

My readers, histories, and in fact all my books, came from the North. They were full of good and wholesome thought from classic Greece and Rome; from modern continental Europe; the isles of Great Britain; from the Northern States; but there was seldom a poem, a story, or an oration, from a Southern author.

Why was it that the South did not have its ratio of representation in the school books and other publications in this country? Was it because the South was financially unable? Fertile soil, bounteous harvests, and vast wealth of slaves, answer, no. Nor was it for want of culture; for the Southern gentleman was a classical scholar; the Southern lady, a queen of grace and refinement. Was it for want of intellectual vigor? The Gladstones and Bismarks of this century have saluted the vigorous thinkers of the South. Was it because the South was wanting in deeds of heroism? The South was the first to defy England, and furnished more soldiers, according to military population, than the North; South Carolina alone furnished twice as many men as New Hampshire, though she had a smaller military population. The South was the first to cross the mountains and attack the Indians. She was the aggressive element in the war of 1812, and in the war with Mexico, there were 43,000 volunteers from the South, and only 23,000 from the North.

Why was it that the South, rich in materials for an abundant and valuable literature, was so barren in literary production? The answer is an easy one. The South was strictly agricultural; the farms were large. There were no