senior Political Class. These lectures were published by Dew in September 1829, and their publication was prompted by Dew's conviction of "the error and impolicy of the Restrictive System .... its rapid progress, and its close connection with political parties." The immediate spur to publication was the "excitement" the restrictive system "had occasioned, and the vituperative discussions it has given rise to." The date of publication and the references to a restrictive system leave little doubt that Dew's action was taken in response to the furor generated by the Tariff of 1828."

The Tariff of 1828 (called, in some quarters, the Tariff of Abominations) averaged about fifty percent of the value of imports compared to thirty-three and a half percent in 1824 and fifty percent in 1816. It was designed as a political stratagem to present Andrew Jackson as a free-trader to the South and a protectionist to the North. No one reasonably expected the tariff to pass as it placed higher duties on raw materials than on manufactures, and it
was projected that the New England vote would help defeat it. It did pass, and the ensuing "excitement" and vituperation, as Dew would have it, opened with Calhoun's *South Carolina Exposition and Protest* and proceeded to the nullification crisis involving South Carolina, a new chapter in the history of conflict between northern and southern interests. The Lectures were intended to be Dew's contribution on behalf of free trade and in defense of his own state which, at the time, like South Carolina, was experiencing the impact of ruined soil and population decline.45

Dew states that he intends to provide "a calm and dispassionate view of the subject" without "mingling in the politics of the day ...." It is difficult to understand how one could profess the position he does, at the time, without inviting a political "tag", and, perhaps, Dew is simply laying a false trail. Whatever his real intentions, he is aware that it is "the great duty of the professor to inculcate upon the mind of the student those general principles alone, which may form the basis of his future opinions and actions." This duty, which allows for a certain lack of objectivity on the part of the teacher, Dew attempts to fulfill to the utmost.46

The ten lectures in the series, not including the introductory lecture, were, as Dew explained, "too long" in their written form to be delivered in class, but he did use
his work as the textbook base of his shorter presentations and class discussions. He organized the ten lectures into four parts, and that will be the organization used in this dissertation: first, the arguments favoring freedom of trade; second, the arguments most relied upon by defenders of the restrictive system; third, the relative advantages of manufactures and agriculture in reference to morals, health, and politics; fourth, causes contributing to the establishment of the restrictive system in almost all countries. This organizational plan allows for manageability of the subject matter within the structure of this dissertation. A complete analysis of the lectures, with appropriate focus on its sources - Quesnay, Adam Smith, Say - awaits a monograph-length study.

Dew establishes his position in the first two pages of the lectures when he outlines the four basic historical economic systems advocated by philosophers, statesmen and merchants: the mercantile, the manufacturing, the agricultural, and the free trade. Wealth, in the mercantile system, is money, and government is responsible for regulations ensuring the acquisition and maintenance of a favorable supply of gold and silver for the nation. The manufacturing is "little more than a modification of the mercantile." It concentrates on "selling as much as possible to foreign nations, and buying as little as possible." It advises the "prohibition of the entry of such
foreign manufactures as can be produced at home...." This clearly is the restricted system of the title, the system which produced abominable tariffs, the system which would lead South Carolina to contemplate secession. The agricultural system, as Dew characterizes it, is "entirely opposed to the manufacturing," entirely opposed, without even the possibility of compromise. All wealth, in this system, comes from the land. Here, Dew places himself squarely in the school of Francois Quesnay and the physiocrats. That portion of the produce (of the land) not needed for wages or supplying the activity of farming constitutes the annual addition to society's wealth. Only this portion may be taxed. In every other respect, the agricultural system follows the principle of the fourth system, the free-trade system.47

The free-trade system came right out of the Enlightenment and, based upon major values figuring prominently in the ideology of the American Revolution, proposed that nations trade freely and fairly with each other, according to the natural laws of economy, which, like all other natural laws driving the physical and social world, were God-given and guaranteed to produce progress if unimpeded. This system, of course, was based on the utopian idea that all men were born free, rational, and, in a word, good and, as the doctrine of laissez-faire, had never really worked to perfection anywhere. But, Dew believed it did
work, and so had John Adams and Thomas Jefferson and John Randolph and a host of distinguished Americans. And they believed, as Dew stated, that "the prosperity and happiness of the world, and of each nation, would be greatest" if such a system prevailed.

As late as 1842, Dew was making no secret of his free-trade aspirations. In the Digest, for example, he denounced Jacobin economic reform because it refused to recognize natural economic laws and allow them free play. "Never, perhaps, since the foundation of the world, did the wisdom of man attempt so seriously to supplant the laws of trade, and to render the whole economical mechanism of society dependent on legislative edicts...." The irrationality of the Jacobin program, their inability to recognize the damage that restriction would inflict, was inexcusable. Their economic course would lead to the stagnation of despotism, and, as Dew continuously and emphatically points out, stagnation leads to death.

The first section of the Lectures dealing with arguments on behalf of free trade owes much to Adam Smith. Dew looks at the "condition of man" and "the great object at which he aims - happiness". This is the goal of all his labor, and in the process of attaining that goal, he supplies his various wants through consumption. Consumption is the "end and object of production." All of these conditions are natural and operate rationally or
systematically. A commodity's value is regulated by the demand which the wants of man supply. If a sufficient amount of the commodity were not produced, the demand would lead to a price rise beyond the cost of production. The ensuing increased production of the commodity would eventually bring profit and demand into balance. If too great an amount of the commodity were produced, on the other hand, the price would fall below the cost of production. Those employed in producing this commodity would gradually withdraw their support until supply was brought into balance with demand. The cost of production remains the given, in both cases, and permanently regulates the cost of the commodity. These are the "laws which regulate prices," and "the vigilant eye of government is not required to watch over any of the departments of industry." Man's view of his "enlightened self-interest" will naturally lead him to "that employment which is the most profitable to him," probably into the production of those commodities which are in insufficient supply.

The core of Dew's argument, like Smith's, is self-interest. Self-interest not the government is the best arbiter of economic activities and should be left freely to its own devices. "Better then," as Dew says, to "trust the individual ...." Government is intended only to protect the individual against crime and against the aggression of foreign nations; "the rest is superfluous, and a superfluous
which is destructive." The national interest is, indeed, identified with the individual’s interest, and, even though Dew admits critics of this position assert it applies only to some constituent parts of a nation, the wealthy, for example, he contends that the principle in its broad application embraces all and excludes none.\textsuperscript{51}

Having established the critical significance of self-interest, Dew is compelled by his circumstance to address those who consider slavery a "public calamity" and certainly a monumental contradiction to any beneficial impact the pursuit of self-interest might realize. Dew evades the issue adroitly, claiming that, in the economic view, slaves do not compose the nation; "you would consider them in the light of property alone, like horses and cattle, and not like men." The slave is not an individual whose self-interests should be pursued. His "happiness, rights .... are in this case supposed to be merged completely in those of the master." The slave is not a human being; he/she is a piece of property. Only by designating the slave as non-human will Dew’s Procrustean bed of an economic argument fit the southern circumstances. The slave does not fit the bed, so he/she is conveniently lopped off. Dew’s perception of the slave as an economic unit must be kept in mind; otherwise, his reasoning may often appear illogical or paradoxical. His economic sense is sound if utopian; his humanistic sense is tragically flawed.\textsuperscript{52}
The amount of work, or industry, put out in a society is directly proportional to the capital the society can employ. It can never exceed that capital. Labor, of its own accord, is diverted into directions it considers advantageous [naturally, in the eighteenth century view, this is "most advantageous to the society"], and, therefore, some commodities may not be produced at home. The nation can still "enjoy a larger portion of all the necessaries and conveniences of life, by exchanging with foreign nations the surplus portion of her products, than she would do were she to attempt to make all at home." Why, one might ask, if the laws of supply and demand worked perfectly, would a nation have a surplus, let alone workers who would not turn to the production of any item in demand but not produced in sufficient quantity within the nation, itself? Dew responds to this by asserting that one individual can produce a surplus by confining himself to one or two products which can be produced with facility. This individual can exchange surplus products for imported items which can be acquired more cheaply from abroad than by making them at home. The conditions necessarily affecting this production and exchange are climate, soil, and capital which, in different areas, exert controls over what can be produced, the profits accruing from the production, wages, etc.53

The attempts by government to regulate the balance of trade create injustice of two kinds. First, they may injure
one class of the community for the benefit of another. Second, they sometimes infringe upon the natural rights of man. In the first instance, when "our" government "prohibits the foreign article, it will certainly .... give the greatest advantages to the north-eastern States, where they already have a dense population, and largely accumulated capital." Agricultural products like wool, hemp, and iron may also be protected; then, the districts raising those products will be benefited. Dew is specific as to the areas injured by tariffs. In the case of manufactures, the South and West lose to the North, first, in the "enhancement of the price of manufactured commodities" and, second, in emigration from the north which would otherwise take place because of job loss. The "prevention of emigration to the western country, is injurious to the States of the west" because it lessens the demand for land and, thereby, keeps land prices down. Such references to population dynamics can be taken as a direct reflection of Dew's concern about the replacement of population loss in Virginia (see chapter 5).

When Dew proceeds to arguments most used by defenders of the restrictive system, he begins with the principles of the mercantile theory regarding the accumulation of precious metals in relationship to the use of gold and silver in a society. He points out that scarcity of money may be a result of the conditions of its circulation and not of its
quantity and, in general, demonstrates that, even if money constitutes a nation’s wealth, the measures used to judge its abundance were “fallacious” and “legislation could never accumulate or diminish it far beyond the wants of society,” which is central to Dew’s economic thinking. As he points out, moreover, most restrictionists would admit that free trade would be “most advantageous to each nation, if it were adopted by every other ....” When one nation begins to restrict, others must do likewise “in self-defense”. This reasoning is, again, fallacious, according to Dew, and he illustrates his contention with an example featuring both Virginia and South Carolina, the states, incidentally, most impacted by the adverse economic circumstances of the time. With the wheat and tobacco produced on one acre of its soil, Virginia, Dew explains, obtains as much corn and rice from South Carolina as Virginia would take two acres to produce. He hypothesizes that South Carolina, which exchanges its corn and rice on an equal basis for wheat and tobacco from Virginia, would commence taxing wheat and tobacco from Virginia, and the tax makes the trade twenty-five percent less lucrative for Virginia than before. Should Virginia, Dew asks, follow the same policy toward South Carolina? "Certainly not." This would be self-defeating for Virginia because Virginia is still getting corn and rice seventy-five percent cheaper than she can raise them. The trade is still advantageous for Virginia. If South Carolina increased its
duties, it would continue to be advantageous, although less so, until South Carolina raised duties to one hundred percent. At that point, trade between the two states would begin to diminish, and, if South Carolina raised duties still more, trade would cease.\footnote{Dew applies the Virginia-South Carolina model to the cotton trade between America and Great Britain, a trade with an annual United States exportation of 800,000 bales to Great Britain which also obtained raw cotton from India, Brazil, and Egypt. The price of cotton had been declining since 1818, and cotton which had sold for thirty-one cents a pound in 1818 fetched only eight cents in 1831. When English woolens, cottons, iron, etc. were exchanged freely for American cotton, tobacco, etc., a balance of trade mutually profitable naturally resulted. Americans were buying, in effect, cotton clothing, made from American raw cotton, produced more cheaply in England than in the United States. When this trade is restricted or prohibited by tariffs, certain conditions disadvantageous to lucrative trading result. First, Great Britain will be unable to buy as much as formerly, and her purchases, most likely those from the United States, will be reduced. Second, Great Britain will purchase raw cotton from India, Egypt, etc. hence, stimulating raw cotton production and lower cotton prices in those areas and further diminishing cotton trade with the United States. Third, the European market will}
gradually be lost with devastating impact not only on the South but also on the northern states which provide shipping for trade (the northern states received about $5,000,000 on cotton worth around $24,735,000 to the South) and also furnish manufactured goods for the southern market. If, of course, the trade in cotton, rice, and tobacco were destroyed, the South would not long remain a good customer of northern produce. Fourth, the stimulation to manufacturing such restrictions would effect and the possible extension of manufacture into the northern and western states would not, as some proposed, provide new markets for southern cotton offsetting the loss of the English market. As Dew emphasizes, the extended home market was never considered by the manufacturers, themselves, "capable of taking more than from 175 to 200,000 bales of our cotton, while the English market would .... under a more liberal system, be good for 800,000." Fifth, products "can only be bought by means of products." For any foreign produce brought into the United States, an equivalent must be given in exchange, and the "raising or purchasing of this equivalent, encourages domestic industry much more efficiently than if we attempted to raise at home the manufacture instead of the equivalent ...." Sixth, the stimulation of the home market by restrictions will "draw off from agriculture and commerce, a portion of their laborers and capitalists." Fewer agricultural products will
be raised "in consequence of the labor and capital which go over to manufactures having deserted the land," but there would not necessarily by any additional or any fewer consumers of agricultural produce. Any changes in this circumscribed market would, in addition, have a more immediate, possibly devastating, impact on demand which a broader European market would not affect. Here, Dew's fear of population loss is again apparent.56

In Dew's responses to arguments made on behalf of restriction, there is, reasonably enough, the hard core of concern for landholding, the production of a staple crop, the maintenance and expansion of the market for the staple crop, with the corollary of relative indifference toward the situation of the paid laborer. The labor force of his environment was a largely unpaid one which could not be drawn off to manufactures without the sanction of its owners and did not furnish the consumer market that labor did in the North, East, and West. The labor quotient invested in the product in the South, in general, was perceived as a negligible part of the value of the product, and the labor force, itself, did not figure as any kind of homogenous market.

When Dew moves to the fourth part of his lectures, the relative advantages of agriculture and manufactures in reference to morals, health, happiness and politics, his tidewater environmental imprint is, if possible, more self-
evident. The agricultural way of life clearly holds the
trump card, as Dew intended it should.

The unvarying labor of one engaged in manufactures
produces a "dexterity which is truly astonishing; but his
mind is not likely to be improved in an equal degree."
Agricultural labor, on the other hand, is more varied and
gives "greater exercise to the understanding, and greater
play to the imagination." To enhance this image, Dew
alludes not only to the diversity of exercises, reading, for
example, but also to the beauties of nature which surround
the farmer. He does not, however, explain how this
circumstance might benefit the slave or even what the slave
might do with such beneficence. He does not specifically
include the slave when he grandiloquently reminds his
readers that, according to Thomas Jefferson, "Those who
labor in the earth are the chosen people of God ...."
Manufactures, moreover, have a tendency to divide society
into two distinct classes, capitalists and laborers who are
separated too far from one another with "no middle class to
form the link" between them, no middle class to instruct the
lowest and influence the highest. Here, Dew, for all his
research, his facts, his statistics, had to be turning a
very blind eye to the class system in his own immediate or,
even, broad environment. He unequivocally will state in the
Review, later, that "in our southern country, there is no
body [middle class] of this kind to become the absorbent.
nor are we likely to have such a body ...." There simply was no such substantial class in the south, and this situation was endemic to that particular society in which there were two classes so separated by such a distance from one another that there was virtually no hope they could be linked in any foreseeable future scenario.\(^57\)

Dew’s arguments on behalf of agriculture’s preeminence improve when he takes up the matters of health and happiness. The farmer, of course, has the advantage of life in the open air, the activity required by agricultural tasks, and the steady employment nature and the land supply. Manufacturing laborers, on the other hand, suffer from bad air, inactivity, fluctuation in the availability of employment resulting from the use of labor-saving machines, changes in public taste, and the accident of war. Loss of employment and/or poor working conditions may lead to epidemic, starvation, infant death, beggary, idleness - a host of horrors with which Dew illustrates and clinches his argument that the manufacturing life can never provide the happiness of the agricultural. The fundamental flaw in his argument, however, is obviously the basis of comparison he uses. The horrors in a manufacturing society affect only the workers, while the benefits of the agricultural life are bestowed primarily upon major landholders.\(^58\)

After consideration of the relative merits of agriculture and manufacturing in the areas of morals, health
and happiness, Dew turns to politics and investigates the political effects of manufactures. When he writes of "manufactures" in this instance, he does not mean those which have arisen spontaneously, reflecting a skill and filling a need, but those falsely stimulated by government restrictions. The latter are, without exception, unfortunate. "Manufactures have ... the effect of assembling persons, and those of the lower classes together in great numbers. Following similar pursuits, and having the same manners and habits, an esprit du corps quickly arises; they are apt to become turbulent and factious, and too often are the blind instrument of the infuriated demagogue, and the ring-leaders in mobs and violent commotions." This is the same viewpoint Dew expressed in the Digest when talking about the excesses of the French Revolution. It would not take too great a stretch of his imagination or that of a student to apply the same criterion to the slave population of the South or, in microcosm, the tidewater. In the institution of slavery could certainly be found persons of the lowest class in great numbers, following the same pursuits and having the same interests. Only on large plantations might there be sufficient numbers gathered together to create turmoil, but, as the Nat Turner revolt will evidence only a few years after Dew publishes his Lectures, that did not preclude the possibility of violence. Dew continues by extending the circumstance,
envisioning that labor commotions could lead to the establishment of a standing army, "a system of surveillance and espionage, with a rigid and energetic police .... and this is always hostile to genuine liberty." The spirit of liberty could scarcely subsist, let alone flourish.⁵⁹

A second evil of the manufacturing system relates to the laborer's great dependence upon the capitalist who employs him. Dew saw the future, as he would express it in the Digest. Virginia, at the time Dew published these lectures, did not allow universal male suffrage, but if it were to do so, it would encounter the problem of the undue influence exercised by the owner of industry (if Virginia should develop a substantial industrial machine) on his workers, causing them to "vote and act constantly in unison with his will." The independence and dignity of character essential to a citizen would, thereby, by undermined.⁶⁰

The last political effect of manufacturing Dew discusses is its tendency to accumulate wealth in the hands of a few, the owners of industry. Such an inequity is inimical to "liberty and to happiness."⁶¹

In the fourth and last part of his lectures, Dew considers the "causes of the almost universal adoption of the restrictive system." It is in this section that his own political views, contrary to the initial claim of objectivity, are plainly expressed and show him to be unquestionably a professor of his environmental values.⁶²
The restrictive system has gained ascendancy largely for two reasons. The first of these reasons is the selfishness and injustice of the protected sections of a country which have used dubious compromises (with which they, in the end, have not always been happy) to assure themselves of majority support and, consequently, government support for the manufactures of their section. As an illustration of this circumstance, Dew states, simply, "Look to the votes on the tariff of 1828, and I fear they will demonstrate the selfishness and injustice of the whole protecting system." Here, as he approaches the end of his printed lectures, Dew articulates the political objective of his economic concerns and proceeds with an analysis of its genesis.

Dew's breakdown of the vote in the House of Representatives vividly illustrates his position. All the members from the southern states (Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia) voted against the bill except three from Virginia and three who were absent. All from the south-western states (Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana) voted against it. All from the western states (Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Missouri) voted for the bill except one from Mississippi and one from Ohio. Of the delegates from the middle states (Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New York), fifty-six voted for, eleven against, seven absent, one dead. The New England delegation
had proposed the measure, they opposed its adoption as a body because they could not accept its final form. Could there be a better example than this vote, Dew asks, of self-aggrandizement at the expense of minority interests and the public welfare? He quotes Calhoun to support his thrust: "If there be a political proposition universally true, one that springs directly from the nature of man, and is independent of circumstances, it is, that irresponsible power is inconsistent with liberty, and must corrupt those who exercise it." 64

Dew, Calhoun, and everyone knowledgeable about political affairs were well aware of the political machinations which produced the tariff of 1828. They were convinced, from their perspective, that their section had been taken advantage of by a combination of others pursuing their self-interest and not that of the commonwealth. This was not consistent with Dew’s natural law, enlightenment philosophical base according to which the individual’s true self-interest lay in the pursuit of the common good. He could not countenance the narrow interpretation other political sectional interests were placing on Adam Smith’s theories, and he could not do so because it did not serve the interests of his own section. Not only is the contracted pursuit of self-interest the goal of the "protected" interests but venality, as well, the pursuit of evil for the sake of evil. "The injustice of the law would
be its highest recommendation to such a majority; for the more oppressive it might be upon the minority, the greater would be their gains ..." This is irresponsible government, irresponsible in the use of the people’s delegated authority and because the full impact of such acts would not fall on the sections which initiated them.65

The spirit which Madison sought to exorcise in Federalist Paper number ten was stubbornly holding its own. The majority was taking advantage of the minority and doing it at a galloping pace. "The sections in our country which form the majority are those which support a tariff, and a system of internal improvements;" and what is to be done, Dew quermies, "seeing that the majority are thus disposed to act?" He becomes more specific - "Are we rashly to sever the Union, which has hitherto been considered the ark of our safety ...." That was the crucial question which Dew and his southern compatriots were asking, and Dew’s answer, for his students and his countrymen, was forthright. "It is what I should teach, and what every man in the land should teach .... that the dissolution of our Union is the last remedy to which the friend of his country and of man should look .... The North may repose confidence in its strength and power, and the South may look forward to the accumulation of wealth and riches in the freedom of its commerce, yet if disunion take place, the history of our country will show .... the folly and delusion of these
dreams." Dew clearly entertained secession as an option, the ultimate option, perhaps, but still a viable alternative to slow strangulation at the hands of a despotism. Despotism, as he will maintain so vehemently in the Digest will lead to stagnation and death. The spirit of liberty could not survive such manipulation, and dissolution of the union among the states was preferable."

Dissolution of the union, however, presented its own insurmountable problems. "Look to Europe," Dew exclaims; she is "torn" and "disjointed", wasting her resources on "the field of battle" to maintain the balance of power. "So will our own country be torn to pieces, oppressed with debt, impoverished and ruined, if ever disunion take place." The prospects of such an outcome appear to have horrified Dew. Later, in 1836, he will make reference, again, to the possibility and compare the south to the 300 Spartans who stood firm but went down to defeat (see Chapter 5). He was too intelligent a man not to have anticipated the outcome and to have suggested it to his students, and, yet, disunion remained, for him, an option."

The second reason for almost universal acceptance of the restrictive system is its support by the "statistical or matter of fact reasoners". These individuals are those who not only fail to comprehend the God-given general laws according to which the world runs but also do not have the intellect or reason to adapt the human circumstance to these
Irrationality and venality were two forces which threatened the South, two forces which threatened all that Dew considered meaningful in his environment. In the Digest, these forces had brought the French Revolution to the brink, and far beyond, of extremism, and, in the Lectures, they menaced the pillars of tidewater society by producing a restricted commercial system inimical to the free production and exchange of staple crops. Land ownership, which the Digest so carefully designated as the basis of liberty through the principle of representation, was subsequently threatened, and, consequently, liberty, itself. Slavery was a humane institution, as its historical evolution had demonstrated, and one designed to maintain the true equality of those not confined by its strictures. Slaves, however, were not a class in themselves, or, for that matter, human beings who, like other human beings, operated according to Dew's "known principles of human
nature." They were property and, as such, not individuals whose "self-interest" should be pursued."®

The value system which Dew presented to his students supported the values of his and, for the most part, their environment. It came directly from his experience dating from his early life on a plantation to his residence in Williamsburg and ultimately to his professorship, there. It was in the air he breathed and the words he spoke and wrote, and he intended to pass it on to his students, who, he hoped, would follow in the William and Mary tradition of statesmanship. Perhaps, one day, in that capacity, they might effect a change. As he charged them, "I hope you have profited by these discussions, and will, when you have left these walls, continue still your researches. You must recollect, that sovereignty pervades our wide-spread empire, like the very air we breathe .... and ... it is consequently the duty of every American citizen, especially of such as enjoy the great privileges and opportunities which you do, to prepare himself for the part which may devolve upon him. And a laudable ambition should make you look to yourselves as the philosophers and statesmen of other days."®
CHAPTER 8
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CHAPTER 9

WHAT THEY TAUGHT: NATHANIEL BEVERLY TUCKER

Quantum mutatus ab illo
Hectore qui redit, exurias indutus Achillis
Vel Danaum Phrygios jaculatus puppibus ignes
Hostis habet muros: ruit alto a culmine Troja.
Si Pergama dextra
Defendi possent, etiam hac defensa fuissent.¹

How changed from that Hector
Who returned from battle putting on Achilles' spoils,
Or Hector when he flung his
Phrygian firebrands at Dardan prows!

The enemy has gained the walls;
Troy falls from her high peak.
If Pergamus be defended by any prowess,
Then my hand would have served.

Like Thomas Dew and true to his educational background,
Beverley Tucker was fond of classical allusions. It is not
surprising, given their environmental experience, that they
both favored gloomy references focusing on ruins, a torched
Troy and, for Dew, dead Spartans. Tucker uses his sketchily
remembered excerpt from the second book of Virgil's Aeneid
to draw a comparison between the appearance of the dead
Hector's ghost to a dreaming Aeneas and the hypothetical
appearance of the dead John Randolph's spector to "all who
would defend the palladium of states' rights." Hector's spectral image served to warn Aeneas to escape the vengeful denizens of the wooden horse. Aeneas would do so and establish in mythology, at least, Rome in all her questionable glory. Randolph's image would warn against the circumstances of Tucker's Series of Lectures on the Science of Government (henceforth, Lectures on Government). Whether those who defended states' rights and the other values of Tucker's presentation would escape to another "Rome" was a question still to be answered.²

Beverly Tucker's world and a summary view of its meaningful characteristics have been presented in this dissertation. The purpose of Chapter 9, like that of Chapter 8, is to analyze the ideas he offered his classes (and his public) which supported what he considered to be of value in his environment and to demonstrate how these ideas formed part of a holistic experience provided by the William and Mary faculty for its students. The basis for this analysis will be a set of published lectures, the Lectures on Government. Incidental reference will be made to two of Tucker's novels, The Partisan Leader and George Balcombe (see Chapter 6). Neither of these novels will be considered in their entirety, however, as they were fictional works published for the reading public.

The Lectures on Government was published in 1842. It consists of 464 pages organized into twenty-one lectures.
Some of these lectures were read before various societies, for example, the Literary Societies of Randolph-Macon College, but their content was certainly incorporated into Tucker's classroom presentation. The *Lectures on Government* was intended to prepare the student for the study of the United States Constitution and, as such, dealt with subjects like the importance of studying political science, the philosophy of government, and the history of political institutions. It also dealt, most markedly, with slavery and states' rights as integrally related to the study of government. Unlike Dew's work, Tucker's tends to be repetitive, subjective, sometimes rambling, sometimes vague, fraught with undue sentimentalism, and occasionally emphatically Calvinistic, as might be expected from one who had experienced a Presbyterian period. It did, however, focus on the American system and the development of that system and reflects better than Dew's work the intense struggle of a mind, molded hugely by eighteenth century enlightenment principles, the extremism of the French Revolution and the Malthusian-engendered fear of the "masses", to counter the growth of strong central government, the extension of the franchise, and the abolition of black slavery. Tucker clearly intended to offer his students rational and moral sanctions for states' rights, the limitation of the franchise to the propertied male, and the perpetual servitude of a racially defined
lowest class. By the 1850s, southerners like the Virginian, George Fitzhugh, had cast off (at least nominally) their eighteenth century intellectual heritage, repudiated Locke and Adam Smith, declared "free society" to be "a failure" and promoted a slave society as the "very best form of socialism" (for the lower classes) and the last best hope for mankind. Beverly Tucker and Thomas Dew, however, true products of their environment, continued to revere personal freedom for some, link it intrinsically to the ownership of property and the realization of progress, and wallow in the paradox of accommodating slavery in a society, theoretically, of equals.¹

The structure and style of the Lectures on Government lend themselves to a topical, as opposed to a chronological, analysis, and this chapter, therefore, will focus on the three major themes of the entire work: the development of government per se, the foundation and development of the American state-federal system, and the defense of slavery. The defense of slavery will be treated last; it is not presented by Tucker as integral to his political philosophy or as necessarily linked to states’ rights theory. And, yet, there it is -- two full lectures devoted to it. Such an emphasis could not have been incidental. Slavery must never have been far from Tucker’s mind; it was a valued feature of the society his theories of government were designed to protect.
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Initiating his discussion of the development of government, Tucker asserts his agreement with Professor Lieber of the University of South Carolina who claimed that the "'state is a form and faculty of mankind to lead the species toward perfection. It is the glory of man.'" The belief that men are capable of perfection was an Enlightenment concept with its roots in the Renaissance as was the belief that man had a natural capacity for self-government because God had "implanted in his heart" the "sense of right and wrong, the native love of good and aversion to all that is evil." In this instinct, according to Tucker, is "man's capacity for freedom". This is the starting point for both the theory and practice of free government. These instincts require, however, that all people must guard their passions and watch themselves if they wish to remain free, for "self-control is the inseparable condition of political freedom."

Tucker's explanation of the origins of free government either informed his students or confirmed their previously acquired conviction that "the power of the people is from God," and only if this power is used righteously will He bless those who wield it with "prosperity and happiness, and the advance of science and art and intellectual improvement." Prosperity and progress (and, perhaps, perfection in a "remote generation") are the Calvinistic
marks of the righteous, the elect, and these marks Tucker will later assign to those of the propertied class.\textsuperscript{5}

Like Dew, Tucker believed in progress and saw his age as accomplishing much in "the march of the intellect, the discoveries of science, the invention of art...." But this progress is the result of a lengthy process beginning in human society which, in conformity with Lockian theory, predated government.\textsuperscript{6}

Man is "a social animal", for society is "essential to the preservation of the human species." This is evident, for example, in the development of kinship ties to protect mother and infant. The "primary end and object of society is security." Men are, therefore, dispersed over the earth in "BANDS or SOCIETIES." Government begins, Tucker explains, when the individuals of one band and individuals of another would conflict. Members of the band to which each belonged would support their associates, and hostile, warlike activity would result. This hostility would perpetuate itself until the parties might agree "to submit the controversy to the arbitrament of their respective friends, with an understanding that the associates of him who should be found to have done the wrong should punish, or force him to repair it." In this circumstance is government born, an instrument of leverage over the behavior of individuals in society. All governments, therefore, by their nature, require three things: 1) that each
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individual be responsible solely to his own society for any wrongs done to members of that or any other society; 2) that each society be responsible to other societies for wrongs done by its members to other societies or its members; 3) that each individual be obedient to the society "made answerable for him, and securing him from all responsibility but to itself." In this reciprocal relationship of the individual to society "we find the origin of the inseparable connection between allegiance and protection." And in these fundamental political relationships - the individual to the society and the society to the world - lies the source of "sovereignty" or power.'

In order to fulfill the purposes for which societies have developed governments, those who administer them should have two objectives: 1) to preserve the peace; 2) to secure to "each citizen the tranquil enjoyment of life, liberty and property." Borrowing from the eighteenth century cyclical conception of historical development (see Chapter 1), Tucker, like Dew, demonstrates that all nations which have ever fostered freedom have gone through cycles of growth and decline. At first, freedom wins the devotion of all, but, as prosperity increases, greed becomes prevalent. Greed gives rise to the demagogue who panders to it by showering upon the masses the spoils until prosperity has been destroyed. Then, only a military despotism can control the excesses of the mobs and restore order. The despotism might
eventually give way to a limited monarchy based upon a virtuous aristocracy, and the cycle will ultimately revolve around to its starting point, ready to begin another revolution of the historical wheel. Part of Tucker’s purpose, if not his primary purpose, in exploring the historical cycle was to detect the flaws which had led to cycle changes from a more to a less auspicious circumstance. He hoped to warn against such flaws and to devise a scheme to ensure the permanent welfare of society. He was looking for a way to keep government, once having reached a beneficial position on the wheel, from changing or, at least, from changing without the thoughtful and virtuous consideration of the people’s needs by their propertied and duly elected representatives. It cannot have been a surprise to Tucker’s students that his best example of such a government was the government of Virginia.⁸

The quality of government is judged according to the inclination and ability of its institutions to protect property. In his fourth lecture, Tucker establishes government responsibility for the protection of property under the law. Laws regarding property become necessary as soon as society has provided sufficient security for men to obtain more than a few personal items. It is significant to observe that, according to Tucker, entitlement to property is not a natural right, or existing in a state of nature. He, therefore, avoids refuting any argument that all are
entitled to it. By his use of the term, "society", Tucker seems to indicate, here, that laws regarding property predate the establishment of government. It is more likely, however, that he regarded these laws as artificial constructs based upon the natural (original or primary in a society) law "of occupancy in which all separate property [as opposed to property held in common] originates." As artificial constructs, these laws would be instituted as governments rose and would be part of their rising along with the need for protection of members of one society against members of another. Protection of property becomes a function of government, therefore, and government assumes a "moral responsibility", making it a kind of "artificial moral" person, for punishing the thief, etc. These artificial persons are called, in the language of political science, bodies politic.\(^9\)

In Tucker's presentation of the origins of government lie the seeds of his position on states' rights. Whether this was perceived by his students, at this point, is questionable, but as he continues with a discussion of the nature of the body politic it becomes more apparent. A body politic, according to Tucker, "is a society of men, permanently united for the purpose of promoting their common welfare, and possessing within and of itself a right derived from the consent of the parties, and recognized by the rest of the world, to regulate the civil conduct of its members."
By definition of the word, "politic", Tucker's society already has a government with regulative functions. The right of this body to govern comes from the consent of the governed because of the natural equality of man and must be recognized by the world.\textsuperscript{10}

Tucker's explanation of the body politic and the nature of its power may have seemed vague or, at the best, idealistic to his students. The example he used, however, must have been transparently obvious and singularly appealing. It was the "body politic which we know by the name of the Commonwealth of Virginia." The Virginia Convention of 1776 had designated the state a commonwealth and ordained "that her people should be governed by laws enacted by her own separate legislature, and by no other, and tried by judges appointed thereby, and by no other." In 1788, the commonwealth gave up part of its power to legislate and adjudicate when it ratified the federal Constitution. The Constitution of the United States, consequently, received its "binding force" on the people of Virginia from the commonwealth of Virginia. Virginia, in effect, "commanded" her people to obey the laws of the United States and to respect its functionaries. In the act of this obedience, the people of Virginia acknowledge Virginia's sovereignty of power, and so long as she maintains her "political personality" and the "right to make
and execute her own laws" those people owe her their primary allegiance."

Anyone can imagine the impact of Tucker’s words on the minds of his students, most Virginians raised within the context of their state’s illustrious history. "Virginia is your country," Tucker would declaim, "and the country of your fathers. To her your allegiance is due. Her alone you are bound to obey .... Give her all your allegiance, all your devotion, all your veneration and love, and you will give the best pledge of your fidelity to the Constitution of the United States, which she has commanded you to respect, and which you are bound to respect, only because she has commanded it.”

Tucker’s devotion to his state (see Chapter 6) assumed emotional proportions going beyond his rational argument that the state, as a properly constituted body politic, commanded its citizens’ first allegiance. In his novel, The Partisan Leader, a tale of Virginia’s secession, Arthur Trevor, one of the characters, explains his easy recognition of a Virginian: "I heard it in your voice; I saw it in their eyes; and I felt it in my heart ...." Here was a romantic, as full of feeling as Tucker, himself. And his second novel, George Balcombe, so perfectly reflected the soul of its author that Poe, in his review written prior to the revelation of Tucker as author, exclaimed, "the mind of the chief personage of the story, is the transcript of a
mind familiar to us .... George Balcombe thinks, speaks, and acts, as no person .... but Judge Beverly Tucker, ever precisely thought, spoke, or acted before." Balcombe, the leading character, a Virginian certainly modeled after Tucker's image of himself, represented ideals held dear by Virginians, but, more significant, he is the universal civilizing agent holding aloft forever the standards of states' rights, stratified society, slavery, gentlemanly behavior, and God-ordained order. These were the same standards Tucker held aloft for his students and expected them to carry on when he could no longer do so.¹³

In laying the basis for Constitutional interpretation, Tucker discusses feudalism in England, the development of restraints on royal power, the emergence of representative government, and the integral role of property in the process. He credits England with establishing the roots for "her institutions and our own." He does not, however, regard England's contribution with the naked admiration of Dew. Tucker points out that valuable truths were learned from the British, but they were "mingled" with error. The "founders" of the American government had difficulty discerning which principles in English liberalism could be universally applied and which were peculiar to the island nation, itself. Mistakes were made in the construction of government as well as its administration for the simple Montesquieuan reason that "nature and circumstance make a
difference among men." Tucker is saying, in effect, that the constitutional system established for a small island nation with large colonial holdings could not, in its full-blown form, work perfectly for the federated system of a large, continental nation with extreme differences of climate, soil, etc. 14

A right understanding of the American Constitution requires tracing the states' development back to their colonial origins to show that "each of the North American colonies was constituted in and of itself a body politic, governing itself by its own laws, and in nowise subject to the authority of the lords and commons of England, nor to the king himself as king of England, but only as king of such colony." The example Tucker uses to illustrate his position is, of course, Virginia, the earliest colony established. Beginning with an analysis of the letters patent of Sir Humphrey Gilbert and those of Sir Walter Raleigh, Tucker emphasizes that the original grant of land was a feudal grant made by the queen as sole allodial proprietor of the land to be granted, not as queen of England. These grants were "nowise subject to the authority" of parliament or the queen (as sovereign of England). In the Jamestown charter, James I granted the land to be held by himself and his heirs "As Of Our Manour of East Greenwich, in free and common soccage, and not in capite ...." The words, "As Of Our Manour of East
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Greenwich," indicate that, legally, the colony of Virginia was intended to be "part and parcel of that manor which was the private property of the king." The king, therefore, would not have lost the property even though he might have lost the crown. The manor was, in addition, in the episcopal diocese of London, and, consequently, Virginia would be a part and parcel of the same diocese. Such, indeed, was the case as Chapter 2 explains. To substantiate his case further, Tucker adds that all land grants made before the Revolution were described as "lying in that part of the manor of East Greenwich called Virginia."^15

The Jamestown charter constituted the incorporated London Company a "body politic" and authorized its right to enact laws for the good government and well-being of the colony. Here, Tucker makes appropriate reference to ordinances established by the London Company. His primary purpose, however, is to illustrate his view that Virginia (and the other colonies) was a "body politic" complete in itself and that the English government "had, from the first, nothing to do with its affairs." The Virginia body politic would have a governing structure similar to that of England, but the colony was founded "in a perfect and absolute right of self-government, qualified only by the reserved rights of the company of proprietors, and the supervisory authority of the king." When Charles I dissolved the company in 1626, it
was advantageous to the colony, which held and had held allegiance to the king but retained its sovereignty.\textsuperscript{16}

Virginia's sovereignty was assumed in her act of May 15, 1776. She does not, in specific terms, declare herself free, sovereign, and independent. She "acts" upon the assumption of sovereignty by proceeding to establish a new government and adopt a new constitution. She does instruct her delegates to the Second Continental Congress to propose a declaration of independence, but she did not think it a "necessary preliminary". She had actually "taken her stand among the nations of the earth" before the Declaration of Independence was written.\textsuperscript{17}

Virginia, as a body politic, erected a government which was a "creature of circumstance" not a "creature of theory". Virginia's constitution had parts which were in "exact conformity to the wants, habits, and prejudices of the community." This was as it should be, for laws should reflect the spirit or will of the society. Puritan society of New England created a government with strictures on conscience, domestic habits, deportment, and even dress of individuals. That might seem inconsistent in a people who had left England seeking religious freedom, but it perfectly reflected the will of their society. The people of the south, on the other hand, had "that high, enthusiastic, and passionate loyalty, which makes obedience liberal, by engaging pride on behalf of authority. The spirit of
personal freedom was perhaps never stronger than in the high-minded cavalier, who, recognizing in his royal master a divine right to his obedience, rendered his homage with the eager zeal of an idolater." Virginia colonists relished their freedom, settling themselves in a large and fertile area allowing them not only the necessities of life but also its luxuries. They sought their "own gratification", and there was nothing which could interfere "with the enjoyment of personal liberty." The government they set up reflected this cultural spirit, distinguishing in rank and protective of property. Only when the rights of property were invaded by the British parliament and Virginia's appeal to the king for protection ignored did Virginia sever her connection with the king. And when this happened "they found hardly anything to change in the frame of their government."  

As a Virginian, Tucker testified to the highly refined sense of personal pride or personal autonomy felt by Virginians of his class. What Thomas Breen's research revealed about eighteenth century Virginians, the words of a nineteenth century Virginian reveal about their descendants. Virginians were proud, and they were conscious of their pride. It was a distinguishing mark of class and easily associated with the political belief that state governments were sovereign over federal government in matters concerning the domestic institutions of their citizens. Those institutions, whatever they might be, reflected the dearly-
held values of power blocks within the population which looked upon state government as the first and foremost line of defense for the protection of their security.

The core of Tucker's states' rights constitutional interpretation is Lecture XXI which begins with an indictment of the northern press monopoly on the publication of textbooks promoting the Federalist view. He continues with a brief summary of Constitutional interpretations, the related development of the two-party system, and a commentary on Judge Abel Upshur's (see Chapter 6) review of Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story's monumental Commentaries on the Constitution published in 1833.

Tucker establishes the context for his critique of Story's Commentaries by discussing the power of the press in "this reading age". That power is wielded almost exclusively by the northern press especially over the minds of the young. "Books, intended to form the minds, the habits, and the manners of the rising generation are put into the hands of our children; and, in these, we look in vain for any lessons adapted to such of our institutions .... as are peculiar to ourselves." The writers of these books, George Bancroft and others of the school of nationalistic history, come from "a section of the Union where all men, in every occupation and in every gradation of society, are aware of a common interest, to establish a
Consciously or subconsciously Tucker characterizes all northerners as opposed to southern interests and promoting a constitutional interpretation to further their own position. This opposition can be traced to before the Constitutional Convention when "near the centre of the Union, a line of demarcation was already traced between two interests," whose clash threatened to disrupt the Convention, itself. Some framers of the Constitution knew that in such a large country with such a variety of soils, climates, etc. only a common legislature with "very limited powers" was viable. This would prevent one interest from becoming preponderant. Those who thought they could "foresee that the balance of power would be on their side" desired a government with "ample power". The latter were more numerous, and if the fate of the Constitution had been decided by the Convention, alone, such a strong government would have been constructed. Even if the fate of the Constitution were to have been decided by a "numerical majority of all the people of all the states, taken collectively", such a strong government would have been adopted. These were not, however, the methods of ratification used. In order to activate the Constitution, nine of the thirteen states (each "acting for itself") had to ratify it. Some states of the necessary nine would have had to come from a part of the minority
group, and, therefore, the majority tempered their views and presented them in a form acceptable to the minority.20

Up to this point in the lecture, Tucker refers euphemistically to majorities and minorities and divided interests. Here, he states bluntly that those interests are northern and southern, respectively, and that "in all struggles between northern and southern interests, taking as the boundary of each the line between the slave-holding states and the rest, the northern interest must inevitably preponderate." Hardly a constitutional issue has arisen over which the disputants have not arranged themselves along this line, northerners affirming and southerners denying to congress the questionable power. Northerners consistently supported the most "liberal construction" of the Constitution; southerners, the most conservative. Northerners saw, however, that they would fall short of their power goal unless they could "establish some principle authorizing a rule of construction, which might justify the assumption of powers not named." And it is here Tucker emphasizes that "we are to find the line of difference between the two great parties, which have always divided and still divide, the union."21

The two great and divisive American political parties have historically gone by different names, but, for the purpose of his lectures, Tucker designates them as the central and the anti-central parties. These terms are self-
explanatory. The first centralists were, of course, the Federalists who gave way to the anti-centralists in the political revolution of 1801. When the Jeffersonian Republicans adopted the pose of centralists, they gathered in those of the Federalists who wished to disavow a federalism that had become unpopular, and "they were all republicans together." John Randolph and other anti-Federalists who refused to join this "new confraternity, were stigmatized as a sort of tertium quid."22

With the coming of the 1820s, the genuine centralists shook off those who still "retained a sort of hankering after some of the old states' rights notions", called themselves the national republican party and brought "Mr. J.Q. Adams" to the presidency who "not having a majority in his favour, had of course a majority against him." The latter, "friends of the defeated candidates" anxious to avenge their loss, opposed Mr. Adams (who had "openly hoisted the banner of centralism") by declaring for the "states' right church." As a result, Andrew Jackson came to power under the "anti-central banner". In an aside, Tucker reminded his listeners that, at this point, the "ostracism" of John Randolph was "repealed".23

The election of Andrew Jackson gives Tucker the opportunity to launch an oblique attack against democracy while assailing Jackson's stand on nullification. Jackson, according to Tucker, was really a centralist, and this was
nowhere more evident than after his second election in "his celebrated proclamation of December 10, 1832, against South Carolina." The proclamation was issued against the people of South Carolina after South Carolina's nullification convention declared the tariff of 1832 "null, void, and no law, nor binding upon this State." Jackson stated that the power to annul a federal law claimed by a state was "incompatible with the existence of the union" and that no state had the right to secede. Jackson's "triumphant re-election.... by an immense majority" gave him "a right to consider himself as the organ and exponent of numbers as such", and, therefore, "he proclaimed himself the head of a democratic party." By this act centralism became democracy.²⁴

"Next after that of national republican, the name of democracy is perhaps the most appropriate, certainly the most dangerous, that centralism ever has assumed." As Tucker explains it, democracy is the claim by a majority of the people that they have a right to do what they want, "regardless of the constitution, and of the covenanted rights of minorities, for whose benefit and protection constitutions were devised." The same right was claimed by the centralists for the representatives of the majority in congress. And the people, the multitudes, unable to distinguish between the rights of the majority and the rights of their representatives, saw in nullification not a
protection of minority rights but a "defiance to the sovereign will of a majority."  

While these conflicts were raging, the northern press was busy preparing works to influence the minds of the youthful in favor of the centralist interpretation of the Constitution. One of these works was Chancellor Kent's lectures (1825) on the Constitution based on the principle that the "'association of the American people, into one body politic, took place, while they were colonies of the British empire, and owed allegiance to the British crown.'" This was the viewpoint of Jackson's proclamation and also that of Supreme Court Justice Joseph Story's Commentaries on the Constitution published in 1833.  

Joseph Story, a Harvard professor and nationalist New England republican, was appointed to the Supreme Court of John Marshall by Madison in 1811. He presided during part of the time, 1789 to the Civil War, when the Court was preoccupied with the nation-state relationship. This issue was closely related to property rights and slavery, and the tendency of the Court was to preserve and augment a loose construction of the Constitution. In the case of Martin v. Hunter's Lessee (1816), for example, Story spoke for the Court (Marshall having disqualified himself) and asserted that the Constitution was a creation of the people of the United States and not of the several states. The people were, in effect, the source of sovereignty not the states.
The case of *McCulloch v. Maryland* was a classic example of the same principle and gave the Chief Justice the opportunity to render one of his most famous decisions - that the government of the United States was a government of the people and comes from them. Its powers were granted by them and must be generously interpreted in order to meet the "various crises" which might develop and execute its duties in a way "beneficial to the people."^27

Tucker prefaces the remarks on Story's *Commentaries* with the assertion that Jackson's Proclamation signaled their publication. They "contained the substance" of Daniel Webster's speech on the Proclamation. It would be possible, Tucker felt, "to trace a political connection, from Judge Story, to some of those who were about the president at that time, and by whom the proclamation was concocted."^28

Judge Story (like Kent) based his interpretation on the belief that the American people were associated in one body politic while still colonies of Great Britain. If this were true, Tucker contends, the states were not bodies "'retaining sovereignty and independence’" as professed in the Articles of Confederation. They become "mere municipal divisions of the incorporated whole", vulnerable at any time to dissolution. It is now, Tucker exclaims, that the ghost of John Randolph should appear, warning, like the shade of Trojan Hector, of imminent destruction. In Randolph’s
absence, however, Tucker defers to Abel Upshur’s critique of Story’s Commentaries.\textsuperscript{29}

Story, according to Upshur, offers several arguments to support his theory of one body politic. All the people were, for example, subject to the king; every colonist had a right to inhabit any colony and to inherit land in any; commercial intercourse was regulated by the government of Great Britain. Upshur counters these claims with his own arguments. He claims that the mother country had rights "'in the same form, and not to the same extent, over every other colony of the empire. Did this make the people of all the colonies one people?'" The right of habitation and inheritance, moreover, were the "'ordinary'' rights of every British subject. Story’s arguments were, consequently, specious, unsustained, incomplete, and, in some cases, they actually served to refute his own position. They were used solely to demonstrate that the Constitution established a consolidated (people) and not a federative (state) system.\textsuperscript{30}

Upshur expanded his attack on consolidation by enumerating reasons why colonial Americans owed allegiance to their own colony’s government, first, and then to the king as the head. The people of one colony owed no allegiance to the government of any other; they were not bound by the laws of any other; the colonies had no common legislature, treasury, judiciary. Colonial governments were not even alike in their organization.\textsuperscript{31}
Tucker interjects at this point with a resumé of Story's discussion of the states' "political action" during the Revolutionary War. Story argues that "if the states did not form a body politic, before the commencement of that contest, they became one in the progress of it." Here, too, Upshur (through Tucker) claims that Story has made errors. Story states, for example, that the first Continental Congress was a nationalist government and was organized with consent of the people acting in their sovereign capacity. Not true, says Upshur. The congress which met on 5 September 1774 in Philadelphia was a "'deliberative and advisory body, and nothing more; and, for this reason, it was not deemed important, or, at least, not indispensable, that all the colonies should be represented, since the resolutions of congress had no obligatory force whatever.'" Upshur points out, in addition, that the troops required by the second Continental Congress, also not a national body, were raised by the states, and officers' commissions were countersigned by the states' governors.32

Upshur's (and Tucker's) criticism of Story's position is detailed and effective. It is a significant part of states' rights dogma, and it reflects the level of acrimony attained by the long historical debate between, as Tucker would have it, the centralists and the anti-centralists. Tucker, himself, enlarges his presentation on the subject by including the writers of the Federalist Papers.
The writers of the *Federalist Papers* were, in Tucker's opinion, the "most extreme centralists of their day." He cleverly emphasizes that they made a telling case against the Constitution as establishing a dangerously strong federal government. The writers entertained the question of what would transpire if the Constitution were rejected. Do they suggest that "the whole population ... would tumble together into one confused ... mass, in which all .... would have to seek out associates, like-minded with themselves, and form new bodies politic ....?" Certainly not. "They say that Virginia would be Virginia still, and Massachusetts, Massachusetts still...." They could not say this if the states owed their existence to the Articles of Confederation or the Constitution. The essential question, as Tucker phrased it rightly, was whether the Constitution created the states or the states, the Constitution.^^

Tucker's Lecture XXI was a somewhat rambling but classic presentation of part of states' rights doctrine. He had laid the foundation in preceding lectures on society and government, liberty and allegiance and the nature of sovereignty. He needed only to introduce the catalyst which would render the political creed of states' rights into a defense for his system of social values. That catalyst was slavery.

Tucker devotes two of his lectures, XVI and XVII, to a defense of slavery, a significant indication of the
importance he felt it should have in his students' grasp of the nature of their constitutional system. Clearly he believed it was critical for them to contemplate the institution within their political-legal context so that, one day, they might defend it. For this purpose, Tucker dips into the historical pool of pro-slavery arguments and reels in a formidable "catch". His arguments, like Dew's, demonstrate the significant impact made on proslavery arguments by the French Revolution and the development of Malthusian theories on population, but they retain the eighteenth century emphasis on liberty, equality (or inequality), and progress.

Lecture XVI is entitled "An Essay on the Moral and Political Effect of the Relation between the Caucasian Master and the African Slave." Lecture XVII has no specific title, but Tucker says that its purpose is to discuss the "political effect of slavery, as it exists among us." By "political" effects he means the impact the institution had on order, harmony, tranquility and security, which are all "conducive to happiness".

Tucker's goal in Lecture XVI is to help those whose happiness and duties are "intimately" connected with the institution of slavery and "understand it rightly". He also hopes to show slavery in its "true light" to those not so closely connected to it, for the "love of reputation is natural to man" and it is not easy for slave owners to "sit
down under the reproach of the world." With his own words, Tucker indicated his awareness of the negative criticism extended to those who upheld the system and his desire to justify that position to the world. He plainly saw the relationship between slavery and "government and morality" and the necessity for convincing all (in a democracy) of "the wisdom and justice of opinions and conduct" in the South. Falling back on the sound eighteenth century criterion of reason, he proceeds with what he calls "my business to reason and to testify" to the efficacious effects of the institution.³⁵

In his argument defending race-based slavery, Tucker offers first a theory of inequality. Using a Calvinistic, predestining God, he affirms that this God "has thrown obstacles in the way of that equality of enjoyment which we have assumed to be his general purpose." God has made the "sources of enjoyment more accessible to some than to others, and He has endowed different individuals with capacities for enjoyment, yet more various than the faculties and opportunities by which its means are to be procured." God has, for example, given some the low desire of pursuing money while others have rare and precious mental powers, genius, knowledge, or collectively, "talent". The latter have unique "tastes and desires", the "instincts of greatness." They court knowledge for its own sake, disseminate it to "advance the empire of mind," and promote
the "happiness of the human race." Tucker may have included himself in this elite group, but he does not state this openly. His fundamental belief is that all of God's creatures have different capacities for enjoyment, and those capacities are met in accordance with their need for fulfillment. 36

Tucker's argument for inequality was not new. It could be traced back to the eighteenth century, the sixteenth, and for that matter, to Plutarch and to Aristotle. Slavery was natural; God had intentionally established a world in which some were to be "High and Honourable", others, "Low and Despicable". That was precisely the terminology of the Puritan slaveholder, John Saffin, justice of the Massachusetts provincial court, at the beginning of the eighteenth century. He and Samuel Sewall, merchant and member of the governor's council in Massachusetts, were the authors of, respectively, the earliest proslavery and antislavery tracts in British America (see Introduction). Even John Locke, when he spoke of equality, had in mind a certain class in society and did not rule out slavery (see Chapter 4). 37

Not only were individuals created with different capacities and in circumstances providing different means of meeting needs, but the entire human race has "undergone the various modifications that make the difference between the intellectual Caucasian, the fierce Malay, the soft Hindoo,
the rude but docile Negro, and the brutish and intractable New Hollander." Scientifically speaking, these changes were brought about by climate, but the climate was created by God. Thus, in one fell swoop, Tucker justifies the inequality of races. It is God's plan. And in this plan God reveals "his great purpose in the creation of the human race. It is the eternal happiness of all through faith in the Redeemer of the world." In the worldly circumstance, God's creatures are unequal, but they can all be equal in the happiness of all through faith."

Using concepts collected from the centuries, from chain-of-being theories to the natural law of Stoicism to Reformation theology to climate control, Tucker rationalizes human inequality, but his rationalization takes on a more racial cast as he continues. He establishes, first, the fact that it can be plainly seen "how other races may derive advantage from their intercourse with the Caucasian." This advantage has been abundantly derived by the African race. The "appropriation" of African labor was the white man's first motivation to "form a connection" with the Negro, a motive "indeed unworthy", but "the result has been the physical, intellectual and moral improvement of the inferior race." The inferior race, the African, first appeared to the European "hardly bearing the lineaments of humanity, in intellect scarcely superior to the brutes, and mainly distinguishable from them by the greater variety of ....
evil propensities." This base condition has been much improved by contact with the white race, and "mild Virtues" have taken the place of "savage cruelty". In the moral and religious point of view, the two races, within the context of a slave society, will grow in love for one another and approach that blessed condition when all the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, and all hearts shall be knit together in love for the sake of Him who loves them all."

Tucker's version of the paternalistic proslavery argument is overlain with religious and romantic fervor, and God's sanction is fundamental. Who, in nineteenth century America, would argue with an interpretation of God's will but one who had another. Slavery is beneficial for the slave, a civilizing condition. Such is the "natural and proper effect" of slavery, as Tucker phrased it, "on an inferior race, placed in direct subjection and immediate communication with a master race of unquestionable superiority." The individual slave, when properly and Christianly civilized, offers a "salutary" lesson in humble, faithful, affectionate and cheerful service to a master who may not, himself, exhibit such virtuous behavior. Discipline will sometimes be required to achieve the proper degree of civilization, but as a father disciplines a child (or God, his creatures), the master disciplines wisely and "cheers" the slave along the way of progress in the life of
"honest industry" which will bring him "happiness". Both master and slave are elevated by this circumstance, and slavery will favor the "growth of religion in the hearts of both."

Having established the benefits of slavery for master and slave and reveled in the ultimate state of perfect love and goodness in the love of Christ to which both parties are aspiring, Tucker addresses a question which he anticipates may be asked. If everyone is joined in a euphoria of love, why is slavery necessary? With such love, the services of a slave would, doubtless, be voluntary, and the benevolence of the master, gratuitous. This, says Tucker, is a "specious" argument. The circumstance may be compared to that of a monk in the middle ages or the status of a married couple. The monk has the laws of his order, the couple, their connubial ties, which keep him and them from surrendering to the vagaries of the imperfect human imagination. Bond by these tethers, they are not inclined to stray from the path and upset the order of society. The legal structure of slavery will perform the same function for the slave. It will, in fine, help him to interiorize the sense of restraint and dependence and learn to call it love. The "disabilities" of slavery are "protecting disabilities", screening the slave from distractions and a "conflict of interests" between his own affairs and those of the family he serves. As such, the legal structure of slavery must
remain to maintain the "beautiful system of domestic harmony, which .... foreshadows the blissful state in which love is to be the only law, and love the only sanction, and love the supreme bliss of all."  

Tucker's views on the inequality of God's human creatures, environmentally produced racial differences and the civilizing role of slavery were not new in the lexicon of proslavery arguments. He does seem to place a far greater premium on the power of love than most, but his experiences in the writing of romantic fiction may have made an enormous impression on his essentially rationalistic and legal approach. The timing of his presentation, however, the late 1830s and early 1840s, was indeed critical, and in Lecture XVII this becomes transparently clear as he discusses the political impact of slavery.

Slavery, according to Tucker, significantly influences order, harmony, tranquility and security, thereby affecting the happiness of all. Slavery can play this role in a number of ways, none so important as providing a counterbalance to the extension of universal (manhood) suffrage. Tucker approaches this role in a circuitous way, demonstrating how the fear of abolition was linked in his mind, as it was in Dew's, with the fear of the expansion of the franchise. In the mass of mankind, he explains, many are ignorant. A vote of the majority of the ignorant would produce such "disastrous consequences" that no man could
calculate them. When all members of the electorate hold property, "the right of property will be held sacred by all, and the legislation which is best for some will be best for all. There will be therefore no misgovernment ...." But when society has "distributed mankind into different classes, having distinct and conflicting interests," political action begins in the adjustment of these interests and the resolution of conflicts."}

Political action is complicated because, as all "experience has shown," the more powerful class will sacrifice the weaker class if it is to the powerful class' advantage. But there are certain powerful checks to this abuse of power by the powerful; there are no such checks to this abuse of power by the poor. The four checks upon abuse of power by the wealthy are temptation, conscience, danger of consequences, the want of intelligence and treachery."

In the first category of checks on power, Tucker deals with a constitution placing power in the hands of a small class of wealthy men. There is temptation for those men to abuse their power, but the "plunder of the poor" is unproductive. A far greater temptation would exist for the poor masses to plunder the few persons of wealth. The second category, conscience, covers the situation in all countries where public opinion influences legislation. It is perceived as far more unjust for the rich to plunder the poor than for the reverse to be true. The quotient of guilt
for the rich would be high, while that of the poor might be virtually non-existent."

When Tucker begins upon his third justification for the power of wealth, his rationalization takes on a Machiavellian twist. The third justification, danger of consequences, relates to the perception of the wealthy that an abuse of power by a privileged few is "dangerous to themselves," for they can be overthrown by the masses. The ruling class must be careful "that the sufferings of the poorer classes, however caused, be not imputed to government." The rich, rather than take from the poor, must tax themselves to benefit the poor. As a warning, Tucker points to the extremism of the French Revolution, and the Revolution serves the same warning function for the fourth justification, want of intelligence and treachery. In the latter circumstance, power "in the ignorant multitude may be baffled by the superior intelligence" of the few wealthy in positions of power. Leaders of the poor, moreover, having achieved power, "are rarely content to remain poor." They retain the largest share of "plunder" for themselves and are, henceforth, concerned with the retention of their new status. The wealthy, of course, would not follow the same course of action.45

Whatever the condition of achieving power, whether by revolution or the extension of suffrage, once the masses have come to power they would consult their own interests.
They would "prey" upon the property of the rich, and "property would lose half its value from a sense of insecurity; the motives to industry would be lost," and evils would result leading to despotism.⁴⁶

Both Tucker and Dew had been mightily impressed by the social, political, and, especially, the economic dynamics of the French Revolution, and, had they been allowed a glimpse of the immediate future, they might have quaked at the prospect of a "spectre... haunting Europe". They both sought to establish and support a government of the elite which would maintain free institutions as they perceived them and "the rights of all men, in all conditions." They both offered what they thought was the perfect solution to the problem, and that was slavery.⁴⁷

In putting forward slavery as the palliative for the social dyspepsia of the lower class, Tucker and Dew resort to the same basic argument. "The existence of slavery in a community will always keep alive a jealous passion for liberty in the lowest class of those who are not slaves." Tucker, however, asserts that keeping alive the spirit of freedom will not necessarily restrain the "suicidal tendency" of extending freedom with an expanded franchise.

To support this he uses the "diligent researches of the British parliament" which have revealed the conditions of the poor. (Tucker, here, must have reference to the Sadler Report, although he does not mention it by name.) These
researches present the government with two choices: extending the franchise or empowering the government to repress. Either option could lead to insurmountable problems. Now, hypothesizes Tucker, suppose that the entire English working class, whose circumstance is worse than that of American slaves, were actually slaves.*

In his enslavement hypothesis, Tucker anticipates some of the thinking of George Fitzhugh without basing his ideas on the same historical tradition. Tucker had by no means rejected the late eighteenth-early nineteenth century goal of trying to reconcile slavery and liberalism. Fitzhugh, by the 1850s, had done so. If the working class were enslaved, Tucker continues, the problem of social turmoil is averted for the following reasons: 1) the "authority and discipline of the master" would replace a police force which is expensive and annoying. And in the South, slaves are easily distinguished by color, for the "white man's colour is his certificate of freedom"; 2) a military force in times of peace would be unnecessary. The expense of suppressing a slave insurrection would fall upon the owners who would hire "private men". How Tucker could offer this reason without, at least privately, pulling a face is incomprehensible, given the south's fear of losing Constitutional guarantees of help against insurrection; 3) whenever free laborers threaten insurrection, they are sure of sympathy "from the class next above" them. There would be no sympathy if the
lowest class was composed of "NEGRO slaves"; 4) as the slave is property, the master is motivated to care for him/her, and there would be less cause for insurrection than among free workers.

Certain characteristics in the arguments Tucker offers stand out. Color is, unquestionably, an issue. It is a badge of enslavement. Dew regarded it in the same way. There is, in addition, a marked attempt to use slavery as leverage over poor whites who would endure any evil "not intolerable" in "preference to the danger of letting lose an enemy so formidable as .... the slave population might become." That the slave class, once unleashed, would lash out at upper and lower class white indiscriminately was a carefully nurtured value in parts of the South, used to confirm the racism of poor whites and manipulate them into conformity with the elite.

The final arguments Tucker offers on behalf of slavery and in opposition to suffrage extension are cleverly and inextricably woven together. If suffrage becomes universal (for males) two conditions of opposite character may result. Universal suffrage could become a "signal" for the confiscation of property as happened during the French Revolution. Universal suffrage could, on the other hand, give wealthy men undue control over the votes of their " retainers". (In areas where slavery is an institution, the number of poor whites serving as retainers is, naturally,
reduced). Tucker suggests that in his own community (Williamsburg) the latter circumstance was the case for white laborers. But he quickly qualifies this statement in the next sentence. Wages are high, he says, and the cost of living low; whites, therefore, may entertain the goal of "acquiring landed property". Having such a goal gives the poorest in society respect for laws protecting property. The lowest class, the enslaved class, is not able to entertain such a goal and remains non-threatening "with no hope of bettering his condition". The slave, in conclusion, unlike the white worker, is satisfied.\footnote{51}

Having satisfied himself and, presumably, his students that slavery and states’ rights were the great panaceas for American social and political problems, Tucker, in the last of his lectures, warns his class against bigotry, their own and others, and charges them to take their places among "the discreet and conscientious" who seek truth, refuse to be circumscribed by party affiliation, and are "after all, the salt of the earth." These are the people most competent to handle the affairs of nations. Like Dew, Tucker perceived his students, rightly, as political creatures with a role to be played in the governing structure of their society. That role, in the national arena, assumes power only under the auspices of Virginia’s consent, and Tucker seeks "to impress" upon his young minds, again, that the respect and obedience they extend to the "central government" is only at
and through the behest of Virginia, only with her sanction. He allows that his "business" has been to "teach you to observe; to compare; to think", and he hopes they will employ those functions even if they should find him in error by doing so. Few teachers could wish for greater accomplishment than impressing upon their students rudiments of critical thinking, whatever the subject matter of the course. And, yet, there is the lingering suspicion that Tucker hoped for more. In a kind of Foreword to the lectures, Tucker claimed that his "aim was to lead his pupils, by cautious steps, to the boundary between what is known, and that which is unknown, perhaps unknowable; that, standing there, upon the brink of that dark abyss, they might learn to distinguish between theory and fact - between reason and conjecture - between opinion .... and the crude unconsidered notions which men so often dignify by that name." Within the space-time environment of Tucker and most of his students, how could any of the latter have departed with any other impression but that fact, reason, and opinion had been marshaled on the side of slavery, states' rights, a stratified society, the equality of some and the inequality of most, and rule by the propertied class. And all with the ultimate sanction of a Calvinistic God who would unite everyone in the love of his son. The ghost of John Randolph had good reason to sound the alarms. "If what is to come be anything like what is passed, it would be wise to abandon
the hulk to...the worms. I am more and more convinced that
.... this world of ours is a vast madhouse."
CHAPTER 9
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An early daguerreotype of the Wren Building was produced in 1856. It shows the stately structure approached by a rough path bordered on each side by a row of young sycamores and elms. To the left of the path stood the imposing marble statue of Norborne Berkeley, Baron de Botetourt, Governor of the Virginia colony and Rector of the Board of Visitors in the third quarter of the eighteenth century, purchased by the faculty for $100 in 1773 and moved from its original location on the Capitol piazza. The daguerreotype process produced a picture on a silver surface exposed to mercury vapor and was invented in 1839. It would have been possible, therefore, to create a visual image of the same landscape in the summer of 1846, perhaps, on the fourth of July just before the annual meeting of the Society of the Alumni of the College of William and Mary. The human subjects of the picture could well have been the newly married president of the college, Thomas Dew, and his faculty, Beverley Tucker, Robert Saunders, John Millington, and Charles Minnigerode. Such a hypothetical daguerreotype would have served as a visual metaphor for the holistic value system represented by the lives and teachings of these
five "masters". For the three raised within the tidewater context, the natural and manmade landscape in the picture would have symbolized a significant part of their largely pleasant formative environment. For the two Europeans, it reflected a significant part of the historical background shoring up their largely pleasant adopted way-of-life. For all of them, the physical setting and the value system it represented held enormous meaning and was intrinsically related to the ideas they conceived and taught.

The Introduction of this dissertation stated that it would critically explore the relationship of environment to ideas. For that purpose, it would focus on the faculty of an educational institution, the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia, during the presidency of Thomas R. Dew, 1836-1846. First, the environment which formed and/or nourished their values would be analyzed; then, their values as reflected in their lifestyle and in the published lectures of two of them. The pursuit of the stated purpose began with an investigation of the community which produced the college to establish the cultural values imposed by its history and reflected in its landmarks of which the college was one. The college and its curriculum next became the object of exploration to establish the nature of the educational experience it had historically offered its students and the values inherent in that experience reinforced by institutional architecture and other features.
of the landscape. Third, the lives of the academics were examined to determine how their formative years had influenced what they considered meaningful in life and how their patterns of living reflected those perceptions. Finally, the dissertation analyzed three courses of study prepared by two faculty members, Thomas Dew and Beverley Tucker, for the ideas those courses presented to the student body.

The outstanding characteristics of the Dew faculty revealed by the completed investigation was its homogeneity in lifestyle and ideology. To a man, in one way or another, the Dew faculty, even those of foreign birth, supported the community and the college mores. Personality conflicts were apparent, differences of opinion as to the quality of instruction or the range of salary, as well, but in the fundamental credo of belief, in the perception of what it took to have meaning in life, they stood as one within their institution, within their community. Such unity would be arguably rare in any faculty of the late twentieth century save, perhaps, one of an intensely denominational institution. Significant, also, was the finding that the four American-born academics, Dew, Tucker, Saunders and Brown, were not only products of the community which had produced the college but were products of the college, itself. Their foreign-born colleagues were no less remarkable for the ease with which they entered into their
new environment and quickly adopted it as their own. Last and of no less importance, the amazing identification of the historical landscape and the values it symbolized with the ideology of the faculty must be noted. The past was, indeed, remembered; it was apprehended as part of the present in a way more European than traditionally American, and it was regarded as essential to the quality of the future.

This dissertation cannot be concluded without one more reference to the characters who seemed to play a relatively minor role in the drama but who were, in the end, the vital component of the future -- the students. The Thomas Wallaces, the William Taliaferros, the John Dews (Thomas' brother) -- these were the individuals for whom all was done and said and who were expected to carry on the perceptions of what was meaningful in life or what were considered to be cultural imperatives to the next generation. In their lifestyles, consciously or subconsciously, and in their teaching, very consciously, the Dew faculty must have made an indelible impression on the classes they taught. The narrow limits, both in population and in area, of college and community would unquestionably have had that effect. An investigation of the lives of some of those students to determine their lifestyles and ideas might constitute an interesting sequel to this dissertation.
In the hypothetical dagguereotype of 1846, the five masters of the College of William and May would look eastward, down Duke of Gloucester Street to the capitol, down the years to the future. Three of them, Saunders, Millington and Minnegerode, would survive to test their values in the experience of war, and their courage would not fail in the support of their convictions. Two, Tucker and Dew, would not survive to witness what one of them had prophesied, although not correctly, and the other had feared. But all five lived on in their students, in the bits and pieces of reminiscence, a comfortable evening by the fire, a lecture posture, an inadvertent Raleigh Tavern encounter, and in an assimilated system of ideas which rationalized in a convincing way the values of a shared society. That system supported, in the words of a famous historian, "the olden times" which had "prevailed" long enough to "hallow them in the minds of those who had found them congenial. The scheme of life had imperfections which all but the blind could see. But its face was on the whole so gracious that modifications might easily be lamented, and projects of revolution regarded with a shudder."
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