

THE NORTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XVII

OCTOBER, 1940

NUMBER 4

CONTENTS

NORTH CAROLINA'S RATIFICATION OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION	287
ALBERT RAY NEWSOME	
AN ANTE-BELLUM ATTEMPT TO REGULATE THE PRICE AND SUPPLY OF COTTON.....	302
THOMAS PAYNE GOVAN	
REPERCUSSIONS OF MANUFACTURING IN THE ANTE-BELLUM SOUTH.....	313
FABIAN LINDEN	
CALIFORNIA'S LARKIN SETTLES OLD DEBTS: A VIEW OF NORTH CAROLINA, 1847-1856.....	332
ROBERT J. PARKER and DAVID LEROY CORBITT	
THE HORSE SOCIETY.....	347
DOUGLAS LETELL RIGHTS	
BOOK REVIEWS	356
SITTEYSON'S <i>The Secession Movement in North Carolina</i> —By A. J. HANNA; <i>Old Homes and Gardens of North Carolina</i> — By HUGH T. LEFLER; COUPER'S <i>One Hundred Years at V. M. I.</i> —By ROBERT DOUTHAT MEADE; HILLDRUP'S <i>The Life and Times of Edmund Pendleton</i> —By C. C. PEARSON; CHITWOOD'S <i>John Tyler: Champion of the Old South</i> —By WENDELL HOLMES STEPHENSON.	
HISTORICAL NEWS	368

Entered as second-class matter September 29, 1928, at the post office at
Raleigh, North Carolina, under the act of March 3, 1879.

THE NORTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL REVIEW

Published by The North Carolina Historical Commission, Raleigh, N. C.

CHARLES CHRISTOPHER CRITTENDEN, *Editor*

DAVID LEROY CORBITT, *Managing Editor*

ADVISORY EDITORIAL BOARD

ROBERT DIGGS WIMBERLY CONNOR

WALTER CLINTON JACKSON

ADELAIDE LISETTA FRIES

THE NORTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

MARCUS CICEBO STEPHENS NOBLE, *Chairman*

HEBIOT CLARKSON

MRS. GEORGE McNEILL

JAMES ALLAN DUNN

CLARENCE WILBUR GRIFFIN

CHARLES CHRISTOPHER CRITTENDEN, *Secretary*

This review was established in January, 1924, as a medium of publication and discussion of history in North Carolina. It is issued to other institutions by exchange, but to the general public by subscription only. The regular price is \$2.00 per year. To members of the State Literary and Historical Association there is a special price of \$1.00 per year. Back numbers may be procured at the regular price of \$2.00 per volume, or \$.50 per number.

THE NORTH CAROLINA HISTORICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XVII

OCTOBER, 1940

NUMBER 4

NORTH CAROLINA'S RATIFICATION OF THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION¹

By ALBERT RAY NEWSOME

One hundred fifty years ago in Fayetteville a convention of the sovereign and independent state of North Carolina ratified the Federal Constitution. By this action it accepted the peaceful revolution by which the United States of America achieved a more perfect union through a change in its fundamental law from the Articles of Confederation to the Federal Constitution. The United States is a comparatively youthful nation with an aged government. So adept have been the American people in the art of self-government that the Federal Constitution has survived in a world of crashing empires, tottering thrones, and changing governments as the oldest operating written constitution among the nations of the world. Under their century-and-a-half-old constitution, the people of this American republic have achieved permanent union, political stability, and national greatness. The sesquicentennial of so momentous an event as the political revolution of 1787-89 merits the attention of North Carolina and the United States.

¹ Presidential address delivered before the thirty-ninth annual session of The State Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina at Raleigh, December 7, 1939. The purpose of the speaker was to present to the Association and the public a timely summary and interpretation of an important event whose history has been well known to historians for several years. He has used the primary sources in making a study of "North Carolina in the Federal Convention of 1787," which is scheduled for early publication; but his chief reliance for this address on ratification was upon the comprehensive monograph by Louise Irby Trenholme, *The Ratification of the Federal Constitution in North Carolina* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1932), written by a trained historian after a thorough study of all available manuscript material, printed documents, contemporary newspapers and writings, and secondary works, which are listed in the classified bibliography at the end of the monograph. The basic primary source for the facts concerning North Carolina's ratification are the rare printed journals of the Hillsboro and Fayetteville conventions, reprinted in Clark, Walter, ed., *The State Records of North Carolina*, XXII (Goldsboro: Nash Brothers, 1907), 1-53; and the debates in the Hillsboro Convention reprinted in Elliott, Jonathan, ed., *The Debates in the Several State Conventions, on the Adoption of the Federal Constitution, as Recommended by the General Convention at Philadelphia, in 1787* . . . , second edition (Washington, 1836), IV, 1-252. The debates in the Fayetteville Convention were not recorded and published.

North Carolina has no claim for leadership in that political revolution. It played no appreciable part in the calling of the Federal Convention of 1787 at Philadelphia. Its decision during the last two crowded days of the legislative session to participate in the Convention was due to the political skill and activity of Governor Richard Caswell, William R. Davie, John Gray Blount, Richard Dobbs Spaight, Archibald Maclaine, and other leaders of a small group of upper-class eastern conservatives, primarily from the plantation, slaveholding, and commercial Cape Fear, Roanoke, and Albemarle-Pamlico Sound regions of the East, whose interests were threatened by the prevailing financial bankruptcy, commercial chaos, and excess of democratic local self-government. The State's planter-lawyer-merchant delegation at Philadelphia, consisting of Hugh Williamson, William R. Davie, Richard Dobbs Spaight, Alexander Martin, and William Blount, was experienced in public office, successful in business affairs, conservative in politics, eminently respectable, and representative of the best in North Carolina public life; but not one of the five represented in his background, social and economic status, opinions, or interests the small-farmer majority of the State's population. In the Convention the North Carolina delegation was comparatively mediocre rather than distinguished in ability and reputation. In the framing of the Constitution it played a creditable and important though not a leading or conspicuous rôle; but it did not represent faithfully the views and wishes of agrarian, radical, provincial North Carolina.

In the movement for the ratification of the Federal Constitution by the thirteen states, North Carolina lagged far behind. It was the seventh state to call a ratifying convention, the twelfth to meet in convention, the first in which two conventions were necessary, and the twelfth to complete ratification—nearly a year and a half after the Constitution had been adopted and more than six months after the inauguration of George Washington as first President.

While the Federal Convention was still deliberating behind closed doors in Philadelphia, the constitutional amendments which it was expected to recommend became an issue in the

contest between the radicals and conservatives for control of the North Carolina legislature. The radicals were inclined to condemn and the conservatives to approve whatever the Federal Convention might do. In the election of August, 1787, charges of fraud were made, new elections were ordered in two western counties, and conservative William Hooper had his eyes blacked in a fight. Disturbed over the defeat of James Iredell and other conservative leaders, Archibald Maclaine observed that "we have a set of fools and knaves in every part of the State, who seem to act as by concert; and are uniformly against any man of abilities and virtue."² The election portended radical control of the next legislature.

Despite opposition of the extreme radicals led by Thomas Person, the legislature on December 6, 1787, called a state convention to consider ratification of the new Constitution, in compliance with the request of the United States Congress. The tax-paying freemen of North Carolina were asked to elect on the last Friday and Saturday in March, 1788, five freeholders from each of the fifty-eight counties and one from each of the six borough towns, who should meet in convention at Hillsboro on July 21, 1788, to act upon the question of ratification. Fifteen hundred copies of the new Constitution were ordered printed for circulation among the people.

A long, vigorous, and somewhat bitter contest ensued between the Federalists who advocated and the Anti-Federalists who opposed ratification. The pre-convention campaign in North Carolina was longer than it had been in any other state and afforded an unusual opportunity for thorough public discussion of the Constitution and the crystallization of public sentiment. There is little reason to doubt that the delegates elected in March were informed of the opinions of their constituents and represented them faithfully in the Hillsboro Convention. The contest was waged by private and public discussion at courts, militia musters, taverns, and churches and by private correspondence, newspaper articles, and pamphlets.

United on the constructive program of immediate ratification and possessing many able and educated leaders, the Federalists

² McRee, Griffith J., *Life and Correspondence of James Iredell* (New York, 1857-58), II, 178.

were more aggressive, better organized, and more effective in the presentation of their cause through newspapers and pamphlets. They presented cogent arguments to convince thoughtful voters that the federal government under the Articles of Confederation was too weak to serve the best interests of North Carolina and the Union and that the new Constitution would provide a stronger federal government essential to the preservation of the Union and the solution of its domestic and foreign problems. They answered Anti-Federalist objections and emphasized the possibility of amendment, if the Constitution should prove to be defective. They publicised the successive ratifications of Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, Connecticut, and Massachusetts, noting with particular interest the effective strategy of the Massachusetts Federalists in agreeing to recommend amendments after unconditional ratification had been obtained. James Iredell was the most active supporter and the ablest publicist of ratification, though Hugh Williamson, Archibald Maclaine, William R. Davie, and others were influential in the Federalist campaign.

The Anti-Federalist campaign was based less on formal organization and publicity and more on informal intercourse and appeals to the fears and prejudices as well as to the sober judgment of the people. The Anti-Federalists charged that the Federal Convention by proposing a new constitution rather than a revision of the old constitution had violated its instructions and exceeded its powers, that the new Constitution provided for a federal government whose excessive powers would dwarf the states and menace individual liberty, and that the new government with its aristocratic and monarchical tendencies might be controlled by the conservative eastern business interests to the detriment of the common people. They objected to a standing army, the reëligibility of the President, the powerful judiciary, the congressional control of elections, taxation, commerce, and the federal district. The outlawing of paper money issues and the omission of a bill of rights excited their fears. Baptist preacher Lemuel Burkitt explained to his Hertford County followers the provision for the ten-mile-square area for the seat of government: "This, my friends, will be walled in or

fortified. Here an army of fifty thousand, or, perhaps, a hundred thousand men, will be finally embodied, and will sally forth, and enslave the people, who will be gradually disarmed."³ Willie Jones, influential radical, an educated social aristocrat with a belief in political democracy, was the chief leader of the Anti-Federalists. In the heat of the campaign, Jones deemed it necessary to publish a denial of the charge that he had called Washington, Davie, and other framers of the Constitution scoundrels; and Thomas Person, patriot general in the Revolution, denounced Washington as "a damned rascal, and traitor to his country, for putting his hand to such an infamous paper as the new Constitution."⁴ Though the Anti-Federalist cause was supported by few of the State's most prominent public men, it had many able local leaders who had influence with the people.

Before the March election of delegates to the Hillsboro Convention, public sentiment had crystallized. The Constitution received its strongest support from the more educated, wealthy, conservative, aristocratic planters, merchants, and professional men in the towns and in the commercial and plantation areas of the East; while the great mass of poor, radical, democratic, small farmers of the interior and the West appeared hostile to ratification.

In the March election, the Anti-Federalists won a sweeping victory. Many prominent Federalists, including General Allen Jones, William Hooper, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, William Blount and Alexander Martin, two of the delegates to the Federal Convention, and Judges John Williams and Samuel Ashe, were defeated by their inconspicuous but popular opponents. Stung by defeat, the Federalists precipitated election riots in Hertford and Dobbs counties. In Dobbs, when the counting of ballots forecast defeat for their distinguished ticket headed by Richard Caswell, Federalists knocked over the candles, assaulted the sheriff, and, amid the darkness and confusion, made away with the ballot box. At a special election, in

³ Watson, Winslow C., ed., *Men and Times of the Revolution; or, Memoirs of Elkanah Watson, Including His Journals of Travels in Europe and America, from the Year 1777 to 1842, and His Correspondence with Public Men, and Reminiscences and Incidents of the American Revolution*, second edition (New York, 1856), p. 302.

⁴ McRee, *Life and Correspondence of James Iredell*, II, 224-225.

which the Anti-Federalists did not participate, a Federalist delegation was chosen; but the Hillsboro Convention refused to seat the delegation and left Dobbs County unrepresented.

The public campaign continued from the March election until the Convention met in July. During the interval the Anti-Federalists were discouraged by the ratification of Maryland, South Carolina, New Hampshire, and Virginia. Each of these states except Maryland followed the precedent of Massachusetts in recommending amendments.

When the Hillsboro Convention met on July 21, 1788, the Federal Constitution had already been adopted by the ratification of one more than the requisite number of nine states; and five days later the eleventh state, New York, ratified and recommended amendments as well as a second federal convention to consider the amendments already proposed by five of the ratifying states. By extra-constitutional procedure, the old constitution had been scrapped; and North Carolina was left outside the Union—a sovereign, independent, foreign nation. North Carolina and Rhode Island alone remained technically loyal to the Articles of Confederation and to the old Union. By inaction they became outcasts from the United States, independent nations with no right to participate in the organization of the new government. Their only means of joining the Union was to signify their acceptance of the political revolution by ratifying the Federal Constitution.

The Hillsboro Convention contained a few men of statewide reputation for their ability and service in political and military affairs; but the great majority consisted of substantial landholders with only local influence and prominence. Among the delegates, most of the prominent lawyers, large slaveholders, educated leaders, and representatives of the towns and commercial areas were Federalists, most prominent of whom were James Iredell, Governor Samuel Johnston, William R. Davie, Richard Dobbs Spaight, Archibald Maclaine, John Steele, Stephen Cabarrus, John Gray Blount, and Whitmell Hill. In the debates in the convention, Iredell was the ablest and most active advocate of ratification. The Anti-Federalist leaders of ability, experience and renown included Willie Jones, chief strategist,

Judge Samuel Spencer, ablest debater, Timothy Bloodworth, Reverend David Caldwell, General Thomas Person, General Griffith Rutherford, Joseph McDowell, William Lenoir, Elisha Battle, and James Galloway. As a tribute to his prominence Governor Samuel Johnston was elected president of the convention.

The self-confident Anti-Federalist majority in the Hillsboro Convention did not covet the status of permanent independence for North Carolina; nor was it opposed to union or even to a somewhat stronger federal government. But it believed that the new Constitution created a federal government sufficiently strong and consolidated to impair local self-government, endanger the proper rights and powers of North Carolina, and threaten the civil liberties of individual citizens. Unless the sphere of federal power were restricted and individual liberty and state rights were duly safeguarded by the adoption of amendments to the Constitution, the Anti-Federalists were determined that North Carolina should not ratify.

Confident that the Anti-Federalists were in the majority and that the readiness of the delegates to vote made it unnecessary to waste public money by a long discussion, Willie Jones astonished the Federalists by proposing an immediate vote on ratification. Hoping to win support by delay and by superior skill in explanation and debate, James Iredell and the Federalists persuaded the convention to agree to a discussion of the Constitution clause by clause. Sitting as a committee of the whole, the convention discussed the Constitution for seven days. But Iredell and the Federalists were forced to conduct a somewhat one-sided debate. Though participating in the debate by criticizing some features of the Constitution, the Anti-Federalists did not bring forth and discuss fully all of the objections which they had raised in the campaign. They showed particular concern for protecting civil liberty and the powers of the State. Bloodworth declared that the clause making the Constitution, laws, and treaties of the United States the supreme law of the land would "sweep off all the constitutions of the states" and abolish "the state governments."⁵

⁵ Elliott, *Debates*, IV, 179.

Iredell and the Federalist leaders delivered long, patient, and able explanations and arguments; but they were unable to allay the fears of the Anti-Federalists or convince them of the wisdom of first ratifying the Constitution and then recommending amendments which the State's delegation in Congress would endeavor to secure. The Anti-Federalists desired the amendments in advance of ratification. They believed that North Carolina would be more influential in obtaining amendments if it remained out of the Union. Estimating that probably eighteen months would be required for the adoption of amendments, Willie Jones declared that he had "rather be eighteen years out of the Union than adopt it in its present defective form."⁶ He reported Thomas Jefferson as desirous that nine states ratify the Constitution and set up the new government but that the other four reject it to insure the adoption of amendments. Jones did not know that Jefferson had changed his opinion to favor the Massachusetts plan of ratification with the recommendation of amendments and had expressed the hope that this plan would be followed by the states which were yet to decide the question of ratification.⁷

After some parliamentary maneuvering at the end of the discussion of the Constitution, the Anti-Federalists on August 2 carried a resolution by a vote of 184 to 84, neither rejecting nor ratifying the Constitution, but declaring that "a declaration of rights, asserting and securing from encroachment the great principles of civil and religious liberty, and the unalienable rights of the people, together with amendments . . . ought to be laid before Congress" and a second federal convention "previous to the ratification of the Constitution" by North Carolina.⁸ The convention proposed a declaration of rights consisting of twenty parts and also twenty-six amendments, which followed closely the recommendations of the Virginia ratifying convention. Freedom of assembly, petition, speech, press, and religion were among those inalienable rights of the people con-

⁶ *Ibid.*, IV, 226.

⁷ Jefferson to Carrington, Paris, May 27, 1788, *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, VII (Washington, 1907), p. 36; Jefferson to Carmichael, Paris, June 3, 1788, *Documentary History of the Constitution of the United States of America* (Washington, 1894-1905), IV, 680-681.

⁸ Elliott, *Debates*, IV, 242.

tained in the declaration of rights. The amendments were designed to check the power of the federal government, protect the reserved powers of the states, and safeguard the special interests of North Carolina.

The vote in the Hillsboro Convention indicated that the counties of North Carolina were opposed to the Constitution without amendments by a majority of more than two to one. Thirteen counties in the Albemarle-Pamlico Sound area, every borough except Hillsboro, and the scattered counties of Cumberland, Robeson, Lincoln, and Sumner voted for ratification. The remainder of the State was in opposition.

The refusal of North Carolina to ratify the Constitution at Hillsboro was inherent in the provincialism, inertia, and individualism of its people flowing from the physical, social, economic and cultural isolation incidental to meager water transportation facilities and trade. The dangerous coast and inadequate river system of North Carolina resulted in a comparatively small ocean-borne commerce, considerable economic dependence on South Carolina and Virginia, a relatively small commercial and plantation interest located chiefly in the East, and a predominant small-farm economy whose chief stronghold was in the isolated West. The merchants, planters, lawyers, public and private creditors, and educated leaders, who were convinced of the political and economic advantages of a strong federal government, were relatively few in number and confined largely to the towns and to the commercial and plantation areas of the East. The great mass of poor, democratic small farmers, particularly in the land-locked West, were reasonably well satisfied with the weak federal government under the Articles of Confederation. They suspected a constitution in whose framing and advocacy their political enemies, the eastern conservatives, had played the leading part. They saw no need of and positively feared a strong, costly, distant federal government which might tax them, interfere with personal liberty and democratic self-government, and facilitate the exploitation of the common people for the benefit of the small favored ruling class of well-to-do planters, manufacturers, and merchants.

But the triumph of the Anti-Federalists at Hillsboro was short-lived; the course of events was against them. During the legislative campaign in the summer of 1788 and until the legislature met in November, Iredell, Davie, Maclaine, and other Federalists advocated the calling of a second state convention to rectify the mistake made at Hillsboro. The outcome in the November legislature was in doubt. But the Federalists succeeded by a close vote, over strenuous opposition led by Thomas Person, in calling for the election in August, 1789, of delegates to a second convention which should meet in Fayetteville on November 16, 1789, to consider ratification. Though unable to prevent the calling of a second state convention, the Anti-Federalists were able to defeat Federalist efforts to set an earlier date for the election; and, hopeful that the movement for a second federal convention would succeed, they were able to elect a solid Anti-Federalist delegation consisting of Thomas Person, Timothy Bloodworth, William Lenoir, Joseph McDowell, and Matthew Locke.

The modest shift of public opinion after the Hillsboro Convention was so accelerated during the nine-months' campaign for the election of delegates to the Fayetteville Convention that the ranks of Anti-Federalism were broken; and the Federalists swept to victory in the election in August, 1789. Furthermore, the trend of events continued to strengthen Federalism until the convention met in November.

What influences accounted for this swift and striking reversal of opinion in North Carolina?

An important factor was the orderly establishment and effective operation of the new government under the presidency of George Washington in 1789. The legislative, executive, and judicial departments were organized, and laws were enacted to assure ample revenue and to stimulate commerce, manufacturing, and shipbuilding. The United States government began to inspire confidence at home and respect abroad.

Coincident with but largely unrelated to the establishment of the new government was the recovery from the acute economic depression of 1785-86. Returning economic prosperity, in which North Carolina shared, enhanced the prestige of the new gov-

ernment, to whose influence it was in part attributed, and stimulated some reaction in North Carolina against the recently dominant radical party and its inflationary paper money excesses.

Occasional unfavorable criticism of laggard North Carolina and censure of its status of independence in company with Rhode Island, unsavory in its reputation for radicalism and paper money, provoked sensitiveness, particularly among North Carolina Federalists. But in general, the attitude of Federalists in North Carolina and other states and of the federal government was moderate, considerate, and conciliatory.

A skilful and effective campaign of education was conducted by Federalist newspapers and leaders, notably Iredell and Davie who assumed the financial responsibility for the publication of the able debates in the Hillsboro Convention. The public read eulogistic articles about Washington, accounts of returning economic prosperity, cordial addresses exchanged by Governor Samuel Johnston and President Washington, and favorable reports of the activities and growing prestige of the federal government and of its cordial relations with the states of the Union. Prominent members of the Masonic order exerted their influence for Federalism. There were appeals to the spirit of harmony and patriotism, warnings of the perils of independence, and cogent presentations of the advantages of Union. It was alleged that the votes of North Carolina were needed in Congress to strengthen the influence of the South and the movement for amending the Constitution. Repeated stories of the decline of Anti-Federalism tended to accelerate the swing to Federalism.

The public was cautioned that North Carolina was unprepared for the military defense of its extensive territory reaching to the Mississippi River. There was a growing consciousness, especially among the speculators in western land and the people west of the mountains, that the State needed the protection of the United States from the Indians, Spain, and Great Britain.

Economic considerations were of great importance in the reversal of public opinion in North Carolina. Returning economic prosperity seemed to confirm the arguments of Federalists that the new Constitution was a greater safeguard for property, commerce, manufacturing, and public and private credit. Hugh

Williamson had written to Madison in 1788 that "my opinions are not biassed by private Interests, but having claims to a considerable Quantity of Land in the Western Country I am fully persuaded that the Value of those Lands must be increased by an efficient federal Govt."⁹ To the degree that the trade of North Carolina was carried on through the ports of Virginia and South Carolina, the State's economic life was at the mercy of the United States. Economic pressure, implicit in the new federal tariff and tonnage acts which regarded North Carolina as a foreign nation, helped to convince Anti-Federalist farmers that the interests of agriculture and commerce were interdependent and that the interests of both were in the hands of a foreign nation. The admission to the United States of North Carolina-grown or manufactured products free of tariff duty and the suspension of discriminatory tonnage duties on vessels owned by citizens of North Carolina until January 15, 1790, showed that the federal government was friendly and conciliatory but also that it had the power to cripple the commerce of North Carolina.¹⁰

Of great aid to the North Carolina Federalists was the movement in the United States for amending the Constitution. The actions and arguments of the Anti-Federalists had implied a willingness for North Carolina to join the Union if a bill of rights and suitable amendments were first incorporated in the Constitution. Influenced by pressure from Virginia and the four other ratifying states which had recommended amendments and by the desire to secure the ratification of North Carolina and Rhode Island, James Madison asked the House of Representatives in June to consider the question of amendment.¹¹ In August the House adopted seventeen of the seventy-eight amendments proposed by the state ratifying conventions. In September the Senate adopted twelve of these which were submitted to the eleven states in the Union for ratification. They comprised a bill of rights and an explicit statement that the powers not delegated to the United States were reserved to the states or to the people. North Carolina Federalists welcomed

⁹ *Documentary History of the Constitution of the United States of America*, IV, 678-679.
¹⁰ Peters, Richard, ed., *The Public Statutes at Large of the United States of America* . . . , I (Boston, 1861), pp. 48, 69.

¹¹ Hunt, Gaillard, ed., *The Writings of James Madison*, V (New York, 1904), 370-389.

their passage by Congress before the meeting of the Fayetteville Convention and freely predicted their adoption.

The second North Carolina ratifying convention met in Fayetteville from November 16 to November 23, 1789. Governor Samuel Johnston was again elected president. About half of the delegates in the convention were also members of the sitting legislature, which adjourned to permit the convention to meet in Convention Hall. More than two-fifths of the delegates had been in the Hillsboro Convention sixteen months earlier. Again Samuel Johnston, William R. Davie, John Gray Blount, and John Steele were Federalist leaders; but their cause was strengthened by the addition of Hugh Williamson, William Blount, Benjamin Hawkins, John Sevier, and others. Again Samuel Spencer, Timothy Bloodworth, Thomas Person, William Lenoir, David Caldwell, and James Galloway led the opposition. But the Federalists were in easy control of the Fayetteville Convention; twenty-four counties had shifted to the Federalist position since the Hillsboro Convention. After three days of unrecorded debate, the Anti-Federalist minority was defeated in its move to postpone ratification again and lay amendments before Congress for adoption. The five proposed amendments contained restrictions on the federal government and indicate clearly that even the twelve amendments submitted by Congress would not make the Constitution acceptable to the Anti-Federalists. Then on motion of William R. Davie, the convention on November 21 by a vote of 194 to 77 adopted and ratified the "Constitution and form of government" of the United States.¹² The opposition then endeavored without success to secure the convention's endorsement of its desired amendments; but under Federalist direction the convention did enjoin North Carolina's congressmen to endeavor to obtain eight additional amendments to the Constitution.

The Federalists rejoiced that their margin of victory at Fayetteville was even greater than that of their opponents at Hillsboro. Forty-five counties supported and only fifteen opposed ratification. The swing to Federalism had been irresistible except in Sullivan County west of the mountains; Wilkes

¹² *The State Records of North Carolina*, XXII, 48-49.

County, where William Lenoir was influential; and three separated groups of counties. Timothy Bloodworth held four counties in the New Hanover area loyal to Anti-Federalism; Samuel Spencer did likewise with four counties in the Anson area; and Thomas Person, David Caldwell, and James Galloway accomplished the same result with five in the Granville-Guilford area.

On December 1 the Federalists held a grand celebration at Edenton, home of James Iredell and Samuel Johnston and chief center of Federalist influence. The raising of a United States flag in the center of town at sunrise, the display of colors by the vessels in the harbor, a noon salute of twelve guns, a public dinner at which twelve toasts were drunk, and in the evening an illuminated courthouse cupola, a large bonfire, and the display on the flagstaff of twelve lighted lanterns and one dark one for Rhode Island filled a day of "pleasure, joy and satisfaction."¹³

After ratification North Carolina gained easy admission to the Union as the twelfth state. Its Federalist delegation in Congress was seated early in 1790, and Congress extended the federal judicial system and commercial regulations to North Carolina.

The Anti-Federalist minority in North Carolina had opposed ratification to the end and was not satisfied with the mere addition of a bill of rights to the Constitution. Though it acquiesced in the Federalist victory, it retained a suspicious and jealous attitude toward the federal government which was a factor in the early alignment of North Carolina with the opposition Republican party led by Thomas Jefferson.

The North Carolina House of Commons and Senate passed on December 5 and 8, 1789, respectively, the bill to ratify the twelve amendments submitted by Congress in September.¹⁴ But not until 1791 did ten of these twelve proposed amendments become a part of the Constitution. Undoubtedly North Carolina's refusal at Hillsboro to ratify the Constitution was one of the

¹³ *State Gazette of North Carolina* (Edenton), December 3, 1789.

¹⁴ *The State Records of North Carolina*, XXI, 318, 664, 728. Though passed on December 5 and 8, the act seems not to have been ratified by the signatures of the speakers of the two houses until December 22, the last day of the legislative session. Not until May 25, 1790, did Governor Alexander Martin enclose a copy of the act in his letter of notification to President George Washington. The act bore December 22, 1789, as the date of ratification. *Documentary History of the Constitution of the United States of America*, II, 335-339. The act is printed in *The State Records of North Carolina*, XXV, 20-21.

factors in the subsequent submission of amendments by Congress. But, even though it did not like the Constitution, North Carolina did not desire to remain independent. The many factors of union which had earlier drawn it into the United States of America were still operative. Under the influence of complex circumstances, North Carolina ratified the Constitution and joined the Union in 1789 before it knew that any state had ratified any of the twelve amendments submitted by Congress.¹⁵ The tradition that North Carolina was exclusively or chiefly responsible for the submission by Congress of the amendments embodying the bill of rights and that the State withheld ratification until their adoption is not in accord with the facts.

Provincialism, conservatism, and inertia, attributable mainly to a complexity of geographic and economic factors, have caused North Carolina generally to be slow and reluctant to make important changes in the *status quo*. Next to the last state to ratify the Federal Constitution, it was the last state to pass an ordinance of secession in 1861.¹⁶

¹⁵ The first state ratification of the amendments was by New Jersey on November 20, one day in advance of North Carolina's ratification of the Constitution. *Ratification of the Constitution and Amendments by the States* (71 Cong., 3 sess., Senate Document No. 240. Washington, 1931), p. 2.

¹⁶ Randall, J. G., *The Civil War and Reconstruction* (Boston, 1937), p. 254.

AN ANTE-BELLUM ATTEMPT TO REGULATE THE PRICE AND SUPPLY OF COTTON

By THOMAS PAYNE GOVAN

The recent attempts in the United States to regulate and control the price and supply of cotton have dramatically called attention to a problem that is almost as old as the cotton trade itself. It was as important to the planters of the *ante-bellum* years as it is to the planters of today. Cotton was raised in the South, but its price was largely determined in the Liverpool market—controlled by financial and business conditions in England, not by the needs or desires of the planters. There was no way in which the unorganized, widely scattered planters could insure a regular and profitable return from their crops. This was a constant grievance to the planters and there were many remedies suggested for it.

One of the earliest of these was originated in 1839 by John G. Gamble of Florida and James Hamilton, Jr., of South Carolina.¹ It had no immediate connection with the sectional struggle and included amongst its enemies factors, commission merchants, politicians, and newspapers in the South as well as in the North. It was directed almost entirely against England, where combinations of the spinners to reduce production and the restrictive policies of the Bank of England were seemingly joined together to force down the price of cotton in spite of a deficient crop in America. Their proposal made no attempt to reduce acreage, to restrict production, or to provide for governmental intervention. Its whole purpose was to develop an organization which would enable the planters to hold back a part of the supply from the market when demand was low so that the price would remain constant and profitable.

The plan was never put into operation, and speculation as to its possible results is useless. Its chief importance is to demonstrate that in the old South as well as in the new some of the planters believed an organization was needed to control supply in the interest of price, and, incidentally, it would seem to in-

¹ Gamble to Nicholas Biddle, April 30, 1839, Biddle MSS., Library of Congress; Robert Y. Hane to James H. Hammond, June 18, 1839, Hammond MSS., Library of Congress; *New York Journal of Commerce*, June 12, 1839.

dicate that the planters did not oppose a high tariff because of abstract objections to restriction upon commerce, but merely because they considered it to be injurious to their interest.

Both Hamilton and Gamble were primarily men of affairs, not politicians or theorists. The former had been governor of his State and president of the Bank of South Carolina, and, in 1839, was acting as financial agent of the Republic of Texas and at least one railroad in the South. Gamble was president of the Union Bank of Florida and, like Hamilton, was a planter in his own right. Both were on friendly terms with Nicholas Biddle, president of the Bank of the United States, and it is almost certain that it was the cotton operations of the bank under the direction of Biddle which first suggested to them the need for some control of the supply of cotton.

The Bank of the United States and the other banks along the coast were being pressed by the demand for gold from the interior and for the payment of maturing debts in England when the panic of 1837 occurred. Biddle believed that the financial system of the United States could be preserved only "by persuading the London money market to absorb more American securities in liquidation of the most pressing obligations, and . . . by extending sufficient credit to American planters and cotton factors to enable them to hold their stock for a rise in the price of raw cotton." On March 29, 1837, he announced the intention of the bank to sell post-notes maturing within ten to eighteen months to the amount of \$5,000,000. These post-notes immediately commanded a premium of 12½ per cent and were widely used for the payment of balances owing in England, where, because of the high standing of the Bank of the United States, they were accepted even by the Bank of England.²

Cotton shipments were the principal means of settlement of foreign balances, and had to be relied upon ultimately to retire the post-notes and to pay the American debts in England. Any continued decline in the price of cotton would thus have a disastrous effect not only on the planters and holders of cotton in the South but also the bank and others owing money in England. Biddle thereupon devised a plan to maintain the price

² Jenks, Leland Hamilton, *The Migration of British Capital to 1875* (New York, 1927), pp. 89-90.

of cotton and to prevent the financial crisis from completely drying up the markets in the South. Agents under his personal control were sent into each of the Southern markets with authority to draw on Bevan and Humphreys, merchants of Philadelphia, for the means whereby to make sufficient purchases of and advances on cotton to prevent the complete collapse of prices. The firm of Humphreys and Biddle was organized in Liverpool and the cotton was consigned to it for disposal. This firm kept most of its cotton off of the Liverpool market through the spring and summer of 1838, and then, through fortunate circumstances, disposed of its whole supply at a profit during the autumn. "Cotton recovered rapidly in value and a saving estimated at from ten to twenty-five million dollars was effected for American planters and merchants. By November, 1838, the mercantile indebtedness had been paid in full."³

Nicholas Biddle resigned as president of the Bank of the United States in the spring of 1839 after it had been announced that the bank was no longer continuing its interference with the cotton market. At the same time there was a slackening of the demand for cotton, and in March, 1839, prices began to decline in spite of the fact that the crop of 1838 had been much shorter than that of 1837. There were many reasons for this. Political and financial difficulties had occurred in Belgium, Egypt, China, and the Argentine which reduced the market for finished cotton goods. Continental weavers were making no new purchases of English yarns, and the failure of the English grain crop necessitated large expenditures for the purchase of foodstuffs on the continent. These large demands strained the gold resources of the Bank of England, and the bank, to protect itself, was forced to adopt a restrictive policy which, incidentally, closed the money markets of England to Americans. Simultaneously the English spinners, faced with a curtailment of their markets and of financial aid from the banks, "agreed to terminate their competition for supplies of cotton, restricted their purchases, and went on short time."⁴

³ *Ibid.*, p. 91.

⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 95-96; *London Bankers' Circular*, July 12, 1839, quoted in *Hazard's Commercial and Statistical Register*, I (1839), 157-59; *Manchester Guardian*, July 3, 1839, quoted in *ibid.*, pp. 89-90; Tooke, Thomas, *A History of Prices and of the State of the Circulation from 1793 to 1856* (London, 1838-1857), III, 63-67.

Gamble and Hamilton, along with other planters, were worried by these developments which were bound to reduce drastically the price of cotton unless some steps were immediately taken to prevent the remaining stock of cotton from being thrown at once into the market. A new agency to take the place of "the great and tenacious holder" of the previous year would have to be devised or the spinners of England, through short time and the restrictive policies of the Bank of England, would "have the residue of the crop" at their own price. They, apparently, went to S. V. S. Wiler, New York correspondent of Hottinguer and Company of Havre and associate of Nicholas Biddle in cotton speculations both before and after this date. He agreed to their plan, and, on June 6, 1839, an unsigned circular on the cotton trade was issued from his office.⁵

The circular reviewed the cotton situation and then suggested that the whole of the cotton crop going forward be concentrated in one house in Liverpool "by an arrangement for unfailing adequate and *collateral aids, sufficiently powerful* to enable the house in question to hold over until a greater part of the present stock of cotton in England is worked off at an advanced price." To carry out this procedure it was announced that an advance of fourteen cents per pound would "be made on every bale in this country at all their principal shipping points, to all holders. . . . The consignments were to go forward to Humphreys & Biddle, who sustained by adequate means on both sides of the water will be able to hold on until prices vigorously rally." If the next season's crop were short, the plan would result in great profit to the shippers, but if it were large, the writers of the circular predicted, the great stock held by Humphreys and Biddle "would probably induce the *great and powerful interest* which sustains them to enter the market in the United States early in the autumn, by advancing on the first quarter of the crop in order to retain it on this side of the water for a reasonable period, so as to make the first result of the short crop of 1838 *entirely safe to all* American shippers and holders."⁶

The circulars were unsigned; but they were issued by Wilder,

⁵ New York Journal of Commerce, June 6, 1839.

⁶ *Loc. cit.*

an associate of Biddle; several references were made to "the great and powerful interest" that had previously sustained the cotton market; and the cotton was to go forward to Humphreys and Biddle in Liverpool. It was, consequently, immediately assumed that the circulars had been sent out by representatives of the Bank of the United States, and that it was the beginning of a new attempt by the bank to control the cotton crop.⁷ Wilder immediately denied this and said that the circular had been issued by "some of the holders of cotton in this country, who seek to protect their own interest by a concert of action," and that he had offered to make the advances named to facilitate the export of cotton then in New York.⁸

On July 5, 1839, Gamble and Hamilton, having persuaded other Southern planters and politicians to associate themselves with the proposal, issued another circular inviting planters, factors, bankers, and cotton merchants of the South to meet at Macon, Georgia, on October 22, 1839. This circular was signed by N. A. Ware and J. J. Hughes of Mississippi; John G. Gamble and D. K. Dodge of Florida; Thomas E. Turtt, W. H. Pratt, J. L. Hunter, and Henry Hilliard of Alabama; D. P. Hillhouse and A. B. Davis of Georgia; Nathan McGehee of Louisiana; George McDuffie and James Hamilton, Jr., of South Carolina; and John Branch of North Carolina. It proposed that one or more of the banks in each of the cotton markets of the South should commence advancing the following autumn at a conservative price (12½ cents was the suggested figure) on the estimated crop of 1,600,000 bales. For these advances the banks should issue to the planters, merchants, and factors of the country, on the production of the bill of lading and the assignment of the policy of insurance, post-notes of such description, and payable at such periods, as the convention, called by the circular, should suggest. By this arrangement, the drawers of the circular believed, the cotton could be held at least six months in Europe without the foreign consignee being under an advance of a single cent, and the houses to which the shipments were sent

⁷ *Ibid.*, June 11, 14, 1839.

⁸ *Ibid.*, June 12, 17, 1839. It seems certain that the bank had no connection with this circular, though some of its officers may have been informed of its preparation. For other denials of any connection of the Bank of the United States see Philadelphia *National Gazette* and Charleston *Courier* quoted in Macon *Georgia Messenger*, June 20, 1839; Samuel Jaudon to editor of *The Times*, June 28, 1839, *The Times* (London), June 29, 1839.

could be given sufficient strength to hold for even a longer period, should safe, remunerating prices not be obtained on the maturity of the bills.⁹

The principal citizens and merchants of Macon immediately met, endorsed the principles of the circular, and organized a committee to make arrangements for the convention. The response elsewhere was not so enthusiastic. The Jackson, *Mississippian*, a Democratic newspaper, said:

The ultimatum of the scheme, if carried into effect, will be to establish as the settled policy of the country the post note system . . . it is essentially opposed to *free trade*, and contemplates the establishment of a stupendous monopoly of the trade of the South by the banks, to the prejudice and ruin of all individual enterprise . . . we trust it will be universally repudiated by the intelligent planters of our State;—it is indeed time that the combinations of a few individuals with banks, to defraud the great mass of producers should be ended, and every attempt of the banks to engage in traffic, peculiar to merchants, should be frowned upon.¹⁰

This was followed in two weeks by the “Address of the Democratic State Rights Convention to the People of Mississippi,” which reviewed the whole history of the intervention by the banks of Mississippi and the Bank of the United States in the cotton market, and said:

A circular has lately been issued by a combination of individuals in six of the Southern States, proposing that a combination of the banks in those States shall advance on the shipment of cotton twelve and a half cents per pound. . . . A more extensive scheme of public plunder was never, perhaps, projected in this country. . . . It presents the framework of a bubble which swells far beyond the romancing genius of the famous John Law. . . . Without impugning the motives or honesty of the operators in this speculation, it is obvious that the scheme proposed increases the opportunities of fraud.¹¹

Southern factors attacked the circular. Robert Y. Hayne, whose son was entering the commission business in Charleston, wrote to James H. Hammond, “The late ‘Cotton Circular’ is making a great stir here. . . . I confess for my own part, I distrust *much* the beneficial effects of any combination whatever to

⁹ Macon *Georgia Messenger*, July 18, 1839.

¹⁰ Jackson *Mississippian*, September 6, 1839.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, September 20, 1839.

affect prices, either at home or abroad. The thing is very difficult to accomplish, and if affected, does in general, at least as much harm as good, while the failure of the attempt is positively injurious."¹² Another factorage house in Charleston devoted the larger part of its annual review of the cotton market to an adverse criticism of the plan, saying:

It has been suggested that a Convention be held in Macon, Georgia, in October next, for the purpose of adopting measures that will counteract any combination formed on the other side of the water, to depress our Great Staple below its real value . . . all combinations formed by the Manufacturers of Europe have been for self-protection, and they will not curtail their hours of labour (let the price of Cotton be what it may) while they can realize a profit on their Yarns and Manufactured Goods. . . . The price of Cotton, Yarns and Goods must be regulated by the supply and demand, and any measures adopted by a Convention, under the garb of protection, and acted upon would force the raw material above what the course of trade would naturally carry it, and would in the end prove ruinous to the Agricultural and Commercial interests of the whole Union. Much has been said respecting the Bank of England curtailing her issues for the purpose of depressing the price of Cotton; there is no doubt but the operations of that Bank, will, as far as possible, prevent speculation from advancing the price of the raw material beyond what would be safe for the Manufacturing interest, at the same time her influence is much lessened, as the bulk of the operations in Cotton are sustained by the Joint Stock Banks.¹³

The English cotton buyers in America, however, seemed less excited by the circular than the American cotton merchants. One, writing to an associate in England, described the circular, and commented that it was "very lengthy & hard upon the spinners & Bank of England," but closed his letter with the casual statement, "I hope you may be enabled to get some good orders of Cotton as I think a fair business will be done in it next season."¹⁴ The Liverpool and London papers mentioned each of the circulars and showed some slight signs of alarm as long as it was thought that the United States Bank was the instigator

¹² Hayne to Hammond, June 18, 1839, Hammond MSS.

¹³ Printed circular of Robinson and Caldwell, Charleston, September 6, 1839, Singleton MSS., Southern Collection, University of North Carolina Library. In this denial of the influence of the Bank of England on the cotton market the writer ignored, probably because he did not realize its importance, the efficacy of the newly established power of the Bank of England over the Joint Stock Bank through the raising and lowering of the bank rate.

¹⁴ Horace Sistare, Savannah, to Godfrey Barnsley, July 26, 1839, Godfrey Barnsley MSS., Manuscript Division, Duke University Library.

of the movement. When this was found to be untrue, they dismissed the whole subject and turned their attention to the more serious financial crisis that was already affecting the economy of the country.¹⁵

George McDuffie, the chief Southern defender of the principle of "free trade," was stung by the criticisms of the circular in the South, and made public defense of his connection with it. He stated that on his return from Europe he had met two other planters (probably Gamble and Hamilton) in New York and had discussed with them the state of the cotton market and the combination of the spinners and bankers of England to depress the price of the staple. The circular had been issued after he had left New York and his name had been affixed to it by a friend "upon the implied authority derived from a very strong intimate friendship, and from my own concurrence in the general principles and objects developed in that document."

McDuffie had led the defense of the Bank of the United States in the House of Representatives during Jackson's attack upon it. He believed in a national banking system and had consistently opposed the indiscriminate increase of state banks and their circulation. He, therefore, objected to the suggested issue of "post notes payable at remote periods," or to the idea of a large cotton bank in the South, which had been added during the discussions of the circular. But this opposition to these incidental features did not extend to the general principle of the plan to bring stability and uniformity to the cotton trade. "No banking operation," he said, "can be more legitimate than that proposed by the Circular." It would give to the Southern banks a constant supply of foreign exchange. The planter would have the advantage of the prompt conversion of his cotton into cash as soon as it reached the Southern market, and a period of six or seven months in which to avail himself of favorable changes in the markets.

Many persons in the South, he continued, had expressed apprehension that the circular would cause combinations against the South. Some of the newspapers had even encouraged such combinations by charging the writers with "hostile and offensive combinations," when they proposed only to assume a de-

¹⁵ *Liverpool Times*, June 25, July 2, August 20, 1839; *The Times*, June 29, 1839.

fensive position "to resist such combinations abroad, and to avoid the necessity of glutting the markets in moments of panic or temporary or unnatural depression."

They proclaim our weakness, and exaggerate the power of the adversary . . . the European manufacturers, now notoriously combined to force down the price of cotton, in the face of the most deficient crop ever made. . . . If it were to come to a war of combinations, which God forbid, it is utterly untrue, that we should be powerless in such a contest. . . . Our cotton is absolutely indispensable to the manufacturing and commercial nations of Europe, and by withholding a single crop, we could spread starvation and rebellion over all the manufacturing portions of Europe . . .

As to combinations abroad, they exist already, and have recently carried their power to the utmost stretch. They have had to give way, and a reaction is already commenced. . . . The idea that other cotton countries will rival and supplant us, is utterly visionary . . . the combination of slave labor, with highly intelligent proprietors present to direct their operations—a combination which exists nowhere else in the world, is the great and sufficient cause of that superiority in our cotton planting, which will forever defy all competition, until fanaticism shall reduce us to the condition of St. Domingo and Jamaica. . . .

One writer exclaims 'let trade alone to regulate itself' and another is so very absurd as to consider this effort of the planters to place their property out of the reach of foreign combinations, by preventing its accumulation in the hands of speculators, without capital, as a gross violation of the principles of free trade! . . . The planters . . . dispersed as they are, have been so long and so habitually sheared, that those who have enjoyed the golden fleece, seem now to regard it as a vested right. It is high time to break the illusion . . . and if any class in our Southern communities choose to take side against us, and even become the advocates of the foreign manufacturers . . . , they must be taught that the planters constitute the first estate in the empire of Southern commerce, and are not to be driven or flattered, or wheedled from their just purposes, by the combined forces of speculators and editors.¹⁶

Meanwhile Hamilton had sailed for Europe to make the necessary arrangements in England and on the continent. Five mercantile firms, including Humphreys and Biddle, in Liverpool, and seven in Havre agreed "to take the agency of receiving and disposing of such consignments of cotton from the South, as may go forward in accordance with such measures as may be adopted by the convention." Vincent Nolte, the great

¹⁶ George McDuffie to the editor of the *South Carolinian*, reprinted in *Macon Georgia Messenger*, October 3, 1839.

cotton speculator, who had just failed in New Orleans for the second time, accompanied Hamilton and agreed to act as general supervisor of the cotton operations of the planters in Europe.¹⁷

Mays Humphreys, principal partner of Humphreys and Biddle, at Hamilton's request, drew up a general report on the cotton situation in Europe for presentation to the convention.¹⁸ He sent it to Biddle in Philadelphia, who must have decided that it was inadvisable for the firm to appear as an active participant as there is no record of Humphreys's report being presented to the convention. Biddle himself had been asked to become a party to the arrangement, although he was no longer connected with the Bank of the United States. Early in the spring Gamble had written him enclosing an outline of the proposed operation, and both Gamble and McDuffie had requested him, during the summer, to give them the support of his influence, but there is no record of a reply from Biddle.¹⁹ It seems certain, however, that he took no part either in the preliminary organization or in the convention itself. After it had been held he wrote to Humphreys, enclosing the report of its proceedings, and said, "I do not know that they will produce much direct effect. But this places the House in a most conspicuous position before the country as the protectors of the Southern interest, and will predispose any inclined to ship to prefer our house."²⁰

When Biddle wrote this letter it was already too late and he probably knew it. Financial difficulties on the European continent, accentuated by the restrictive policies of the Bank of England, had done their work. The world was in the grip of a panic, and early in October the banks of Philadelphia, Baltimore, and the Southern states suspended specie payments. Bills of the Bank of the United States had been refused by Hottinguer and Company, and the firm of Humphreys and Biddle was to last but a short time longer.

The convention was held on October 22, 23, and 24, 1839, but the attendance was not large. Hamilton reported on his ac-

¹⁷ Macon *Georgia Messenger*, October 24, 1839; Nolte, Vincent, *Fifty Years in Both Hemispheres or Reminiscences of the Life of a Former Merchant* (New York, 1854), pp. 436-437.

¹⁸ Humphreys to Biddle, September 19, 1839, Biddle MSS.

¹⁹ Gamble to Biddle, April 30, August 20, 1839; McDuffie to Biddle, July 26, 1839, *ibid.*

²⁰ Unsigned rough draft of a letter in Biddle's handwriting obviously to Humphreys, November 14, 1839, *ibid.*

tivities in Europe. Thomas Butler King of Georgia drew up a long report proving the necessity for some agency that would protect the cotton planter against the spinners and the Bank of England, as Humphreys and Biddle with the aid of the Bank of the United States had done in 1838. But it was of no use. Planters and merchants, pressed by their creditors, had to sell their cotton for what it would bring. Banks, instead of making advances, were demanding payments from their debtors and each other to meet obligations of their own. Specie payments and normal business relations were not resumed until 1841 and later. When this happened the careful plans of Hamilton and Gamble were forgotten or ignored. The cotton trade remained as it had been without apparent change as a result of their activities. Here, as later, cotton planters talked much but did little about this important problem—a problem which was to contribute to the causes of a civil war, and then to enslave supposed “free” people in a tangled economic maze which led to the exploitation of the human material and the exhaustion of the soil of one of the great areas of the nation.

REPERCUSSIONS OF MANUFACTURING IN THE ANTE-BELLUM SOUTH*

By FABIAN LINDEN

The movement for a "home industry" in the Old South was another expression of the sectional conflict that was to culminate in civil war. The growing aggressiveness of the industrial North exposed the inadequacies of the cotton economy. Each new crisis in the South brought forth attendant panaceas, of which the movement for manufacturing gained widest support, for its proponents held that only a "diversified economy" could make the South truly independent.

But, as will be seen, the movement was sown on barren ground. The economic and social measures necessary for its success conflicted with the interests of the planters, and this challenge aroused a determined opposition. But, perhaps more important, the institutions engendered by a slave economy denied Southern industry the very conditions essential to its growth.

The agitation for manufacturing, latent since the 1820's, emerged with renewed vigor during the agricultural depression of the 1840's. In that decade the price of cotton hit an all-time low. While the average price for the period sank to approximately 8 cents a pound, cotton sold in 1844 for 5.6 cents and at times yielded as little as 2 or 3 cents.¹ This was in contrast to the 12.3 cents of the preceding decade. As a consequence profit on capital in agriculture during the '40's was seldom higher than four per cent and was often as low as two per cent.² With the ever increasing cotton production of the Southwest, little hope could be held out for an immediate upturn. On the contrary, predictions of utter impoverishment and systematic breakdown of the slave system were rife.³

* The author is indebted to Dr. John Musser of New York University for the suggestion of this title.

¹ Gregg, W., *Essays on Domestic Industry; or, An Inquiry into the Expediency of Establishing Manufactures in South Carolina* (Charleston, 1845). Reprinted in: Tompkins, D., *Cotton Mill Commercial Features* (Charlotte, N. C., 1899), p. 213. Never before and not again until 1897 did the price of cotton drop so low. U. S. Department of Commerce, *Cotton Production and Distribution*, Bull. No. 169, pp. 57-59.

² DeBow's *Commercial Review of the South and West* (New Orleans, 1846-70), VIII, 137.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 502; *Nile's Weekly Register* (Baltimore, 1811-49), LXVIII, 104.

Manufacturing, on the other hand, was enjoying a relative prosperity. In the depth of the depression, cotton mills were reporting large profits. The DeKalb mill claimed to yield dividends from 10 to 15 per cent, while factories near Augusta, Georgia, were paying as high as 20 to 30 per cent on investments.⁴ And even the warning of William Gregg, the leading advocate of diversification, to prospective investors "not to look for more than 10 per cent, 12 per cent or 14 per cent on investments"⁵ represented a bountiful return in contrast to the prevalent levels of agricultural profits.⁶ Thus the primary contention of the pro-manufacturing elements was that industry promised better returns on dollars invested. And, indeed, successes of enterprises like the DeKalb, Graniteville, and Prattsville mills constituted a most convincing argument.⁷

The diversificationists did not, however, stop here. They searched every possible aspect of the Southern scene for factors favorable to their cause. They pointed to the visible geographic advantages of the South, its location close to the sources of raw materials. It was estimated that the local manufacturer could save more than twenty per cent on freight charges and on the absence of wastage from transportation which was a constant irritation to Northern cotton manufacturers.⁸ This made possible both a cheaper and superior final product. Thus while Northern factories produced yard-wide No. 14 sheeting for \$5.26, Gregg's mill at Graniteville was turning out the same cloth for \$4.84, and took first prize for quality at a Philadelphia exhibition.⁹

Other sectional assets were pointed to. Rich deposits of coal and iron, an abundance of forests and water ways, the mildness of the climate, and the 20,000 miles of Southern seacoast were

⁴ *DeBow's Review*, VII, 373; XVIII, 788; Mitchell, B., *William Gregg: Factory Master of the Old South* (Chapel Hill, N. C. 1928), p. 109.

⁵ *Hunt's Merchant's Magazine and Commercial Review* (New York, 1839-70), XXII, 107.

⁶ During the tariff debates of 1842, George McDuffie expressed the prevalent attitude of the pro-manufacturing elements. "Abandon your fields, for their crops are blasted as they rise. Sell and sacrifice your lands and appropriate the proceeds to the establishment of manufacturing. As we have not had the spirit to resist the oppression, let us have the wisdom to repair the ravages." *Congressional Globe*, 28th Congress, 1st session, Appx. 108.

⁷ Boyd, M. C., *Alabama in the Fifties*, Columbia University Studies, No. 353, (New York, 1931) p. 60; Buck, P. H., "The Poor Whites of the Ante-Bellum South," *American Historical Review*, XXXI (1926), 50.

⁸ *DeBow's Review*, III, 3; VIII, 41; *Hunt's Merchant's Magazine*, XXII, 108; Hammond, J. H., *An Address Delivered before the South Carolina Institute at its First Annual Fair* (Charleston, South Carolina, Nov. 20, 1849), p. 36.

⁹ *DeBow's Review*, VIII, 514.

all offered as positive evidence that the South could adequately support industry.¹⁰

A major economic advantage was the presence of a large and cheap labor supply. A large mass of "poor whites," as well as sections of the slave population rendered idle by a non-profitable agriculture were seen as potential factory hands.¹¹ Gregg put the number of poor whites in South Carolina alone at 125,000 while *DeBow's Review*, in 1860, counted them at several millions for the entire South.¹² This "mass of unemployed white labor" was seen as a boon to rising industry. Their needs, due to the climate and their habitual way of life, were small; hours of labor were longer in the South than in the North; and they were virgin to the factory, unversed in "haggling and striking for wages." Moreover, argued Gregg, should trouble arise with white industrial workers, capital could turn to the large reserve of the Negro population.¹³

The slaves, indeed, were seen as ideal for this purpose. Here was an opportunity for plantation owners to transform the liability of idle slaves into a productive asset.¹⁴ Moreover, it offered to industry a cheaper and more pliable type of labor: more pliable because slaves could not protest hours or conditions of work, nor were they subject to protective legislation; and cheaper, because as slaves their maintenance could be kept at minimum. The DeKalb mill reported that a Negro worker cost \$75 a year in contrast to \$116 required for a white operator, while Salude estimated a saving of 30 per cent by the use of slaves. The more enthusiastic judged that the South's labor costs would be 50 per cent less than those of the North.¹⁵

"Bring the spindle to the cotton," became the sloganized spearhead of the diversification movement. By 1840 the growing need for home industry was recognized at the commercial

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, VII, 490; VIII, 14, 373, 505, 518.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 138; Olmstead, F. L., *A Journey in the Back Country* (New York, 1907), II, 128.

¹² *DeBow's Review*, XI, 133; XXIX, 227.

¹³ *Ibid.*, VIII, 513; Mitchell, *William Gregg*, p. 143.

¹⁴ Flanders, R. B., "A Forgotten Man of the Old South," *Georgia Historical Quarterly*, XV, 156.

¹⁵ DeBow, J. D. B., *The Industrial Resources of the Southern and Western States*, 3 vols. (New Orleans, 1853), III, 127; *DeBow's Review*, III, 96; VIII, 139; Hammond, M. B., *The Cotton Industry*, *American Economic Association New Series*, No. 1, 1879, p. 91; Ingle, E., *Southern Sidelights* (New York, 1896), pp. 75 ff.; *Hunt's Merchant's Magazine*, XXII, 107.

conventions.¹⁶ In 1853 a committee was established to popularize, particularly in Europe, Southern industrial opportunities. A year later several governors were asking for the creation of state committees on manufacturing. The Whigs justified their position of non-intercourse with the North on the ground that it would stimulate home industry.¹⁷ An annual increase of millions in the income of the South was predicted if the section took to manufacturing.¹⁸ On the other hand, the precariousness of the single crop system was pointed to, for a sudden emergence of a formidable cotton-growing competitor or the failure of a year's crop would result in sectional ruin.

Another factor having serious political repercussions was the sharp disproportion of population growth between the North and the South. While in 1800 the national population was almost equally distributed, the South was, scarcely fifty years later, clearly a minority section having only approximately 40 per cent of the total.¹⁹ This reflected itself inevitably in decreased representation in the federal government. In 1860 the House seated 85 Southern representatives as opposed to 163 from the North.²⁰

The rapidity of Northern expansion was attributed for the most part to foreign immigration. By 1860 about 20 per cent of the Northern population had come from Europe, while only six per cent of all Southern white inhabitants were foreign-born.²¹ It was contended that the industrial opportunities which kept immigrants in the North were relatively non-existent in the South. Thus Barnard predicted that a flourishing home industry "would detract something from the increase of the Northern population and add something to ours."²²

¹⁶ Clark, V. S., "Manufacturing During the Ante-Bellum and War Years," *The South in the Building of the Nation* (Richmond, Virginia, 1909), V, 317; Wender, H., *Southern Commercial Conventions*, *Johns Hopkins University Studies*, XLVIII, No. 4, *passim*.

¹⁷ Clark, V. S., *History of Manufacturing in the United States* (New York, 1929), I, 555; Barnard, F. A., *Oration Delivered Before Citizens of Tuscaloosa* (Tuscaloosa, Alabama, 1851); Cole, A. C., *The Whig Party in the South* (Washington, 1913) pp. 206 ff.

¹⁸ *DeBow's Review*, VIII, 145; 515. Hamilton Smith of Kentucky claimed that the Southern planter, with an investment of \$738,000 made but \$80,000 or 10 per cent profit, while the manufacturer, investing but \$260,900 received \$106,000 or 40 per cent. These figures were frequently quoted by diversificationists. *DeBow's Review*, VII, 59; VIII, 19, 51, 486.

¹⁹ *Eighth Census*, 1860, Population, Introduction, p. xx.

²⁰ Carpenter, J. T., *The South as a Conscious Minority* (New York, 1930), p. 15.

²¹ Mitchell, B., *The Rise of the Cotton Mills in the South*, *Johns Hopkins Studies*, Series XXXIX, No. 2 (Baltimore, 1921), p. 31.

²² Barnard, *Oration*, p. 27. Cf. *Hunt's Merchant's Magazine*, XXI, 6, 499; XXIX 227; Wender, *Southern Commercial Conventions*, p. 199.

The growing migration of the population from the South Atlantic states to the Southwest aggravated the problem considerably. Soil exhaustion in the older states rendered cultivation, well-nigh profitless, and rather than risk capital in rehabilitation efforts planters sought virgin soil in the West. Hammond calculated that South Carolina slaveholders "carried off" 8,300 Negroes a year, transferring them "from a soil producing to the head twelve hundred pounds . . . to one that yielded eighteen hundred pounds."²³ Hence the cotton production of the Atlantic coast states showed in 1860 an increase of only 44 per cent over the preceding decade as contrasted with the corresponding increase of 153 per cent for the Southwestern states.²⁴

This development of the Southwest at the expense of the older states, it was contended, could lead only to sectional disaster. For as the population of the free states grew in density, its invasion of the abandoned northern portions of the South could not be staved off. Slave territory, on the other hand, would become increasingly limited. From the point of view of the plantocracy, this could lead only to a disastrous loss of political strength and to a dangerous concentration of the slave population.²⁵ To stem the migratory tendency a diversified economy was required, claimed the proponents of industry. Manufacturing offered plantation owners, now abandoning exhausted lands, a new field for investment of their capital and slaves. Thus it would serve not merely to increase the population but to stabilize it as well.

Diversificationists also made advantageous use of Southern irritation with the glaring evidences of Yankee exploitation. Most of the profits in cotton-growing went, it was felt, to fill the pockets of New England manufacturers. Raw cotton,

²³ *DeBow's Review*, VIII, 502. Once having started, it was expected that this migration would continue at an even greater pace. For planters in the older states were unable to compete with the cheaply produced cotton of the Southwest, and soon would be forced to seek more productive soil. Taylor, R. H., *Slaveholding in North Carolina: an Economic View*, *John Sprunt Historical Publications*, Vol. XVIII, Nos. 1-2, pp. 56, 67.

²⁴ Hammond, *Address*, p. 84; Hawk, E. Q., *Economic History of the South* (New York, 1934), p. 232.

²⁵ This idea was perhaps best developed by Edmund Ruffin in his article, "The Effects of High Prices of Slaves," *DeBow's Review*, XXVI, pp. 647-57. Although he makes no mention of manufacturing, he nevertheless demonstrates that soil exhaustion in the older states would result in the loss of Southern territory to the North. See also an earlier article in the same publication written by M. Tarver. He voices the Southern fear of a concentrated slave population. *Ibid.*, III, 213.

shipped to Eastern mills for fabrication, returned "bearing on its back the charge of carriage to and fro, of manufacturing, of commissions, insurance and heavy profits of the merchant."²⁶ Yet the cotton kingdom had only to adopt industry, it was argued, and the home market would be supplied at a "just price," and at the same time adequate profit would be assured to both its manufacturers and plantation owners.²⁷ Political leaders reflected the indignation of the cotton states when they brandished the threat of Southern competition over the heads of Northern industrial interests. "What then should we do," bitterly questioned Senator McDuffie of South Carolina. "Why Sir, as we should have the slavish privilege of doing what you had not prohibited us from doing, we should . . . direct our capital and industry from agriculture to manufacturing."²⁸ And the Virginia Senator Mason suited action to the word by appearing in Washington dressed entirely in homespun.²⁹

Economic aggression from the North, however, could not entirely explain away inherent weaknesses in the plantation system itself. The dislocation of large masses of people, the "poor whites," from the sources of production, had created a disquieting situation. For it had become increasingly evident that they could find no place in the plantation economy. Uneducated, unproductive, and frequently criminal, they constituted a burden to Southern society, the dangers of which the planter class could not fail to perceive.³⁰ "It is this great upheaving of our masses that we are to fear," cautioned *DeBow's Review* in 1850, "so far as our own institutions are concerned."³¹

It was therefore from pure self-interest that plantation owners were urged into widespread manufacturing. For, it was argued, with the slaves engaged in agriculture and the whites in the factory, every freeman would, as a matter of class preservation, become a "firm and uncompromising" supporter of the

²⁶ *Ibid.*, VIII, 99.

²⁷ *New York Herald*, May 21, 1859; Cf. *DeBow's Review*, VIII, 484.

²⁸ *Congressional Globe*, 23th Congress, 1st Session, Appx. 108.

²⁹ Learning of Mason's gesture, Lincoln whimsically suggested that a certain consistency of the Senator would oblige him to walk barefoot through the halls of Congress. Cole, A. C., *The Irrepressible Conflict* (New York, 1934), p. 67.

³⁰ Hammond, *Address*, p. 232; *DeBow's Review*, VIII, 139.

³¹ *Ibid.*, VIII, 25; Buck, P. H., in his comment on "The Poor White of the Ante-Bellum South," holds that "there took shape a movement of discontent which promised to wrest the political leadership from the hands of the gentry and overthrow . . . monopoly of the plantation system."

slave system.³² Even those who doubted the imminence of open revolt could not fail to perceive the value of converting a non-productive group into a productive one. Thus industry was held to be a bulwark at once against internal and external enemies.

Convincing and justified as the arguments in behalf of "home industry" were, there was nevertheless launched against it a bitter opposition. Plantation owners clearly recognized in this movement a formidable threat to their interests. Diversificationists, however, realized that without the support of the plantocracy their plans to bring the spindle to the cotton would collapse, and hence put forward every effort to enlist their sympathy. They passionately urged the planters to take cognizance of a crisis in their own economy, and pointed out that their interests were inseparable from those of the entire section.³³ Thus it was contended that with industry increasing the demand for slaves, the value of both Negroes and cotton would be "enhanced." Further, as Southern capital flowed away from the plantation into the mill, the restriction of cotton production would also result in the rise of prices. And, conversely, since the demand for cotton fabrics was held to be unlimited, an increase in the number of factories would lead inevitably to a higher price for cotton. Finally, increased land values were promised on the basis of the predicted growth of industrial towns. In brief, manufacturing would stabilize rather than destroy the plantation economy.³⁴

Increasingly it was accepted that political independence could be achieved only through economic emancipation. Early in 1861, when sectional animosity was near the breaking point, Gregg wrote, "We trust that it has been manifest to the people of the South that a prosperous state of commerce and manufacture is . . . absolutely necessary to render us politically in-

³² Hammond, *Address*, p. 34; Olmstead, F. L., *The Cotton Kingdom* (New York, 1862) II, 357. For other arguments of a social nature advanced in support of home industry, see *DeBow's Review*, III, 188, 198; VIII, 26, 508; XXIV 386; *Barnard Oration* p. 26.

³³ Characteristically, *DeBow's Review* held that the success of manufacturing was dependent upon "whether the agriculturist shall forget his fear of injury to his slave property, and shall grasp the hand of his brother, the manufacturer, who is really ready and able to increase the value of his product three-fold. . . . In a word, it is whether the plow, the loom, and the anvil shall be brought together in harmony and success." *DeBow's Review*, VIII, 25; Cf. *ibid.*, III, 199.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, III, 195 ff.; VIII, 15-27; Mitchell, *William Gregg*, p. 302.

dependent.”³⁵ Others, however, believing open conflict inevitable, foresaw the weakness of an agrarian economy in time of war and urged the immediate establishment of factories as an absolutely essential military precaution.³⁶

Thus the agitation for industrialization sought, in the most practical terms, to win adherents from among the people of the South and, most particularly, the plantations.

The slaveholders, on the contrary, relentlessly hostile to the rising “menace,” fought determinedly to block the establishment of factories. William Gregg, James H. Taylor, Richard F. Reynolds, A. H. Brisbane, all leading figures in the movement for manufacturing, complained bitterly of the opposition they met at “every turn.”³⁷ “Surely there is nothing in cotton spinning,” sardonically commented *DeBow's Review*, “that can poison the atmosphere of South Carolina.”³⁸

The hostility was encountered on all sides. The state legislatures erected effective legal barriers to fledgling industries. Charters of incorporation, so vital to the development of large-scale projects, were frequently denied, and those finally passed contained provisions that hampered their effectiveness. In 1837 the *Greenville Mountaineer* denounced as “an act of legalized fraud” a bill before the North Carolina legislature which authorized limited partnerships.³⁹ Gregg, in chartering his Graniteville mill, applied circumspectly to both the Georgia and South Carolina legislatures, and while the latter reluctantly legalized his venture, Georgia gave him an outright refusal.⁴⁰

In the current journals the planters' views had powerful exponents, blending argument with vituperation in abundant measure. The Southern climate and the lack of skilled labor, as well as the essentially “rural character” of the people, were deemed unsuitable for so “complicated” a pursuit as manufac-

³⁵ *DeBow's Review*, XXX, 102.

³⁶ *DeBow's Review*, XXIX, 625; XXX, 221.

³⁷ Mitchell, *William Gregg*, p. 73; Russell, R. R., *Economic Aspects of Southern Sectionalism*, *University of Illinois Social Studies*, XI, Nos. 1 and 2, p. 54; Ingle, *Southern Side-lights*, p. 69.

³⁸ *DeBow's Review*, VIII, 138.

³⁹ Boucher, C. S., *The Ante-Bellum Attitude of South Carolina toward Manufacturing and Agriculture*, *Washington University Humanistic Studies*, Series IV, Vol. III, Part II, No. 2 (St. Louis, 1916), pp. 252-3.

⁴⁰ Gregg, *Essays*, p. 84. Confronted with these difficulties, Gregg wrote his pamphlet on *An Inquiry into the Expediency of Granting Charters of Incorporation for Manufacturing Purposes in South Carolina*.

turing.⁴¹ Hostility to the North was turned effectively against industry as a "Northern Corruption." Politicians branded manufacturing, bearing with it the vice, poverty, and ignorance of the cities, as incompatible with Southern culture and liberty. George Fitzhugh, author of *Sociology for the South*, villified "the filthy, crowded, licentious factories . . . of the North."⁴²

Such agitation had for decades succeeded in massing popular sentiment against industry. During a South Carolina political campaign the *Free Press and Hive* "exposed" candidate William Preston by revealing that his brother had invested in a manufacturing enterprise. Even so remote a connection with the hated pursuit, it was believed, would decrease Preston's chances for victory.⁴³ Thus the political and social fashion was determined largely by the views and interests of slaveholders.

Their position, however, was clearly defensive, for essentially they saw in manufacturing a threat to their interests. Professor Beard has suggested that the planter's hostility to industry be attributed to his "rural habits of life" and his "tribesman's instinctive dislike for unaccustomed ways."⁴⁴ But beneath "rural habits" and tribesman's instincts lay a more fundamental desire to protect vested wealth and power, which acknowledged in industry a formidable rival. Allowed to develop unchallenged, it might engulf the whole of Southern economy. Thus manufacturing was seen as a Trojan horse, and Graniteville, Prattsville, DeKalb, Vancluse, and Salude were the invading columns of the enemy.

A social change was believed inevitable. The *Southern Quarterly Review* warned that once industry established itself firmly on Southern soil, the agricultural class would perforce lose its position. It was precisely this, it was pointed out, that had taken place in the North which now, with tolerant patronage, could refer to its "honest" and "sturdy" farmers. The *Review* urged resistance against "the efforts of those who, dazzled by the splendors of Northern civilization, would endeavor to imi-

⁴¹ *Hunt's Merchant's Magazine*, XXII, 27; *Nile's Register*, LXVIII, 104; *Southern Quarterly Review* (Charleston, 1842-56), XXVI, 434.

⁴² *DeBow's Review*, XXIII, 587; Cf. Fitzhugh, G., *Sociology for the South* (Richmond, Va., 1854), pp. 18 ff.

⁴³ Similar campaigns were waged against Judge William Smith and a James Chestnut. Boucher, *Ante-Bellum Attitude of South Carolina*, pp. 233-234.

⁴⁴ Beard, C. A. and M. R., *The Rise of American Civilization* (New York, 1937), I, 657.

tate it," which, it held, could be done "only by the destruction of the planter."⁴⁵

An immediate threat was seen in the proposals of industrialists to introduce immigrant workers as a source of skilled labor. Planters stood squarely against it. Foreigners, bringing with them European anti-slave traditions, were susceptible to abolition agitation. Moreover, those immigrants that ventured South were rarely able to buy themselves into the slaveholding class, but immediately became laborers, and as such resisted slave competition. The *Morehouse Advocate*, a Louisiana newspaper, stated the case simply: "The great mass of foreigners who come to our shores are laborers, and consequently come into competition with slave labor. It is to their interest to abolish slavery; and we know full well the disposition of man to promote all things which advance his own interests."⁴⁶

Immigration, moreover, tended to strengthen as a class the non-slaveholding whites, a situation which the planters viewed apprehensively. Already indications of a developing "class consciousness" were beginning to appear among the white factory workers. As early as 1824 signs of industrial organizations in the large cities had made themselves felt. Baltimore, Charleston, New Orleans, Richmond, Savannah, and Wilmington had labor organizations.⁴⁷ Later, in the 1830's, strikes for higher wages and shorter hours had become a common occurrence. Even Graniteville, the pride of Gregg and his followers, felt the tremors of labor difficulties when, in 1857, the workers made formal demands for increased pay, and probably "quit work in an effort to get it."⁴⁸

Slaveholders recognized the danger in labor's organization; it had, in fact, already come into conflict with their interests. In North Carolina the Raleigh Workingmen's Association challenged an old revenue law which taxed mechanics' tools more

⁴⁵ *Southern Quarterly Review*, XXVI, 448-51

⁴⁶ Quoted by Hawk, *Economic History*, p. 226. In a somewhat different vein, but more characteristic, is the following, taken from a newspaper of the 1850's: "A large proportion of the mechanical force that migrate to the South, are a curse instead of a blessing; they are generally a worthless, unprincipled class . . . enemies to our peculiar institution . . . pests to society, dangerous among the slave population, and ever ready to form combinations against the interests of the slaveholder. . . ." Quoted in Clark, "Manufacturing During the Ante-Bellum and War Period," *Building of the Nation*, V, 213-214.

⁴⁷ Cole, *Conflict*, p. 37; Flish, J. A., *The Common People of the Old South*, American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1908, I, 139; Buck, "Poor Whites" pp. 41 ff.

⁴⁸ Mitchell, *William Gregg*, p. 61; Bruce, K., *Virginia Iron Manufacturing in the Slave Era* (New York, 1931), pp. 244 ff.

heavily than slave property.⁴⁹ More fundamentally, organized labor, fearing a reduction in its wage standards, was demanding that Negroes be kept out of mechanical pursuits. Indications of strife between the groups were not wanting. A farm building in North Carolina built by colored labor was destroyed, and suspicion was focused on a white organization for the elimination of Negro competition.⁵⁰ In 1845 the Georgia legislature made the employment of a Negro mechanic or mason illegal, and similar legislation was being considered in other states. So strong had grown the popular feeling against Negro labor in industry that C. G. Memminger, a leader in Southern affairs, predicted, in a letter to Hammond, that "ere long we will have a formidable party on the subject."⁵¹

In this situation slaveholders faced a dilemma. On the one hand, legislative limitation on the use of slaves restricted not only their powers but an immediate source of profit, for planters had turned in the crisis to industry to hire out their idle Negroes. More significantly, however, a victory for organized white labor set an ominous precedent, which, if left unchallenged, would lead only to more restrictive demands on the part of the new-fledged class. Slaveholders feared lest, with Negroes out of industry, the cities fall into the hands of native and foreign whites who would legislate for their own interests and perhaps become an abolitionist bulwark. L. W. Spratt, editor of the *Charleston Standard*, expressed this apprehension when he wrote that "they will question the right of masters to employ their slaves in any works that they may wish for; . . . they may acquire the power to determine municipal elections; . . . thus the town of Charleston, at the heart of slavery, may become a fortress of democratic power against it."⁵²

On the other hand, many believed that even greater danger was to be apprehended from the employment of slaves in the factories. It was feared that a slave, made mechanic, was more than half freed.⁵³ Moreover, an absorption of slaves from the

⁴⁹ Boyd, W. K., *North Carolina on the Eve of Secession*, American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1910, p. 175.

⁵⁰ Flish, *Common People*, p. 140.

⁵¹ Boucher, *Ante-Bellum Attitude of South Carolina*, p. 256.

⁵² Extract from a letter of L. W. Spratt of Charleston to John Perkins of Louisiana. Quoted by Phillips, U. B., *Plantation and Frontier* (Cleveland, 1910), II, 178.

⁵³ *DeBow's Review*, VIII, 518.

plantation to the factories meant essentially a contraction of the plantations, for the blacks used in industry were needed in the agricultural expansion movement of the 1840's and 1850's.⁵⁴

Thus, in essence, the rise of manufacturing forced upon the plantocracy the choice of paths leading to its eventual engulfment. To join in keeping the slaves out of industry meant actually to support and strengthen the rising industrial classes which were by nature set in opposition to the slaveholder. To allow, on the other hand, the slave to become a member of an industrial society was tantamount to giving him the weapon with which to gain his own freedom. Moreover, it would serve as an immediate springboard for the organization of the white worker. In either case the forces for manufacturing stood ultimately to gain at the expense of the slaveholding economy.

A more immediate threat to planters' interests, however, was a high national tariff. Thus resentment against the loom was intensified by the popular Southern belief that manufacturing implied the acceptance of a protectionist policy.⁵⁵ Apprehension was felt that Southern industrialists would inevitably join forces with the North in its demand for a high tariff.

The pro-manufacturing element, recognizing that the South's hatred of the tariff would be wielded against home industry, sought to forestall the attack. Gregg, in 1850, astutely denied he favored protection. In a letter to Governor Seabrook of South Carolina, he pointed to the low cost of production at Graniteville as a major factor in disarming "all opposition from those who fear that we may deliberately join the Northern people in a clamor for protection. . . ."⁵⁶

Diversificationists saw the wisdom in leaving the job of keeping out foreign goods to the Yankees, whose congressmen were notoriously adequate in this direction. But as the North had sought the tariff as a guard against European competition, what was to protect the infant industries of the South from the North? New England's superior capital reserve gave her a pow-

⁵⁴ In 1860 Thomas Kettle claimed that the slave population was entirely inadequate for the labor required in the cotton fields. He held that while in 1820 there were three slaves for every bale of cotton produced, by 1860 less than a single slave was available for the same unit of work. *Southern Wealth and Northern Profits* (New York, 1860), p. 159. The rapid rise in slave prices in the 1850's lends credibility to Kettle's estimates.

⁵⁵ Channing, E., *A History of the United States*, V (New York, 1930), 76.

⁵⁶ Quoted by Russell, *Economic Aspects*, p. 155; Cf. Mitchell, *William Gregg*, p. 22.

erful advantage over her undeveloped Southern rival. She could, if need be, sell her goods below cost in the slave states in order to drive "home industry" into bankruptcy. Northern-made goods did, in fact, force many Southern products off the market.⁵⁷

Some form of sectional protection for the fledgling factories was evidently necessary. Many recommendations were made, of which three types may be discerned. First, and most frequently proposed, were bounties and tax exemptions. Many prominent figures sympathetic to industry advocated that such benefits be granted Southern manufacturers; some states did indeed exempt home industries from one or another state tax.⁵⁸

In the second group were proposals which called for the levying of discriminating taxes against goods manufactured in the North. Typical of these was the bill which came before the North Carolina legislature in 1850, recommending the imposition of a 10 per cent tax on all goods entering from free states. Among the more aggressive supporters of this plan were listed J. H. Hammond, Governor Floyd of Virginia, and Senators McDuffie and Rhett.⁵⁹

Finally, proposals were made for an export tax to be imposed on raw cotton. Such a tax, it was believed, would give Southern mills an insurmountable advantage over all competitors whose source of raw material was the South.⁶⁰

These plans for sectional protection, however, once again demonstrated to the plantations that the interests of industry ran counter to their own. Specifically, each recommendation brought forward a new point of conflict. A tax on incoming manufactured goods would have the same effect as a high national tariff; an export tax on cotton would, for its part, result in a decreased demand, and at the same time encourage England to look for a new source of supply; and lastly, tax discriminations and bounties would mean in essence that the plantations were levied in support of industry. More basic than these objections, moreover, was a consideration of the principle upon which they rested.

⁵⁷ *DeBow's Review*, XXIX, 280, 627.

⁵⁸ Georgia, Virginia, South Carolina, and Alabama. Clark, *Manufacturing*, p. 555; Wender, *Southern Commercial Conventions*, p. 138; *DeBow's Review*, XVII, 225.

⁵⁹ Russell, *Economic Aspects*, p. 161; *DeBow's Review*, VIII, 249-51.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, VIII, 50, 485. The legal obstacle involved here was naturally not overlooked. It was proposed that the planters petition Congress to amend the Constitution, authorizing the imposition of export duties.

The very demand for sectional protection implied an acceptance of the entire protectionist theory. An implied admission of this lay in the plea of Senator Rhett, when, urging prohibitory duties as a dam against Northern goods, he maintained that "if the protective policy is wise and just with foreign nations, it must be equally so between the States."⁶¹

The fears of the slaveholders that the manufacturing element would go the whole hog in their demand for protection were not far-fetched. While Gregg gave assurances in 1850 that he would never join the "clamor for protection" we find him a decade later writing uncompromisingly in favor of the tariff.⁶² His about-face was typical, for more and more Southern newspapers were turning to an outright advocacy of protection. Wrote one paper, the *Jackson Southerner*: "The people of the South and West, who until recently were opposed to protection are retracing their steps almost unanimously."⁶³

Thus the planters found ample justification for the conviction that "home industry" was at bottom the Yankee foe attacking from within.

A far more formidable obstacle than planter opposition, however, was the slave system; for the impracticability of manufacturing lay within the character and institutions of the plantation economy. Slavery denied industry its fundamental needs: skilled labor, liquid capital, and a receptive market.

The use of slaves in industry, which had held great promise to the new manufacturers in the early 1840's, proved unfeasible in actual practice. Slaves transplanted from the plantations to the factories failed to make productive mill hands, for, since they were hired out for the period between planting and picking, the constant alternation between the land and loom prevented even a gradual accumulation of industrial skill.

This could be obviated by the outright purchase of slaves, but that in turn entailed even greater difficulties. First, buying slaves meant a larger immediate outlay of capital. It was estimated that the initial investment would have to be increased by

⁶¹ *Congressional Globe*, 28th Congress, 1st Session, Appx., p. 658.

⁶² *DeBow's Review*, XXX, 103 ff. Here Gregg takes an unequivocal stand for protection.

⁶³ Among those papers taking a pro-tariff position were: *The Savannah Republic*, *Richmond Whig*, *Columbus Enquirer*, and *Savannah Georgian*. Cole, *Whig Party*, pp. 94-95.

as much as 50 per cent, and that in the face of a constant insufficiency of funds. Secondly, bought labor was precisely the factor industry could not endure. The ownership of slave labor would freeze Southern industry at the start, denying it the capacity to expand and contract with relative ease. While an increase in production would demand a much larger outlay for the purchase of additional slaves, any slight depression, on the other hand, would bring relatively greater losses. Slaves, unlike free labor, could not be "fired" and thrown onto the open market; on the contrary their maintenance persisted, independent of profit or loss. Moreover, the forced sale of Negroes in a depressed market, like that of any other superfluous commodity, would entail great losses. Conversely, during prosperous periods, the competitive demands of manufacturers and planters would serve to inflate the price of slaves, perhaps even beyond their productive value.⁶⁴

Manufacturers had no choice but to turn to the whites for a labor source. (The free Negroes were too negligible a group to supply completely even the early needs of industry.) But the "poor whites," having for generations been unable to find a progressive place in the Southern system, had degenerated into a backward, sickly people, unskilled in any craft and difficult to train, while the non-slaveholding independent farmers, who were no less unskilled in industry, were reluctant to give up independence to sink to the level of "hired" help.

Hence an immediate solution was sought in the importation of skilled foreign and Northern workers. Such an experienced group would at least partially answer the technical needs of industry, and at the same time serve to train the native whites. Here, too, however, the economic and social conditions engendered by a slave economy proved an almost insurmountable barrier. The standard of living set for the slave influenced the level for all Southern labor, and this was below that established in an industrial society. Yet even if higher wages were paid, none of the facilities making for a higher standard of living in manufacturing centers were available in the South. Further, where slaves did the manual labor a social stigma attached it-

⁶⁴ See above, pp. 323-324.

self to all physical work.⁶⁵ But foreigners, seeking improvement in their social as well as economic status, were as reluctant to accept social degradation in a backward system as they were to accept a standard of living set for slaves. Olmstead noted that New England factory girls, lured by high wages offered in Georgia mills, found conditions so unpleasant that they soon returned to the free states.⁶⁶

Side by side with a shortage of trained labor, Southern manufacturers were faced by a shortage of capital. For the wealth of the section was fixed in the expensive agrarian economy. Planters, rather than look to new and precarious forms of investment, turned instinctively to the improvement and expansion of their plantations. Moreover, industry was unwelcome in the South and hence there was a psychological reluctance to support it. Encouraged by the increasing world demand for cotton and the ever-present promise of higher prices, planters reinvested profits in land and labor. Nor did Eastern business men show an enthusiasm to invest in the dubious and untried South while the North and West were expanding sections offering relatively sure opportunities for profitable investment.⁶⁷

The character of Southern industry during this period was determined largely by its dependence for financial backing almost solely upon the small investments of some few slaveholders and upon the initiative of scattered individuals. Both the scarcity of capital and the agrarian character of investors are aptly illustrated by the Nesbit Company of South Carolina, where no less than \$34,000 of the capital stock was paid for in the form of slaves.⁶⁸ Not infrequently individuals embarking in industry had to set up independent mills, for, unlike the North, the South had but a small middle class to which to sell its stock. Hence the size, as well as the number of industrial enterprises, was limited by the scarcity of investors' capital. As the follow-

⁶⁵ Barnard, *Oration*, p. 22; *Southern Quarterly Review*, VIII, 460; *DeBow's Review*, XXIV, 383; Olmstead, *Back Country*, II, 129; Cf. Russell, R. R., "The General Effects of Slavery upon Southern Economic Progress," *The Journal of Southern History* (February, 1938), 37-40.

⁶⁶ Olmstead, F. L., *Seaboard States*, p. 455; quoted in Phillips, *Plantation and Frontier*, II, 341.

⁶⁷ For an able contemporary discussion of this entire problem of capital shortage see: *DeBow's Review*, XVIII, 768 ff; *Hunt's Merchant's Magazine*, XXXII, 378.

⁶⁸ Channing, *History*, V, 76. The primary agrarian interests of investors frequently embarrassed the mills. When prices on cotton went up, planters were likely to withdraw their capital from industry and reinvest in agriculture. On the other hand, many planters paid for stock in installments and a fall in prices often made it impossible for them to meet their obligations.

ing table demonstrates, Southern cotton mills were at all times substantially smaller than similar New England establishments.⁶⁹

Section	Year	No. of Plants	Capital Invested	Capitalization of Avg. Plant
New England.....	1840	675	\$34,931,000	\$ 52,000
	1850	564	53,832,000	95,000
	1860	570	69,260,000	122,000
South	1840	248	4,331,000	17,000
	1850	166	7,256,000	44,000
	1860	159	9,596,000	60,000

The scattered and unconcentrated quality of Southern industry handicapped it badly in competition with the North. To each establishment it meant concretely a relative increase in the cost of production. As J. H. Taylor, the treasurer of Graniteville, pointed out, a superintendent who received a salary of \$12,000 to \$15,000 a year could manage a mill of 12,000 spindles as efficiently as one of 3,000. And this was equally true for the fireman, machinist, overseer, and engineer.⁷⁰ Consequently, New England mills, which were by 1860 more than twice the size of Southern factories, could produce cheaply enough to compete effectively with the cotton states in the home market.

While, on the one hand, the plantation system denied Southern industry adequate capital, the system required it, on the other, to maintain a large liquid reserve. Planters bought on credit in anticipation of the profit on their growing crops, and unless a company could gear itself to the "advance system" it could not hope to sell in the Southern market. Naturally, New England mills, in virtue of their superior reserve, could meet this requirement more readily than could Southern mills. While Lowell sold cloth to the South on a six-to-ten-month credit basis, "home industry" allowed little more than sixty days.⁷¹

Constant lack of reserves, moreover, prevented the pioneer manufacturers from purchasing raw materials cheaply in depressed markets. On the contrary, becoming increasingly mortgaged to Northern banks, from which they sought loans in times

⁶⁹ Based on *U. S. Census of Manufacturing*, pp. 54 ff.; Donnell, E. J., *Chronological and Statistical History of Cotton* (New York, 1872), p. 643.

⁷⁰ *DeBow's Review*, VIII, 24 ff.

⁷¹ *Hunt's Merchant's Magazine*, XXI, 628.

of crisis, they were forced to dump goods, frequently at a substantial loss, in order to meet maturing obligations.

Adding to the difficulties of Southern industrialists was the inadequacy of the home market. Traditionally, the North was the manufacturing section, and as such was believed to produce superior and more fashionable goods. Consequently, while there was a "rage" for the "Yankee-made," Southern products gathered dust on the shelves. And despite a widespread campaign in behalf of home patronage, the prejudice persisted.⁷² But quite apart from this psychological attitude, the slave system failed to produce a significant buying public. The consumption of the slaves was kept at a minimum, and the whites were similarly geared to a low standard of living. Hence, since the middle and industrial classes, which constitute the largest spending groups in a manufacturing society, were still undeveloped, the burden of buying fell on the planters. But they, unfortunately, preferred the "Yankee-made."⁷³

The movement to bring industry to the early South can thus be seen as an attempt to impose a "foreign system" upon a preponderantly agrarian economy. As such it challenged the *status quo*, arousing the adamant opposition of the dominant interests. Materially, moreover, it attempted to build where there was but slight foundation, for, as we have seen, the inherent nature of the prevailing economy denied it the elements essential to its growth.

It was only after the abolition of slavery that home industry was able to dig its roots into Southern soil. Not until 1880 did the South, politically and economically free, witness its first unhampered spurt of industrial growth. While in 1880 there was as little as seventeen millions invested in cotton mills, ten years later the capitalization had grown to over fifty-three millions.⁷⁴ This phenomenal increase is all the more remarkable in contrast to the increases of two or three million for the pre-war decades. Undoubtedly many factors were responsible for the tremendous

⁷² See Gregg, W., *Southern Patronage to Southern Imports and Domestic Industry*; DeBow's Review, XXIX, 77-83, 225-232, 494-500, 623-631, 771-778; XXX 102-104, 216-223. In an effort to catch the section's trade some mill owners labelled their products with false trade marks, giving the impression that the goods had been imported into the South. Hawk, *Economic History*, p. 239.

⁷³ In 1860 the proportion of the population, by sections, working in industry was: New England, 1 to 15; Western States, 1 to 48; South, 1 to 82. Clark, "Manufacturing," I, 580.

⁷⁴ Mitchell, *Rise of Cotton Mills*, p. 63.

acceleration in the rate of growth, but fundamental among these influences was abolition.⁷⁵

Yet the significance of Southern ante-bellum manufacturing should not be underestimated. For although it was planted on alien soil it had established itself, and by dint of unwavering persistence, had slowly emerged as a force in Southern life. Its major contribution, however, was psychological in character. For it succeeded in breaking down, bit by bit, the deep-rooted traditional prejudices against manufacturing. Many planters, at first hostile toward "home industry," were made to recognize the economic desirability of having at least a semi-industrial South.⁷⁶ It was, perhaps, wiser to risk the inherent dangers of industrialization than to be "exploited" by an ever stronger North. But even more important, the persistence of diversificationist propaganda succeeded largely in reducing the popular antagonism of the South. Significantly, many states gave official sanction to manufacturing. During the 1850's numerous laws of incorporation were passed, and these were noticeably more liberal.⁷⁷ Certainly the industrial emergence of the ante-bellum period can not be ignored in any study of the "New South."

⁷⁵ Robert R. Russell attributes the backwardness of ante-bellum industry to "a number of reasons . . . few of which have much relevance to slavery." *Slavery and Southern Economic Progress*, pp. 46-52. While the diverse factors he introduces, e.g., climate, topography, natural resources, profitable agriculture, lack of transportation facilities, etc., may have been contributing circumstances, it still remains necessary to explain the phenomenal growth of post-bellum manufacturing in terms other than the effects of abolition. M. T. Copeland attributes this growth "to a change in the attitude of the people themselves and [sic] to the release from the system under which all their savings had to be invested in slaves." *The Cotton Manufacturing Industry of the United States, Harvard Economic Studies*, VIII, 1912, pp. 33-34. Professor E. Q. Hawk holds substantially the same view. *Economic History*, p. 477. Broadus Mitchell, who has made the most comprehensive study of the problem, also implies acceptance of this position when he draws attention to the scarcity of industrial capital in the slave South and contends, later, that the rise of the cotton mills in the "New South" was financed largely by local capital. *Rise of Cotton Mills*, pp. 22-25, Cf. p. 233.

⁷⁶ Bruce, *Virginia Iron Manufacturing*, p. 274.

⁷⁷ Boucher, *Ante-Bellum Attitude of South Carolina*, p. 254; Russell, *Southern Sectionalism*, p. 44; Clark, "Manufacturing," I, 555.

CALIFORNIA'S LARKIN SETTLES OLD DEBTS: A VIEW OF NORTH CAROLINA, 1847-1856

Edited by ROBERT J. PARKER and DAVID LEROY CORBITT

Yankee Thomas Oliver Larkin came to North Carolina in 1821 at the age of nineteen. He spent the following ten years in business in various parts of the State, leaving for Massachusetts in May, 1831.¹

Because of poor health and fortune, and on the advice of his half-brother, John B. R. Cooper, Larkin decided to go to California. After a strenuous voyage around the Horn, he arrived in Monterey in 1832. A year later, in business for himself, he was introducing new methods to the trade.

Successful as a merchant and builder, he soon accumulated a fortune. By May, 1843, he was United States consul, and after 1845, a secret and confidential agent of President Polk. Later he was naval agent and naval storekeeper. Larkin played a silent but powerful role in the American acquisition of California, and later helped to frame the first constitution of that state.²

While in North Carolina, he made a host of friends. Because of inexperience and poor business conditions, he went into debt to some of them. After success had come to him on the Pacific, his mind turned back to his old friends and his unpaid debts. Seventeen to twenty years later he made an attempt to pay up.

In 1847 he wrote to Alexander McRae of New Hanover County, North Carolina, expressing his wish to liquidate old debts and renew old friendships. Within a few months letters from Carolinians began to arrive in Monterey. In practically every case the missives mentioned the amount still due, the changes that had taken place in the State, and residents alive and dead. In the fifties Larkin was in New York and actually planned to revisit North Carolina. This plan failed, however, and never again did he see the friends of his youth.³

¹ Parker, Robert J., "A Yankee in North Carolina: Observations of Thomas Oliver Larkin, 1821-1826," *The North Carolina Historical Review*, XIV, No. 4 (October, 1937) pp. 325-342.

² Parker, Robert J., *Chapters in the Early Life of Thomas Oliver Larkin* (San Francisco, 1939).

³ Parker, Robert J., *Builder of Empire: a Biography of Thomas Oliver Larkin*. An unpublished work in the hands of the author.

Larkin's letter to McRae and some of the answers thereto are a part of the manuscript collection of the Hubert Howe Bancroft Library of the University of California, and appear below in full by permission of the library.⁴

[LARKIN TO ALEXANDER McRAE,⁵ NEW HANOVER COUNTY,
NORTH CAROLINA]

Monterey, March 17, 1847

For some years I have lost all trace of my former friends in New Hanover. For a short time I had a few correspondents there. Now none. In 1844 I had the very great pleasure of affording Consular assistance to one of the Mallett family of North Carolina in a visit I was making to San Francisco at the North. By him I sent home many letters to reopen my old Carolina Correspondence.

In September last while with Commodore Stockton taking possession of different town[s] in California, I met a son of yours. this caused me at the time to address a letter to you to know if I could obtain your assistance in learning something about some debts I may owe there, if they were not paid by the Trustees; for of no one, or no business can I learn respecting this affair. I again write to you on this subject, as my first letter may have failed. I forward to you two or three newspapers of Monterey, the first ever published here. Your son this week sent me some Wilmington Newspapers but not a name can I trace out of my acquaintance. If you will hand the papers I send to you to one of your Editors, it will be the means of shewing all my old Friends my whereabouts. for much time before our flag was raised here I was much engaged in Government business in California. If there had been no war the three coloured flag would have flown its last in California in '48. In October your son was stoping with my family. He now says I have too much 'Big Company' General Kearny Colonel Mason and others being members of my household. I have a dance today, and hope your son will attend. He knowing Spanish can enjoy himself better than many of his brother officers.

⁴ Larkin, "Official correspondence," I, No. 175; Larkin, "Documents for the History of California," Vol. V, No. 291; VII, Nos. 143, 156, 172, 229; IX Nos. 30, 69, 239, 326, 492.

⁵ Alexander McRae was superintendent of common schools for Wilmington in 1846, a justice of the peace in New Hanover County, and a merchant in Wilmington. The McRae family was quite prominent in that section. See Sprunt, James, *Chronicles of the Cape Fear River*, pp. 100, 133, 139, 260, 293, 571; MS. Minutes, Pleas and Quarter Sessions of New Hanover Court, March term, 1846, September term, 1846 (records in the archives of the North Carolina Historical Commission, Raleigh).

[JAMES B. PIGFORD TO LARKIN, MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA]

Oak Point, [North Carolina]

October 4th, 1847

After my due respects to you, I will inform you that a few days ago I was in wilmington and there heard of you for the first time since you left this place, and I was very much gratified to hear from you, and to hear that you were doing well. Mr Alex McRae told me that he had received a letter from you something over a year ago and you requested him to ascertain what amount of debts were against you here, and that you stated that you had left means with Mr Withington to settle your debts but you were not certain whether they were paid or not. Mr McRae states that he had advertized in one of the papers for all that had a claim or claims to present them to him. he said some presented their claims and he sent you a list of them, but he had not heard from you yet. the paper that he advertised it in, I did not take and knew nothing of it until a few days ago. Mr McRae told me to write on to you myself and told me where to direct my letter. I have done so & I hope it may reach you and that it may find you well and doing well. I also hope that you may remember me when you remember the rest of your creditors. The claim that I have is the same that I purchased from Edward P Hall.⁶ You will recollect it no doubt. You confessed Judgment on the note awhile before you Left. the note was given to E P Hall March 11th 1827 the principal was fourty four dollars and three cents, and If your situation is such that you can pay it now, and will do it I will feel ever grateful to you for it. It will at once show that you are an honest man from the heart. as you have written to A McRae you can make mention of me with the rest. I hope you'll write to me also as soon as you get this letter. I should like to see a letter from you and hear of your travels and life ever since you left here. I am married and have one little daughter about 5 years old. I have been married about 8 years. If you write to me I will write back and give you a sketch of the times here since you left.

You can direct your letter to Wilmington N. C.

⁶ Edward P. Hall's name was mentioned as having real estate deeded to him in 1846. See Minutes, Court of the Pleas and Quarter Sessions of New Hanover County, March term, 1846. (Hereafter cited as Minutes.)

[THO. G. THURSTON TO LARKIN]

New Orleans, July 11, 1849

Within the last few months I have taken the liberty of giving two or three of my friends letters of introduction to You as they were about to start for the [one word illegible] El ' Dorado and to have a letter of introduction to a person who has been as long as Yourself in that country and an American also. They considered a great favor. I hope you will not consider me [one word illegible] when I request of you as a favor to furnish me with a few lines for old acquaintance sake and say if You can give me sufficient encouragement to migrate to that country, during my whole life I have followed the beaten path of business which others have made and raped the benefit before me. I have had many ups and downs in all my run = taking the latter predominantly but have always retained a respectable position in Society. You having struck into a new path aided by fortunate circumstances and your own indomitable gift of perseverance have arrived to that eminence in fortune that has made your name known throughout the civilized world. Now my dear Sir if you can encourage me to come to that country where the inducement will give me a respectable living and enable me to provide for a Young and growing family of Boys & Girls the oldest about 21 years, I should like very much to become a resident of California. not however to be dependent on you or any one else but that I may by my own exertion and capacity for business receive a greater reward than I can in this country by the same industry. If I go there it will be with scarcely any means, but I have good health and my family are all healthy and one half of them capable of obtaining a good living for themselves. Can you not point out to me something to my advantage. I have two daughters capable of teaching school in case my means should become so limited as to require it, but if advisable I would first go without my family as travelling in that direction is so enormously high. Please advise me.

I do not know that you will receive any of the letters or newspapers which I have Sent you, but newspapers I will continue to send.

[N. B.]

Mr. G. W. Mallett⁷ who formerly owned a steam mill on the point near Wilmington, N. Ca. is now a partner of mine in business. he informs me that a wild young nephew of his received some favors from you some years ago for which he is extremely thankfull.

⁷ The Mallett family was prominent in that section of the State. Peter Mallett of Fayetteville was captain of Company C, Third Regiment North Carolina Troops, 1861-1865. He was promoted to major and colonel. Later he moved to New York. Clark, Walter, *Histories of the Several Regiments and Battalions from North Carolina in the Great War 1861-1865*, I, 178, 227. C. P. Mallett was first lieutenant in the Third North Carolina Regiment, *Ibid.*, IV, 722; John W. Mallett of Cumberland County was captain in the Eighteenth Battalion. *Ibid.*, IV, 379, 381. Edward Mallett was a major, colonel, and lieutenant colonel of the Sixty-third Regiment and was killed at Bentonville, N. C., March 19, 1865. *Ibid.*, IV, 483, 498; Grant, D. L., *Alumni History of the University of North Carolina*, pp. 408, 409.

[JOHN LARKINS⁸ TO LARKIN]

Long Creek [New Hanover County, North Carolina]

Oct 21, 1849

My old and Respected Friend I Received your letter of 16th June and it gave me great pleasure & satisfaction to learn you were & all your family enjoying good health. You State my Last Letter contained no information of importance Which I hope you Will excuse as it was Wrote in a hurry. You asked to know about Mr D Jones⁹ & family & others of our acquaintances. Mr. Jones is now living in Missourie and settled [there] also [are] Mr. D. Alderman¹⁰ & Mr. Highsouth. Writen him. they left N. C. last spring. Since you left N. C. 3 of my Sisters and 2 Brothers have moved West. my two Brothers I. M. Larkins & Robert are Dead and Left families. My three Sisters are living in Ala & Miss. The hand of nature has wrought many changes in the elapse of sixteen years. the piny growth of our country is half Dead. as a naval store country it is fast failling notwithstanding the health is good and our little town Wilmington is fast improving. We will soon have another Rail Road to connect with the W & R. R. Road.¹¹ commencing opposite the market wharf & Running 161½ miles to Manchester¹² S. C. which will be of infinite advantage to our country. in truth the Spirit of internal improvements is very active in our State and still increasing. But enough on this subject.

My old friend and associate when I cast a Retrospect and bring Back the many jovial and Happy hours we have spent together even the night of my marriage to M. J. B. the Light of the candles and you Waiting on me fills my mind with the pleasures of bygone days. and then to Recollect but a few years after, the Host of enemies that crowded on you and dispossessed you of all you owned and Left you pennyless to Seek a Living in an unknown and unfriendly country. it still makes me look on some of them with distrust. and then to Remember the night on which I conveyed you to Wilmington perhaps never to be herd of again is a time never to be forgotten with me.

But enough of the past. I return to the present to contrast your present Situation with that of some of your Carolina enemies. it is with heart felt pleasure I am informed you are able to overcome them

⁸ John Larkins lived in the Rocky Point District and was prominent in his section of New Hanover County. He was appointed a naval stores inspector in 1846. For this position William S. Larkins and William R. Larkins signed his security bond. Minutes, March term, 1846.

⁹ David Jones was transferring property in New Hanover County in 1846. Minutes, March term, 1846.

¹⁰ David Alderman deeded real estate to David Alderman, Jr., in 1846. Minutes, September term, 1846.

¹¹ The Wilmington and Raleigh Railroad was chartered in 1833. The company was organized in 1836, and the road was completed on March 7, 1840. Brown, C. K., *A State Movement in Railroad Development*. pp. 31 ff.

¹² For a discussion of the Wilmington and Manchester Railroad, see *ibid.*, pp. 40 ff.

all and if you choose to Reward your friends, independent is to say the least, truly a great satisfaction.

But I will pass on to a few Remarks on the people and times. commercial Business is very inactive here. at this time a general scarcity of Money, Naval Stores low, turpt pr Barral \$2.10, tar \$1.50 and other articles in proportion. there is a considerable of business done at this little place. many of our old associates have Left and gone to a World of spirits to Reap the promises of God's unsearchable Riches.

You stated in your epistle of the 16 of June you would leave that country in January next. I have only to say may God [one word illegible] you and yours Safely Back to the land of your nativity and after Reaching your destination a hearty welcome to my humble house. I will close accept the sincere Respts of myself and family to you and yours.

P. S. Dont fail to come.

[DEMPSEY HARRELL¹³ TO LARKIN]

South Washington [North Carolina]

My old and Respected friend,

Jan 20th/50

And Christmas Hollydays for 1850 are past, we have had a great many Weddings and balls in this time. I have not attended but one. that was an infare [affair] at Solomon Turners. there was some three hundred people but no dancing. they sung and played. I and family are invited tonight to a wedding at B. N. Nuokirks—but cant attend in conciquence of a freshit in all the creeks. they are swimming—than they will have dancing a plenty but I always begin to think but very little of parts or balls & I'll say no more about them. I have never received but one letter from you since you left N. C.—that was dated Dec. 30th/45. After you left Rockfish I continued with E. Witherington until he got tired of the place. he then sold out to me. I remained there two years. the place was sold and I had to leave. I then remained idle or out of business for about one year. then I went on to New York purchased about \$1000 worth of goods, and opened at the [one word illegible, probably Teachy] place. remained thare 2 years and got cut out of it. I then bought out Wm. Usher in So. Wash.¹⁴ where I am now writing. I had like to forget to tell you that while at the

¹³ Dempsey Harrell was superintendent of common schools for the South Washington District, 1846; tax lister for the same district, 1846; a justice of the peace, 1846, and a member of the patrol for the same district, 1847. Minutes 1846-1847.

¹⁴ South Washington was established in 1791 and was 142 miles southeast of Raleigh. In 1822 South Washington and Wilmington were the only post offices in New Hanover County. Geo. H. McMillian was postmaster in 1830. *Table of the post offices in the United States, arranged by States and Counties as they were October 1, 1830* (Washington, D. C., 1831), p. 146; *Laws of North Carolina, 1791*, Chap. 70; Melver, Colin, *The North Carolina Register and United States Calendar for the Year of Our Lord, 1823*, p. 65.

Teachey place that I took it in the head and got married so I have now got a wife and nine living children. Old N. C. fashion but respectable. I was glad to hear from you when I did. (it reminded me of old times) and should have answered it immediately on the reception but it was about twelve months after you wrote it before I recd. your letter. in that time the war had broken out fully with Mexico, and there was but a slim chance of conveying a letter to your place.

Since you have left, the most of the old men have died off—viz. Col. Teachey, John Boney, Dal. Bong, Chic Boney, Wm. Boney, Jim Southern with many others. the greatest stew amongst us at this time is state improvements such as Rail Roads, Plank Roads¹⁵ & clearing out rivers and Creeks. I am rather of the opinion that our public men will tax the state till she will not be worth the taxes. you know our means, you are apprized we have a Rail Road from Wilmington to Weldon in full operation. also one from Weldon to Raleigh. there is now in contract a Road from Wilmington to the So. Carolina Road. Also a Plank Road from Fayetteville to the back part of the state. One chartered from the Wilmington & Weldon road to the upper part of the State, the latter a Rail Road. You can give some idea from this how our leading men are going it with us. politicks are quite low with us since the presidential election. The Members in Congress is making considerable fuss about slavery. we don't think it will amount to much. some talk of disunion but I think not. The Wilmington and Weldon road runs within about 2 miles of So. Wash, the post office is on the road, where this letter will be mail'd. the name will be familiar to you (Sills Creek). I see by the public prints you have formed your Constitution [California] in order to be admitted as a state in the Union. we also see you have by your Constitution prohibited slavery. we think Slavery might be a benefit, particularly in mining business but you ought to know best. no doubt it will create considerable talk in our Government had you placed it either way. You wanted to know something about the old stand Rockfish—there is no mercantile business carried on at that place. everything has either gone to the Rail Road or to Wilmington. no post office between Wilmington & Kenansville but on the Road. if you should see Mr. Thos. Ash¹⁶ ask him about me, he is well acquainted. his brother Wm. S. is our representative from this district [in Congress]. if you should ever pass through N. C. please call on me. I should be happy to see you. You wished in your letter to me to know something about your debts. I have herd

¹⁵ The first plank road in North Carolina was chartered in 1849. The idea soon spread and in the 1850-51 session of the General Assembly sixteen plank road companies were chartered. See Starling, Robert B., "The Plank Road Movement in North Carolina," *The North Carolina Historical Review*, XVI, Nos. 1 and 2 (January and April, 1939), pp. 1-22, 147-174.

¹⁶ William Shepperd Ashe was the son of Samuel Ashe and Elizabeth Shepperd. He was born September 14, 1814, and died in 1867. He represented New Hanover County in the state senate in 1846, 1848 and 1859; he also represented his district in the United States Congress, 1846-1855. *North Carolina Manual, 1913*, pp. 724, 933, 934; Ashe, Samuel A., ed., *Biographical History of North Carolina*, VIII, 30.

several persons say you owed them some perhaps have their claim and others said they had lost theirs. I hold a small note of yours for 9 24/00 dolls. which was given before you left N. C. it is out at the house or I would give you the date.

Your sincere friend

[N. B.] I am about closing my business at this time and not certain whether I will assume it soon again. Should like to hear from you please write me soon.

D. H.

[D. McINTIRE¹⁷ TO LARKIN]

Rocky Point, New Hanover [County], N. C. Dec. 19/50

My old friend

Thomas O. Larkin

Just on the eve of your departure for California I received a long letter from you. Yesterday another the 2nd letter was handed me by a friend dated 30th July last it having been directed to Sills Creek P. O. where I seldom call for letters not living near that place. Something like twenty years is a long time to pass away between two old friends without corresponding. it certainly is not my fault for I certainly would have written often could I have known where to direct a letter. I had the pleasure of hearing from you direct by our Representative Mr. Ashe. I see from your letter the time has passed which you appointed for Visiting old N. C. What has happened to prevent you. It is useless for me to tell you I would be glad to see you, you must know that from our former intimacy.

I think you left N. C. in 1830 or 31 Very soon after or about that time, I became tired of Merchandizing and bought the H. James¹⁸ place. Went to farming. Soon tired of a bachelor's life and in the Spring of 1832 was married. We have had 8 children, the first & last are dead. I now send all to school Say four Daughters & two Sons. In 1840 I bought the place I now live on from S. Lane the former residence of his Father, having sold the other to Tho. Lee for double the amt I paid for it. Since I commenced farming have not made money so fast as trading. But have increased my property some & lived a tolerable easy farmer's life. have had several hard spells sickness but thank God have recovered. My Wife has had but little sickness but often complaining. Our Children all look healthy and learn very well. I will stop the history of my family.

¹⁷ David McIntire was elected superintendent of common schools for the Rocky Point District in September, 1846. He also represented New Hanover County in the lower house of the General Assembly, 1842 and 1844. Minutes, September term, 1846; *North Carolina Manual, 1913*, p. 723.

¹⁸ Hinton James was a justice of the peace in 1846. Minutes, March, 1846.

Friend Larkin what shall I say to you next. Oh, I will give you a history of the Jones family your old friends. Susan Jane I think lives on Blk [Black?] River. I think her husband has been for some time rather intemperate & managed badly but have just understood he has reformed, probably joined the sons. Scudder & Wife have both died some years back. Mrs. Hatcher I think is dead. Ann married one of the Croons, she has been dead some years back. One or two years ago David & family moved to Missouri. he married a Miss Keith over the Creek. David was a smart industrious farmer & good Citizen. Your old friend Withington has been dead many years. he was one of the inspectors of naval stores, died having no property I presume. Charles Huring still lives at the old place and in possession of a large property. I would think was rich though he may be in debt. I know but little about him now a days. For many years he has been quite intemperate but recently I understand has joined the Sons of temperance. Consequently has become a new man. he has been married several years to a Miss Preders of Sampson County. A great many your old acquaintances have died since you left. You would find now almost a new sett of inhabitants with here and there an old acquaintance. A great many have moved away. Your old mill has gone down long since, was worked a while by Garrason Moore & Miller but soon quit her I believe, without much mischief. You ask if Withington according to deed of trust paid any of your debts. I think I could safely say not the first Copper. I heard no more about it after you were gone. All I heard say anything about it whom you owed was about the same thing I told you just before leaving. You can go, if you get able you can pay us, if not let it be lost. Sometimes ago I think some few years Genl. M Rae showed me a letter from you saying you would pay any debts still against you. it was published and I presume the most of the claims were presented and sent to you but never any answer was received. the whole amt. with Interest I think would not amout to much. I think it very probable the amt I hold against you is the largest, however, I don't know. Mr. R. G. Sharpless has just moved away to Mo. left me his agent. Among the set of his papers was a note on you which he said I could keep, if you ever returned he knew you would pay. As you say News Papers are not always right but I have understood from various sources that you were independent.

Mr Tate¹⁹ & Wife are both living, the health of the latter very delicate. Mr. Tate preached in this neighborhood one or two weeks back. both his Sons Tho.²⁰ & Robt.²¹ are grown have finished their educa-

¹⁹ Robert Tate was a Presbyterian minister. As a member of the Orange Presbytery he attended the twelfth session of the North Carolina Synod held at Hopwell Church, October 31, 1793. Foote, William Henry, *Sketches of North Carolina*, pp. 300, 501.

²⁰ Thomas H. Tate, a planter of New Hanover County, was born in Rocky Point in 1824 and died in 1879. He was a student at the University of North Carolina, 1842-1845. Grant, *Alumni History*, p. 608.

²¹ Robert Hunter Tate, a physician, was born in 1826 and died in 1864. He graduated at the University of North Carolina in 1847. He was a member of the General Assembly in 1856. *Ibid.*, p. 608; *North Carolina Manual, 1913*, p. 724.

tion at Chapel Hill & both married the eldest a farmer the other a Doctor. Thomas wife was the daughter of the late Wm. B. Colvin. Robt to a daughter of James Murphy on So. River. & Thomas still lives at the same old place and driving on about as usual. Margaret Tate you recollect first married Duncan McIntire. She was soon a widow and after a few years married a Mr. Pittman up the Country. Now living near Sills Creek. I remember the ball at Duplin C. & I was there. Often I have looked back on my youthful days & some of them days of pleasantry. how often have I thought of the fun at the old mill & other places. Sarah has two of your books now, which reminds us of you occasionally. I think the four pages nearly complete your will then [one word illegible] me. Write me again. any enquiry you wish to make I will attend to it. should like to have my wife see your Lady. will you bring her with you.

Two or three days back I cut my rist [wrist] very bad. it plagues me about writing and a farmer is generally too much engaged to write often, having been out of practice you must excuse any mistakes. I forgot to tell you I have a Brother in California. You recollect the one that stayed with me at Long Creek, Charles. he has been there nearly two years. I was in hopes he would see you. Brother Andrew lives in Miss. Murdock in Louis. You will not blame me after securing this letter I have answered the first mail. when you write again direct [your letter to?] Cypress Grove P. O. New Hanover, N. C. You must give me a full history of your life at least the outlines. Sarah has just come in time enough before I closed the letter to send her respects and would be glad to see you and Lady.

Your old affectionate friend,

[DEMPSEY HARRELL TO LARKIN]

South Washington, [North Carolina]

Feb. 10, 1854

Dear Friend,

Thomas O. Larkin Esq.,

Sir thinking, the letter I wrote you a few weeks after my return from New York where I saw you last and propaby [probably] the last in this world that we will see each other, (still I should like to see you again and your coutry [country] too.) I then wrote you about your Brother. I found out an old Gentleman by the name of John Soton who gave me the yard. I looked as you said without finding any thing. I returned and he said he assisted in Burying your Brother. he knew you very well at that time and that everything was yet right.

that he can show you the spot. had seen it five days before. he says it will propable [probably] cost you about \$300 to put it in good repair. if he should die his son that works in his shop with him nows [knows] the spot. at any time will point it out when requested. he offered to go back with me but it was too near the time for the cars to leave and I wished to come out. You can buy everything that is necessary in Wilmington. they have two marble yards in the place and Ingravers [Engravers] and workmen plenty. the town is nearly four times as large as it was when you left N. C. two Rail Roads lead to it and plank Road—we have a R. Road to run through the center of the States to the Mountains—when finished we will have plenty of Roads I think in this State. still another is talked of from Raleigh to Augusta Ga. it is thought that General G[overnment] will start a Road about the Mississippi valey [Mississippi Valley] through the territories to the Roky [Rocky] Mountains. the country is improving even the old North State. You have money enough come and se [see] us. My family is all in tolerable good health. There has been some 30 deaths up in Duplin by Small pox—but what I care how is wearing out. we have been somewhat uneasy but the most is now vaccinated. property of every description is extremely high. My best respects to yourself and family.

D. Harrell

N. B. I wish to hear from you please write me.

D. H.

[DAVID McINTIRE TO LARKIN]

Wilmington, N. C., 1st Apl 1854

My Dear Friend

Your two letters dated 15th Feb last was received two or three weeks back with a draft enclosed for \$250. I have just exchanged it for the Cash at our Bank. I am at a loss to know how you wish it distributed as you sent two memorandums differing in Amt. do you maintain for me to retain the full Amt you owe me & divide the ballance, or would it not be better to say how much to each person. my amt in dividing the mare returned through you to old Cameron I think about \$164 including interest. You can pay whatever you think proper. I hold a note of Robert L. Sharpless against you which is not acknowledged. it is certainly genuine as it is your own hand write throughout. in fact all the claims I know of against you I believe genuine & have never been paid. I think \$100 would cover Sharpless note & int. he is a poor man & you know a good man. My health has been good since I last wrote also my wife & children. my

two oldest, Son & Daughter are at Collige. another Daughter ready to start. in all we have Six Children 2 Sons & 4 Daughters. my youngest 2 years old. I think I mentioned in my last that we were burnt out Dwelling & Meat house. We have now very lively times. all produce brings fair prices. Am still farming making Corn potatoes ground peas & C raising hogs. Mr. Tate & Sady were well when I last heard from them. The old Gentleman is now near 80 years old. Still preaches. his two Sons, Tho & Robt. are very fine men. I like them very much, as well as my own brothers. I was in hopes you would have visited us ere this. Will you not return to the old States. if you do, would be pleased you could give us a call & talk over old things. Many changes have taken place in twenty years. Old things sour away and all quiet now. I must close would wish you more if I had time. I came down this morning on the cars & will return this evening.

Let me hear from you on receipt of this as soon as you can conveniently.

Your old friend,

D. McINTIRE.

[WILLIAM CAMERON TO LARKIN]

New Orleans, April 18, 1855

Dear Friend,

Some two or three years ago I received a letter from you while you were in New York in answer to one I had written you—on reception of yours I again wrote you, but received no answer, and think it probable that it did not come to hand—In your letter (which I have misplaced) you gave me in part a History of your life [one word illegible] time we corresponded with each other about the year 1831—and I was truly gratified to learn of your great success in business and your happiness on a domestic point of view—I must, my dear friend return my warm acknowledgments and thank you for the kind wishes and friendship, and duly appreciate your kind recommendation to Mr. King which you enclosed me—

I recollect you mentioned that about the time of your leaving Carolina you borrowed of me some \$50 which you wanted [to] remit—I have no recollection of this matter at all. I did not know you owed me a dollar, but my dear friend I have never in my life felt the pangs of poverty more acutely than I do at present—and this little sum would be some relief to me if I had it.

I have suffered greatly latterly with the Rheumatism, which is the only disease I am subject to—I have been unemployed ever since No-

vember last, and this place is so dull that it is impossible to procure a situation—to tell the truth I am so poor that I cannot leave this place to seek employment elsewhere. What would my old friend T. O. (or as old Mrs. Jones used to say Oliver) lose by making to me a Loan of a few thousands in order to establish me in a good business, and ensure me of a home in my old age? I am sure he nor his family would ever suffer by it—even if he never received it back, but I feel confident I should be able to return it with Interest—for my health (except the complaint above alluded to) is always good and I bid fair to live to a very old age not being subject to epidemics of any kind—I am at present in good health.

Will my old friend excuse this selfish letter? I know he will for he himself knows from sad experience the sufferings of poverty—and the consequent coldness and indifference exhibited by Those who he once called *friends*.

‘and what is friendship but a name’

Not so, I trust are the feelings between you and me. theres something more than the name I know.

Do answer me as soon as possible and inform me of your future prospects, of your health and that of your family and believe me for [one word illegible] or for woe.

Poor Thurston died some 2 years since leaving a large family and very poor.

Your friend

WILLIAM CAMERON

Address me. Care
W. A. Andrew Sieran
New Orleans.

[SUSAN JANE STRINGFIELD TO LARKIN]

Moore’s Creek, N. C., Sept. 2, 1855

Friend T. O. Larkin

I am almost discouraged writing to you. I have written so many letters and you never received them only one while in N York. We recd yours in answer to that and wrote you another. I answered it just as quick as I received it. we have not hurd [heard] from you since only through D. McIntire. he says he heres from you often. Peyton saw him at long Creek 23 June. he told P. he wished me to go to see him. I did so the fatigue was most too much for me I’m quite weakly. the warm [weather] the distance 25 miles it was most too much for me. I thought I would give almost anything to see your

letters you sent him but did not have the satisfaction of seeing them. David said they were misplaced it would be a great deal of trouble to find them. he said he could tell me what you wrote. he said you send a check on Wilmington Bank for two hundred and fifty Dollars for him to dispose of as he saw proper. So he divided it as well as he could. he payed some debts and give me fifty dollars but he had loaned it out not knowing when I would come. he give me thirty dollars of his own and pay the 20 dollars some time when he could see P. or send it by letter to me. Mc appeared to be very glad to see me. his family was free to chat with me. Said they wished I could stay with them a month. they loved my company.

I cannot discribe my feelings to you. neather could I tell you how I feel on this occation. there is no one on earth that cares for my wants and necessities but you and why should you other friends who say they are friends never has showd us the first bit of kindness even in our worst distress. Father never helps us now. we have 9 children to provide for and educate if we can. we have five sons that can do pretty good work in the field. We will make enough corn this year if nothing happens for the first time in our lives. we always had to buy provisions, the greater part at any rate. produce low all this summer, provisions high. I should like to see you once more. I could tell you more in one day than I can write in a week. All my relations are dead and you I feel like one alone. I do not think of past times. I would have the blues sure enough, if I was to. my little ones making a fuss all around me, I can't write so you can understand it. I am very nervous has been for years. my children is smart and well favoured. they are highly respected. they keep the best of company. I write this to you being a friend of mine. we can pass in any crowd. Since Peyton quit drinking we do a great deal better in many instances. he trys to get along too fast I think. his two full of schemes. we are on debt pretty smartly now that makes me some what deprysed but hes full of schemes smart and active in business that is in law. Im a member of the Baptist church. I joined 14 years age. my daughter Anna Evaline 4 years, one of my sons 2 years. he joined when he was but 12 years old. let me hear from you if you get this soon. accept of this in consideration of it coming from an old friend who wishes you and yours every blessing and every happiness can be bestowed on you here and hereafter. I will write more lengthly the next if I get an answer.

SUSAN JANE STRINGFIELD.

[ROBERT B. COLVIN TO LARKIN]

Hickory Grove Lowndes Co. Ala.

July 12/56

My Dear Sir

I take the liberty of dropping you a few lines concerning a small note I had against you, but it is lost or mislaid the amt. was ten Dollars date the year you left the long creek mills. I do not recollect the year, but I have understood from my old friend David McIntire that you [are] able & desirous to pay those old papers, & dear sir I would not trouble you about the little amt. but have been unfortunete. I have a large family. I am truly glad to [hear] of your success in California. if you was [in] Montgomery Ala. I would go to see you if you would not come to see me. I am 25 miles from the Citty. if I was certain this would reach you I would write more & about old times, who I married &c. all old acquaintances of yours. if I hear from you I will be more communicative.

Respectfully your obedient servant

ROBT. B. COLVIN.

to T. O. Larkin

N. B. you are one of those old acquaintances whom I can never forget. you recollect the letters you put on my arm at Mrs. Walkers,

R. B. C.

Direct to Hickory Grove Lowndes Co. Ala.

THE HORSE SOCIETY

By DOUGLAS LETELL RIGHTS

In the library of the Wachovia Historical Society in Winston-Salem is an old tin box, made by Salem tanners, which contains the records of the Society for Protection of Property in and about Salem. Two small account books, printed copies of the constitution, rules and by-laws, a sheaf of receipts and copies of annual statements, and a few bills of Confederate currency tell the story of the Horse Society, as this protective association was generally known.

In one of the books is inscribed the constitution :

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, STOKES COUNTY
November 10th 1798

We the Officers, civil & military, & others hereunto subscribed, Do solemnly pledge our Honours, each unto the other in the following Articles: That is to say:

1.) It is our mutual Agreement, That when any one of the Subscribers, shall have any Horse, Mare or Gelding, or any other valuable Property, feloniously taken out of his or her Possession, that all Expences in pursuing after the Thief, taking him to Prison, & carrying on the Prosecution, shall & is hereby declared to be at the comon & joint Expence of Us the Subscribers, and we will further aid with our personal Service when called on, and that we will aid & assist any Person or Persons from any other County in this District, that shall be bound in such Articles as this present.

2.) We declare, that we shall & will make Use of every justifiable Means in our Power, to bring to Justice all such, as shall transgress as aforesaid, their Harbourers, Aiders & Abettors, and carry on the Prosecution agreeable to the Laws of this State. And we do further declare, that no Thief or Felon, who shall be overtaken with any Horse, Mare or Gelding or any other Property belonging to any of Us, shall escape or be suffered to escape with the Consent or Conivance of any of Us, but be taken hold of & brought before a Justice of the Peace in this County, to be dealt with according to Law, unless he, she or they, do imediately deliver himself or themselves to the civil Authority thus to be dealt with as aforesaid. And we do hereby offer a Reward of Ten Dollars of the United States to any Person, who shall discover and make evidence to convict any Horsethief, Housebreaker, or other Felon or Felons, their Harbourers, Aiders & Abettors. And to shew our earnest Desire & Intention in this Matter, each of Us who sub-

scribes hereunto, has paid down Half a Dollar of the United States to Charles Frederick Bagge, whom we hereby appoint our Treasurer to defray all Expences accruing by the fullfillment of our present mutual Engagement, and which said Treasurer shall render an Account to Us, or any Person we shall depute, of his Receipts & Disbursements every December Court of this County next ensuing the Time of our present Subscription. And we further promise & declare, that each of us will continue to pay Half a Dollar at any Time as often as the Treasurer shall call on any of Us in writing, when the Money he had in Hand is expended, & he wants a fresh Supply for the purposes we have subscribed hereunto.

3.) We further declare, that from hence forward, We the civil & other Officers hereunto subscribed, shall & will to the utmost of our skill & power, uphold the honour & preserve the Dignity of our several Comissions, by detecting all Abuses of the civil and religious Rights of ourselves & fellow Citizens, by putting the Laws in force (as far as they are cognizable by Us) against them, and that we will not keep any kind of respectfull Company or Correspondence with any Person known to be of such an infamous Character, and shall at all Times & in all Places aid and assist each other from the Insults and Abuses of every such unworthy Member of Society, where our Lives & Property are most imediately in Danger by so doing. And if any civil or military Officer, or any other hereunto subscribed, shall or will knowingly offend or break through any of these Articles, he, she or they so offending or breaking through as aforesaid, shall be held in Abhorrence & detested by having his or her Name erased from these Articles.

4.) And we declare, we shall suffer no Person who is of evil Name, Fame or Reputation (if the same comes to our Knowledge) to set his or her Name hereunto, without giving Notice of the same. And further we agree, that these & every Article herein contained shall be & remain binding on each & every of Us, untill a Majority of the Subscribers shall dissolve the same. And we do agree to have a Meeting of all the Subscribers on the first Fryday in January next ensuing at the house of Jacob Bloom Esqre in Salem, to consult about further Measures necessary to be taken, & to continue such Meetings. And in each & every such Meeting there shall be chosen a Chairman President, who shall continue during the time of Business and shall cause a Record of the Proceedings to be kept by a Clerk appointed for that Purpose.

In witness whereof we have each of us subscribed our Name hereunto the Day & Date first above written.

A true Copy from the Original text.

JOHN RIGHTS
Clerk.

This combination insurance association, vigilantes committee, and fraternal order began auspiciously on November 10, 1798,

with one hundred fifty-six charter members credited with payment of four shillings each, the "Half a Dollar of the United States." Many names still familiar in the community are to be found, such as:

Joseph Korner (Kerner), Christopher Reich, Rudolph Christ (Crist), Henry Ripple, Horatio Hamilton, Jacob Hein (Hine), Philip, Martin and Christian Hoens (Hanes), Daniel Stockton, William Barrow, Ed. and Paul and William Starbuck, Henry Shore, Jr., Samuel Kramsch (later headmaster of Salem Female Academy), Adam Spach, Jr., Peter Foltz, John Hartman, and John Leinbach.

Expenses incident to the organization of the society in November, 1798, were as follows:

1 blank Book 1 shilling 6 pence [probably the record book preserved]
to John Rights for 6 copies of inscription 12 shillings
to Jacob Bloom [Blum] for Do 4 shillings
a blank book for use of the association 8 shillings 6 pence.

The Horse Society was now ready for business, but little happened in 1799, although handcuffs, a chain, etc., were purchased for 14 shillings. The only other item of expense was the clerk's salary of 1 pound.

The year 1800 was even duller; there were no expenditures except for the pay of the clerk, 14 shillings.

In the following year, however, the society began to function. On February 28, 1801, there was "paid for pursuing a Horse-thief . . . to Isaac Dawlton [Dalton] Esq. 1 Day, 8 shillings—Mick. Rominger 2 Days, 16 shillings—George Laugenaur 2 Days, 16 shillings." On May 30 a certain Robinson was paid 2 shillings for "Cryers fees."

In 1803 the entries began with change from pounds, shillings, and pence to dollars and cents.

The society must have met with popular appeal for in 1804 Joseph Marckland made it a present of one dollar, although he was not a member. Of the \$80 on hand, \$70 was loaned to Conrad Kreuser, manager of the Salem store, on a bond at five per cent. Loans to members of the community followed on notes at six per cent.

Another horse was missing in 1805 and Michael Rominger

was paid \$6.50 for pursuing. Two years later Philip Jones received \$10.37½, evidently for like service.

Nathaniel Shober succeeded John Rights as clerk in 1808.

There was a long period of peace and security broken only in 1812, when, "by order of Archiball Campbell and William Walker," Owen Evans was paid \$5.

The most intensive horse and man hunt yet recorded came in 1825, when Joshua Boner was paid \$33.75 for pursuing his horse and "James Stafford persuing a Horse & Negro. Thief and Property deliv. and thief committed to Prison. 6 persuers send by Stafford in all 26 days . . . \$39 . . . 4 send from here in all . . . \$12 . . . for heiring Gordon and Undank . . . \$8.39 . . . Matthew Reiths [Rights] tavern charges for the thief and gards . . . \$2.50." The tavern keeper also provided a rope for \$.65.

The story of this case was often retold in later years. The thief induced Joshua Boner's Negro slave to help him get away with the horses and to accompany him, with the promise of freedom when beyond the limits of the State. They were overtaken in Virginia and brought back to Salem. The thief was sent to jail in Germanton, the county seat, but was subsequently delivered to Virginia authorities on a requisition from the governor of that State. He was taken to Richmond and died in imprisonment. Boner lived west of town at what was known as the Atwood place.

In spite of the heavy expenditure involved in this long chase, the society showed a balance of \$171.37. But before the year was out, Wilson's horses were "persued" by Adam Butner, John Chitty, Thomas Christman, Siewers, Jacob Lanus, Sowel Frazier, Wilson, and another "hand" to the tune of \$76.25. One dollar levies from members kept the treasury in good condition.

By order of Conrad Kreuser, President of the General Meeting, and Emanuel Shober, Secretary, at Salem, on December 10, 1829, amendments to the primary articles and additional rules and regulations were formulated and appended to the original constitution. Some of these additions were as follows:

The Society shall consist of two distinct parts, a General Meeting and a Committee. Every member of the Society shall be a member of the General Meeting; the Committee shall be taken from the General

Meeting, and consist of eighteen members, six of whom shall go out every year, in rotation, and the six going out, shall not be eligible again for one year. . . . The General Meeting and the Committee shall hold their sittings at the Tavern in Salem, or any other convenient place in said town, and stated meetings shall be held every Saturday before Stokes County Court. . . .

Inasmuch as it is frequently found inconvenient for members of the Committee who live at a distance to attend, on account of bad weather, or other cause, at least three members of the Committee shall reside in Salem. . . .

None but respectable persons shall be admitted members of the Society, and whenever a person wishes to join, he is to lay his name before the Committee, who, upon enquiry, shall decide whether he is worthy. . . .

Whenever the conduct of a member becomes such as to render him unworthy, the Committee, on complaint being made, shall examine his case by testimony, and give the object of such investigation due notice, that he may appear and defend himself. . . .

No person shall be admitted a member of the Society who does not live within twenty-five miles of Salem; and when a member moves beyond that distance, and stays away two years, he shall lose his right of membership.

When a member dies and leaves a widow, the benefit of the Society shall be extended to her as long as she continues a widow and conforms to the rules of the Society. . . .

To protect the property of a Company, every member of the Firm must be a member of the Society, otherwise the property of such firm does not fall within its protection.

The protection of the Society shall extend to every species of property a member possesses, within the limits of twenty-five miles around Salem.

When property is stolen, or when there is reasonable ground to suppose that it is stolen, the sufferer shall try to get on the track with the assistance of his neighbors, and make immediate pursuit, either by one of the appointed pursuers, by himself, or by his neighbors. If no certain track can be found, then pursuit shall be made on the different leading roads in the neighborhood; provided, that no more than one pursuer shall go on each road; and if after going seventy-five miles, no track shall be discovered, he shall return; but the pursuer, getting on the track, shall go on, and if necessary, shall hire help on the road.

No false alarm, however, shall be raised, and run the Society to unnecessary expenses; therefore, a reasonable ground must exist, so as to create a presumption that the property is actually stolen; a fact or circumstance, which shall be the duty of the Committee to enquire into on application for pay: it will, therefore, be better in every case, first to obtain the advice of the Committee, before pursuit is made. . . .

When property is stolen from a member, and he has not money to pursue, or those going in pursuit have none, the Treasurer, on application, with the assent of two members of the Committee, may make reasonable advances; taking a due-bill for the same, until the proper accounts shall be rendered and settled.

When differences arise between members of the Society, both parties willing, it may be settled by a committee of five persons, belonging to the Society, each party choosing two, and the four to choose an umpire, which committee in capacity as Referees, shall hear the parties by proper proof, and determine between them; either party refusing to comply with their finding, shall be expelled from the Society.

The Committee shall from time to time appoint stated immediate pursuers, in such numbers as they may think expedient, not less than eighteen, dispersed as much as possible throughout the district, whose duty it shall be, when called on by a sufferer, to follow and pursue the thief, properly armed and equipped, agreeable to the rules laid down, and as herein before stated; and inasmuch as the main strength is in the pursuers, and much depends on a judicious pursuit, not only with an eye to economy, but in the success of the undertaking, it is enjoined on the Committee to select judicious men for that purpose, and as much as possible, such persons who own horses, and who can go properly equipped; and in order to keep up a proper spirit, and to enable the Committee to judge whether their officers be in proper situation to fulfil the object of their appointment, it shall be their duty to appear before the Committee once in twelve months.

The pay to be allowed to pursuers, for twenty-four hours, including the necessary time for rest and refreshment, shall not be lower than one dollar, and not to exceed two dollars fifty cents, including expenses. . . .

The Committee shall procure and keep on hand, at least two pair of hand cuffs, chains, locks, and two or three ropes, to be kept by the Treasurer, and by him furnished to pursuers, who shall be accountable for the same.

If any member has any property stolen by his own slave, he does not fall within the protection of the Society.

The Rules and Regulations of the Society for Protection of Property, &c., having been revised by order of the Committee, and a revision, of which the above is a copy, finally adopted by the Society at their stated meeting in December, A. D. 1829, when it was ordered that 350 copies be printed, and a copy furnished to each member.

The widow of Jacob Bloom became a beneficiary in 1831. Rothhas [Rothaas] and John Vogler, Jr., were paid \$3.90 for pursuing a free Negro who stole linen from the widow. Later Solomon Mickey, Henry Winkler, and George Hege were paid

\$1.00 each for their assistance in this case. Hege returned his dollar as a donation to the society.

The next case was that of an incendiary. In 1835, Sowel Frazier, E. Perry, and Timothy Hauser were paid \$2.00 each for pursuing a man who set fire to Thomas Wilson's barn.

Pursuers for Atwood were paid \$3.00 in 1838.

By order of the Committee, John Butner was allowed \$20 on November 14, 1844, "for following a villain." Butner returned the sum on December 7, but was repaid \$8.00 in March, 1845, according to the receipt "for expenses following a rogue stealing goods out John Butner's store." John Stulz received \$5.00 for his services in chasing the rogue.

Atwood was evidently a loser again in 1846, as Jas. Brendel was paid \$1.00 "in Atwood's case." The next year Atwood was pursuer "in Zevelly's [A. T. Zevely] case," receiving \$3.00, and Zevely received a like sum.

The case of Moses Evans's mare, in 1849, was more baffling. Levine Hine pursued for 7 days, Jas. Crews for 4 days, Henry Holder and "two hands" for 5 days, expense amounting to \$37.87½, and in addition, time undesignated, Iverson Crews was paid \$21.75, and Atwood \$7.82½, by F. C. Meinung, treasurer.

After this there was quiet for a season until 1854, when M. Stewart was paid \$4.65 for pursuing his horse. In this year the society was incorporated, and a fee of \$2.00 was paid to J. Stafford, county official. The constitution and by-laws were printed the following year by L. V. Blum, book and job printer, copies of which are preserved. The cost of printing was \$12.00.

Daniel Reich was paid \$7.00 in 1855, presumably for pursuing.

In March, 1858, Samuel Alspaugh was paid \$6.50 for a three days' chase "in pursuing Edward Sand, a counterfeiter," and adding to the variety, in 1860, L. Belo was paid \$5.00 for a dog.

At the outbreak of the War between the States the Society was in a flourishing condition. Its operations were generally successful in protection of property, it was well supported, and its financial standing was excellent. The report of the treasurer, dated November 19, 1861, listed as capital stock:

Certificate date Dec. 21, 1860	\$578.00
interest due—to Dec. 21	28.90
Certificate date July 23, 1860	118.54
interest due—to Dec. 21	2.47
Cash on hand	2.57
	<hr/>
	\$730.48

No Liabilities.

Lewis Belo, Treas.

In 1863, the two certificates in the Salem Savings Institute, I. G. Lash, proprietor, amounted to \$718.54, and the year closed with a balance of \$14.30 cash on hand. But financial reverses were imminent. Confederate, state, and county taxes amounted to \$13.28 for the year, and the year following the Confederate tax alone was \$44.40. Accounts for the year 1865 are omitted entirely. In 1866, J. G. Sides, who became treasurer and continued in office until 1874, reported \$4.00 cash, plus the certificates in the bank. Of the few new members added in this first year after the war, one was John Wimmer, a Confederate veteran who had lost an arm and a leg in battle. For many years he drove the mail wagon in Salem from railroad station to post office, handling his horses skilfully in spite of his disability.

The savings certificates were repaid in annual installments of ten per cent of the original amount of the investment. Three years the payments were omitted, and the last notation is in 1874 for the final payment. Thus the loss to the society was a little more than two hundred dollars.

In the tin box are nineteen bills of Confederate currency, amounting to \$23.05, some bearing the signature of C. L. Rights, a grandson of the first clerk, John Rights. These were evidently left in the hands of the treasurer at the close of the war.

The only case during war years was "J. M. Stafford's claim" incurring expenses of \$15.00, paid in 1863.

In May, 1867, thieves were busy again, and a total of \$119.75 was paid "for pursuing thief that stole C. L. Banner's mules." Pursuers in this case were J. W. Wright, Demcy Bailey, G. W. Chaffin, and Augustus Fogle. One hundred twelve members paid the \$.50 levy. The list of names is given, showing many returned Confederate veterans.

Three years later \$150.76 was paid for pursuing Jacob Yokeley's horses. Jacob, Samuel, John, and Albert Yokeley, R. Y. Kirkman and Rich Jones were pursuers. First search led to Statesville with no results, and the next to Lincoln County with no better luck. From the expense accounts it seems that the horses were located in South Carolina. Jacob Yokeley went to bring them back, going by way of Lexington and Charlotte to Chester, S. C., by private conveyance to Union Court House, and there "took cars" to Spartanburg. He paid a certain Gentry \$12.00 for "getting horses," and \$30.00 for keeping them nineteen days in the livery stable. The journey back with the horses required four days. The Yokeleys were among the last of the livery stable and horse trading profession in the community, and some of their stables are still standing.

The year 1874 was ill-starred for the Horse Society. In May the pursuers were on the trail of A. E. Conrad's horse, incurring \$58.30 expense, part of this going to R. A. Wommack, liveryman, for horses and feed. The pursuers were John Walton, R. C. Charles, William Banner, S. D. Stimpson, and J. Coxe. Close upon the heels of this case came the final act in the drama, the pursuit of L. P. Matthews's horses. J. E. Holder, M. E. Teague, Albert Peoples, W. T. Tucker, and Joseph Stockton spent more than a week on the trail, but returned without recovery. Teague and Holder pursued a second time. Expenditures mounted to \$161.80. The treasury was drained of its resources, including the last installment of savings for bank certificates surrendered, leaving a deficit of \$.15 due the treasurer, J. G. Sides.

There was only a faint flutter of life during the next and final year, when Augustus Fogle, successor to Sides as treasurer, paid in August state and county taxes amounting to \$.14½. The Horse Society had come to the end of the trail.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE SECESSION MOVEMENT IN NORTH CAROLINA. By Joseph Carlyle Sitterson. The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science, Vol. XXIII, No. 2. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 1939. Pp. x, 285. \$3.00. Paper binding, \$1.25.)

When the Confederacy collapsed and the so-called Reconstruction program was inaugurated, the South was forced to forget the various internal political differences that had contributed to its defeat and to unite all its weakened forces against a foe more sinister than that of war. So well did the South succeed with this emergency unification that few except Southerners of the war generation knew that the South had not always been solid.

Among studies made recently which reveal the sharp diversity of political opinion prevailing in the South prior to the Civil War are those devoted to the secession movement. As early as 1909 Douglas S. Freeman wrote his doctoral dissertation on secession in Virginia, four years later Miss Cleo Hearon's *Mississippi and the Compromise of 1850* appeared, and it was followed in 1916 by Melvin J. White, *The Secession Movement in the United States, 1847-1852*. Two studies on the same State were completed two years later: Philip M. Hamer, *The Secession Movement in South Carolina, 1847-1852*, and C. S. Boucher, "The Secession Movement in South Carolina, 1848 to 1852," *Washington University Humanistic Studies*, Vol. V, Pt. 2, No. 2. Among studies devoted to the movement in individual States that have since appeared are R. H. Shryock, *Georgia and the Union in 1850* (1926); D. L. Dumond, *The Secession Movement, 1860-1861* (1931); C. P. Denman, *The Secession Movement in Alabama* (1933); Dorothy Dodd, "The Secession Movement in Florida, 1850-1861" in the *Florida Historical Quarterly*, XII, 3-24, 45-66 (1933); H. T. Shanks, *The Secession Movement in Virginia, 1847-1861* (1934); P. L. Rainwater, *Mississippi, Storm Center of Secession, 1856-1861* (1938); and W. M. Caskey, *Secession and Restoration of Louisiana* (1938). Of the several other state studies in preparation, the last to appear is Joseph Carlyle Sitterson, *The Secession Movement in North Carolina* (1939), as one of *The James Sprunt Historical Studies in History and Political Science*.

This study is of value to the student of secession in general as well as to those especially interested in the movement in North Carolina. It traces, as the author points out, "both the forces which impelled the South to leave the Union and those which resisted until secession was an accomplished fact" (p. 1), especially conditions and sentiments in North Carolina as these factors relate to the evolution of the separatist movement there from 1789 to 1861.

ERRATUM

The second paragraph on page 357 should *read* as follows:

The first half of the book is given over to a general synthesis of the monographic studies previously made of subjects related to the central theme. Aside from integrating researches made, Dr. Sitterson makes his chief contribution through utilizing new sources bearing on North Carolina's decision to secede.

tion are recorded and interpreted. The insertion of three original maps, one covering the State's distribution of slaves in 1860, another the distribution of its vote in the presidential election of 1860, and a third that of its vote in the convention election of 1861 are used effectively to reach and illustrate conclusions. Such maps are helpful in providing an understanding of the political cross currents and diversity of opinion which characterized the secession movement.

Although the case in North Carolina was not entirely typical of other Southern States, this study does much to correct the common impression that the War for Southern Independence was between a solidly pro-slavery South and a solidly anti-slavery North. A pertinent example of the division of opinion in North Carolina one year before the War is quoted on page 199: "A Southern Confederacy will be worse than a rope of sand with So. Carolina at its head,—arrogant, self-willed and dictatorial as she is."

The elaborate documentation and excessive detail which characterize the treatment make it difficult for the reader to follow the narrative with perspective, but if this is a defect it is positive rather than negative, and enhances the reference value of the book. There are a few technical inconsistencies, and minor

BOOK REVIEWS

THE SECESSION MOVEMENT IN NORTH CAROLINA. By Joseph Carlyle Sitterson. The James Sprunt Studies in History and Political Science, Vol. XXIII, No. 2. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 1939. Pp. x, 285. \$3.00. Paper binding, \$1.25.)

When the Confederacy collapsed and the so-called Reconstruction program was inaugurated, the South was forced to forget the previous internal political differences that had contributed to

tion on secession in Virginia, four years later Miss Cleo Hearon's *Mississippi and the Compromise of 1850* appeared, and it was followed in 1916 by Melvin J. White, *The Secession Movement in the United States, 1847-1852*. Two studies on the same State were completed two years later: Philip M. Hamer, *The Secession Movement in South Carolina, 1847-1852*, and C. S. Boucher, "The Secession Movement in South Carolina, 1848 to 1852," *Washington University Humanistic Studies*, Vol. V, Pt. 2, No. 2. Among studies devoted to the movement in individual States that have since appeared are R. H. Shryock, *Georgia and the Union in 1850* (1926); D. L. Dumond, *The Secession Movement, 1860-1861* (1931); C. P. Denman, *The Secession Movement in Alabama* (1933); Dorothy Dodd, "The Secession Movement in Florida, 1850-1861" in the *Florida Historical Quarterly*, XII, 3-24, 45-66 (1933); H. T. Shanks, *The Secession Movement in Virginia, 1847-1861* (1934); P. L. Rainwater, *Mississippi, Storm Center of Secession, 1856-1861* (1938); and W. M. Caskey, *Secession and Restoration of Louisiana* (1938). Of the several other state studies in preparation, the last to appear is Joseph Carlyle Sitterson, *The Secession Movement in North Carolina* (1939), as one of *The James Sprunt Historical Studies in History and Political Science*.

This study is of value to the student of secession in general as well as to those especially interested in the movement in North Carolina. It traces, as the author points out, "both the forces which impelled the South to leave the Union and those which resisted until secession was an accomplished fact" (p. 1), especially conditions and sentiments in North Carolina as these factors relate to the evolution of the separatist movement there from 1789 to 1861.

The first half of the book is given over to a general synthesis of other Southern states, this study does much to correct the to the central theme. Aside from integrating researches made, Dr. Sitterson makes his chief contribution through utilizing new sources bearing on North Carolina's decision to secede.

Dr. Sitterson's analysis follows essentially a geographical pattern. The coastline, tidewater, piedmont, and mountain sections are differentiated and their respective attitudes on secession are recorded and interpreted. The insertion of three original maps, one covering the State's distribution of slaves in 1860, another the distribution of its vote in the presidential election of 1860, and a third that of its vote in the convention election of 1861 are used effectively to reach and illustrate conclusions. Such maps are helpful in providing an understanding of the political cross currents and diversity of opinion which characterized the secession movement.

Although the case in North Carolina was not entirely typical of other Southern States, this study does much to correct the common impression that the War for Southern Independence was between a solidly pro-slavery South and a solidly anti-slavery North. A pertinent example of the division of opinion in North Carolina one year before the War is quoted on page 199: "A Southern Confederacy will be worse than a rope of sand with So. Carolina at its head,—arrogant, self-willed and dictatorial as she is."

The elaborate documentation and excessive detail which characterize the treatment make it difficult for the reader to follow the narrative with perspective, but if this is a defect it is positive rather than negative, and enhances the reference value of the book. There are a few technical inconsistencies, and minor

errors such, for example, as the occasional omission of italics in footnotes as on page 30. The significance of this study would have been extended if it had been linked with the growth of secession sentiment in other states and developed as a part of that movement in the lower South.

An excellent bibliography, an adequate index, and the helpful maps round out a publication that is a noteworthy contribution to Southern history. Judging the finished product in terms of the purpose expressed by Dr. Sitterson, namely, that of writing "A complete study of the secession movement in North Carolina," despite the possible loose use of the word "complete," there will doubtless be general agreement that the work is a distinctive achievement and a highly creditable addition to *The James Sprunt Historical Studies in History and Political Science* which, inaugurated in 1899, represent one of the best exhibits of the University of North Carolina in the field of historical research and publication. An ideal companion study will be that relating to disaffection in North Carolina during the Civil War, soon to be published, on which Miss Mary Shannon Smith, former head of the history department of Meredith College, has been working for the past quarter of a century.

A. J. HANNA.

ROLLINS COLLEGE,
WINTER PARK, FLA.

OLD HOMES AND GARDENS OF NORTH CAROLINA. Photographs by Bayard Wootten; historical text by Archibald Henderson; compiled by Mrs. Charles A. Cannon, Mrs. Lyman A. Cotten, and Mrs. James Edwin Latham. Published under the auspices of the Garden Club of North Carolina. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 1939. \$10.00.)

This beautiful and interesting volume presents 100 of the lovely old homes and gardens of North Carolina. The foreword to this edition, which is limited to 1,000 copies, is written and signed by Governor Clyde R. Hoey. There is a short introduction by Mrs. R. L. McMillan, president of the Garden Club of North Carolina. Dr. Henderson has contributed a thirty-page article on "The Place, The People, Their Homes and Gardens." A brief historical sketch accompanies each of the 100 plates. All of the plates except Number One, Tryon

Palace, are Wootten photographs. The greater part of the Tryon Palace was burned in 1798 (and not in 1789 as the text reads), and this plate, therefore, is based on an old drawing.

The homes selected for this volume reflect many styles of architecture and represent many different localities in the State. For obvious reasons, most of the plantation homes are in the Coastal Plain region. Most of the town houses are in Edenton, New Bern, Wilmington, Warrenton, and Raleigh. Most of the homes are of the neo-classic type, which was so much in vogue between 1800 and 1860. Most of the houses were built of wood, though a number of the town houses were of brick. A few are a combination of brick and wood, and there is one photograph of the Log House on Watauga River. Some of the houses are very simple in design, but most of them show grace and originality in detail, especially in windows and doorways. There are only two small houses shown, both of which are interesting architecturally and historically.

A few brief comments about certain of the homes and gardens may show something about the general nature of this unusual volume. Orton, near Wilmington, is said to be the finest example of colonial architecture in North Carolina. Hayes, at Edenton, is a "white manor house," flanked by two wings connected with the main structure by beautiful curving arcades. Beverly Hall, in Edenton, is conspicuous for its three porticos and graceful doorways, as well as for one of the loveliest gardens in the State. The Burgwin House, at Wilmington, which was the headquarters of Lord Cornwallis in 1781, is described as "the most characteristic of colonial type." The Governor Dudley House, in Wilmington, is a much more pretentious home. Oakland, which was the home of General Thomas Brown, is "the only surviving colonial manor house on the Cape Fear." The most distinctive colonial structure in New Bern is the John Wright Stanly House, with its ornamented hooded entrance flanked on either side by graceful columns with capital and base of simple Doric style. The broad central hall and staircase of this home are unusually fine. The Smalwood-Ward House in New Bern is a simple but finely proportioned structure. The weathered brick are set in Flemish bond,

and the porch, main cornice, and dormer windows are lavishly decorated with hand-carved ornaments. This house has one of the finest examples of a formal drawing room in North Carolina. The Marsh House at Bath is noted for its English bond chimney seventeen feet wide, and the Sanderson House in Jones County has a double chimney which is graceful and well-proportioned. The Cupola House in Edenton is widely known for its cupola and for its overhanging second story, an architectural feature seldom seen in North Carolina. The Booth House in Edenton has a gambrel roof and dormer windows similar to those in Williamsburg, Virginia. The Greenfield House, near Edenton, is a two-story, frame house, "built in farm-house style, with a well-proportioned double porch across the front. The Old Brick House in Pasquotank County has no porch. Stockton in Gates County has simple Doric columns, while the Old Pendleton Place in Warrenton has a portico of Greek Ionic columns. Lands End on the Perquimans River has an unusual roof line and a slate roof. The Eaton Place in Warrenton is a good example of the neo-classic style of architecture. The gambrel roof and diamond-paned windows make Woodlawn in Granville County distinctive. Wakefield, better known as the Joel Lane House, in Raleigh, is a simple type of house with two stories, gambrel roof, and small wing to the side. The Mordecai House, the John Haywood House, and Christ Church Rectory, all in Raleigh, are much more pretentious structures. The interior of the Haywood House is particularly impressive. The interior view of Cooleemee Plantation, on the Yadkin River, is one of the best in the book, and the winding staircase is one of the most beautiful the reviewer has seen.

One wishes that there might have been some interior views showing period furniture. Most of the nine interior views show only bare rooms or halls. It is rather surprising that no view is given of the slave quarters on some of the old plantations. The text accompanying the plate on Bracebridge Hall indicates that the quarters on this place are still preserved. A picture of a log cabin or the humble dwelling of a small farmer or "po' white" might have been out of place in this volume, but it must be remembered that the vast majority of North Caro-

linians did not have the lovely homes and gardens which are shown here. It is gratifying to know that some North Carolinians did.

HUGH T. LEFLER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA,
CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

ONE HUNDRED YEARS AT V. M. I. By William Couper. (Richmond: Garrett and Massie. c. 1939. Volumes I and II. Pp. xiv, 360; x, 345. \$6.00.)

On April 21, 1851, there was a mutiny at the Virginia Military Institute. It was the first severe test of the system of discipline in the new military college, established at Lexington twelve years before. The cadets had been permitted to attend several sessions of an enthralling murder trial. When the lawyers proved too eloquent or verbose and the proceedings lasted longer than had been expected, the V. M. I. boys could not resist the temptation to hear the closing argument. Incited by the first class, they walked out of barracks and heard the speech without permission. This was open flouting of military authority, and the Superintendent, General F. H. Smith, treated it as such. After due consideration, he announced that the entire first class was dismissed—despite the fact that it was only a few months before graduation. The Board of Visitors later reinstated the erring cadets with the understanding that they be restricted to the limits of the Institute until finals. But they had learned a salutary lesson. It served them in good stead when they had to meet greater trials in after years.

The now forgotten mutiny is one of numerous interesting episodes which Colonel Couper describes in the first two volumes of his exhaustive centennial history of the Virginia Military Institute. The other two volumes are scheduled for appearance this spring. The executive officer and historiographer at V. M. I., Colonel Couper has had access to a large mass of official orders, letters, and reports as well as other valuable historical material. His first two volumes take the narrative from 1839, when V. M. I. was established as a result of the efforts of Colonel Claudius Crozet, a Napoleonic veteran, and some prominent native Virginians, through the earlier

struggling years, the decade of the "fifties" when T. J. Jackson was a professor, and the stormy period of the Civil War.

Reading these two published volumes of Colonel Couper's history, even an acerbic critic could not but be favorably impressed by several phases of the history of V. M. I. The author gives proof of the notable record of former cadets in the Civil War. The young military college in a large measure furnished the drill masters and the subordinate officers in several brigades of the Army of Northern Virginia, to say nothing of some able generals. Stonewall Jackson could partly attribute the fighting ability of his crack army corps to officers with V. M. I. training. When Pickett made his famous charge at Gettysburg he was fortunate in having V. M. I. men as colonels of thirteen of his fifteen regiments. In the civil life of the period also the V. M. I. alumni are shown to have been good citizens, often with superior records in their various fields of endeavor. Perhaps it was too much to expect that they would include any statesmen comparable to the great Virginians of the Revolutionary period. Yet some broadminded V. M. I. graduates will admit that there were weaknesses in the academic training of the college — weaknesses to this day only partly overcome.

Colonel Couper is to be congratulated upon the industry and scholarship he has displayed in his work. This reviewer has detected no factual errors. He does feel, however, that certain portions of the book could be made more readable. For example, although many of the numerous quotations are needed, others could have been effectively condensed or paraphrased.

North Carolinians will be interested to learn that one of the cadets killed in the charge at New Market was W. H. McDowell of their state. A little fellow of about fifteen, he lay there on the battlefield "more fit indeed for a cradle than a grave." We do not have to be pacifists to venture a question as to how many controversial causes are worth the sacrifice of one so young.

ROBERT DOUTHAT MEADE.

RANDOLPH-MACON WOMAN'S COLLEGE,
LYNCHBURG, VA.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF EDMUND PENDLETON. By Robert Leroy Hilldrup. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 1931. Pp. vii, 351.)

This is a good book on an important public man hitherto not adequately studied. The author has used the sources rather exhaustively and according to accepted canons. More frequent footnotes would have made for clearness in the citation of authorities; but one is grateful that the notes run along with the text. There is a portrait of Pendleton and one of John Taylor of Caroline, his kinsman, protégé, and neighbor.

The general reader will be most interested in Pendleton's rapid rise from apprentice to the county clerk to leading lawyer and legislator. That this was due to solid qualities and not to subservience to the dominant aristocratic ring the author is confident. Unlike the contemporary Patrick Henry, likewise self-made, he made no great appeal to the masses. But he became George Washington's lawyer and leading judge of the state's highest courts; and he was chairman of the revolutionary Committee of Safety and chairman of the convention that determined Virginia's adherence to the new Federal Union. Of interest, too, though but meagerly told, was his extensive accumulation of Virginia farm lands and his membership in great western land companies.

A real contribution to the history of the times, the reviewer thinks, is the author's long and fatiguing account of the colonial legislatures in which Pendleton served; for here we see how seriously the Burgesses took their job and hence why—perhaps—some more independent status for Virginia was probably inevitable. Of more general interest is the cleverness with which Pendleton and his group managed to keep effectual control over matters continually in their hands. Patrick Henry stampeded the Burgesses with his Stamp Act speech but the minutes showed unobjectionable, if superfluous, resolutions. Henry stampeded the St. John's Church convention into arming the colony but found himself sidetracked in his ambition for military distinction. In the convention of 1776 Henry's desire for a declaration of independence by the Continental Congress was acceded to but tied up with the concession was the reservation to the state of freedom to make its own government, which

Pendleton's group proceeded to do without awaiting outside authorization and with the controlling places in their hands. And so it was always.

Pendleton's devotion to vested interests finds many illustrations. He was against title to land based on Indian purchase. He was much interested in boundary lines and was cautious about Virginia's cession of northwest territories. As judge he supported the authority of the treaty of 1783 over state legislation. Eager as he seems to have been to collaborate with Jefferson in state policies for the new era, he could not bring himself to favor abolition of the eldest son's special privilege or confiscation of the Episcopal Church's glebe lands; if the Episcopal Church alone could not retain the right to support by taxes, he was willing to have the other churches so supported along with it. And against the impairment of Virginia property rights which he saw involved in the Hamiltonian program he protested privately to Washington as well as in a notable political tract, thereby paving the way for John Taylor.

To the reviewer the author's study would have been more valuable had he assumed a more critical attitude toward his subject. If he had admitted Pendleton to have been tricky or selfish or wobbly or timid or just wrong on some occasions, his hero would have been less perfect but more real. But for all this, it is a book worth while.

C. C. PEARSON.

WAKE FOREST COLLEGE,
WAKE FOREST, N. C.

JOHN TYLER: CHAMPION OF THE OLD SOUTH. By Oliver Perry Chitwood. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 1939. Pp. xv, 496. \$4.00.)

This definitive biography of a champion of the Old South sets in proper perspective and balance one of the most maligned figures of the ante-bellum period. It was John Tyler's fate to inherit the presidency a month after Harrison's inauguration and to be read out of the Whig party within five months because he disagreed with the nationalistic wing on the bank issue. Contemporaries charged that Tyler accepted a position on the Whig ticket in 1840 only to become a traitor to the party and its

policies. That the Whigs had no principles in 1840 except opposition to the party in power, and that Tyler was not committed to a bank charter and other planks in a Whig platform belatedly announced by Henry Clay in 1841, are facts that political historians have recognized for a score of years. There is, therefore, nothing new in Professor Chitwood's revisionist view that Tyler was a consistent state rights advocate of Jeffersonian principles. He is the first scholar, however, to present a well-rounded, objective analysis of Tyler's career, and he has done the job so thoroughly and so meticulously that it will not need to be repeated.

Nearly half the volume is devoted to the five-year period from the campaign of 1840 to Tyler's retirement from the presidency. This emphasis is justifiable, for that half decade brought Tyler prominence if not power and established him as a controversialist in the national political arena. Of the remaining portion of the book, 175 pages trace his career to 1840 and 60 pages treat his life as a country gentleman at "Sherwood Forest" and his peacemaking efforts on the eve of the Civil War. It is quite likely that Tyler would deserve a substantial biography had he never attained the presidency. A graduate of William and Mary College, he retained a lively interest in his alma mater, served as a member of its Board of Visitors, and in a speech punctuated with "flashes of oratory" opposed its removal to Richmond. He studied law, practiced his profession, and rose rapidly in political office, serving several terms in the House of Delegates, five years in the lower house of Congress, a biennium as governor of Virginia, nine years in the United States Senate, and as a delegate to the Virginia constitutional convention of 1829-1830. Professor Chitwood credits Tyler with statemanship of high order in much of his public service.

On all of the important issues of the era—tariff, bank, internal improvements, public lands—Tyler was a consistent opponent of nationalism. He disapproved South Carolina's course in the nullification controversy, spoke eloquently against the Force Bill, cast the only vote against it in the Senate, and played an important rôle in initiating the compromise tariff of

1833. "Tyler never appeared to better advantage in his entire career," Professor Chitwood concludes, "than he did in the part he played in the nullification crisis" (p. 120). In leaving the Democratic party in 1834, Tyler followed the only course consistent with his record, but Professor Chitwood questions the expediency of his resignation from the Senate in 1836 because he could not obey legislative instructions to vote for the Expunging Resolution. "The decision to continue in the Whig ranks [after Jackson's retirement] was probably the greatest mistake ever made by Tyler" (p. 155). His nomination for the vice-presidency was opposed by most of the Whig leaders in Virginia; he "was given the second place on the ticket mainly because he was from the South and had been a strong advocate of States' rights" (p. 172). Professor Chitwood rejects the charges that Tyler changed his attitude on the bank issue at the Harrisburg convention (pp. 172-73). Yet he blames Tyler for withholding from the electorate a frank statement of his real convictions, and criticizes him for assuming "a place of leadership in a party the majority of whose members advocated measures he had spent a life career in opposing" (p. 192). In the party schism of 1841, Professor Chitwood marshals an imposing array of evidence to show that Tyler "put loyalty to duty and conviction above considerations of expediency," but in doing so hoped that this course "would prove the right road to the succession" (p. 219). In a chapter on "Perfidy or Patriotism," the author's verdict is that Tyler "had kept the faith, even though he had not fought a good fight" (p. 268). But, he concludes, the successes of his quadrennium in the presidency show "a remarkable record for an administration of a 'President without a party'" (p. 341).

In discussing the Missouri Compromise, the author says that the exclusion of slavery from a large part of Louisiana territory "turned over to the North a vast area that would in the future insure its preponderance in the Union" (pp. 52-53). As the institution a generation later reached its natural limits, it is difficult to see how the exclusion affected the situation in a practical sense, although it did ban a theoretical Negro from an impossible place.

Although Professor Chitwood appends copious footnotes, he does not include a bibliography. The publication of so good a biography without a critical essay on authorities is a real misfortune. Careful verification would have eliminated a sprinkling of minor errors in quoting.

WENDELL HOLMES STEPHENSON.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY,
UNIVERSITY, LOUISIANA.

HISTORICAL NEWS

"The Lost Colony," Paul Green's historical drama, was presented for the fourth consecutive summer, from June 29 through Labor Day, September 2, at the Waterside Theatre, Fort Raleigh, Roanoke Island.

The North Carolina Society, Colonial Dames of America, on June 26 unveiled a marker at Franklin, Macon County, marking the route followed by DeSoto and his party four hundred years ago.

The North Carolina Historical Commission met on August 30 in Chapel Hill. The secretary's budgetary estimates for the 1941-43 biennium were approved, and routine business was transacted.

Professor R. W. Lee of the Mars Hill College faculty taught history and government in the Wake Forest College summer school.

Dr. David A. Lockmiller has been appointed head of the department of history and political science at State College. He spent a part of the summer in research for a biography of General Enoch H. Crowder, in Chicago and Washington.

Professor J. A. McGeachy of Davidson College spent the summer in research at the University of Chicago.

Professor Robert Wauchope, formerly of the University of Georgia, has been added to the faculty of the University of North Carolina. He will carry a part-time teaching load in archaeology and will also direct the State-wide Work Projects Administration archaeological project, which has been in operation for several months. At the present time the project is conducting one unit at the Frutchey Mound, in Montgomery County, and another unit in Orange County, and plans are being made to open additional units.

Recent addresses by Dr. C. C. Crittenden include the following: July 26, to the Assembly of the 189th Rotary District, at Atlantic Beach, N. C.; August 1, to the Fourth Annual Superintendents' Conference, sponsored by the State Department of Public Instruction, at Cullowhee; August 18, at the second annual pilgrimage to Morattock Primitive Baptist Church (Washington County), which has recently been restored; and September 3, to the teachers of Wake County (excluding the City of Raleigh), at Cary.

Books received include: Harry R. Stevens, *The Ohio Bridge* (Cincinnati: The Ruter Press. c. 1939); Rayford W. Logan, editor, *The Attitude of the Southern White Press toward Negro Suffrage, 1932-1940* (Washington: The Foundation Publishers. 1940); Robert T. Thompson, *Colonel James Neilson: A Business Man of the Early Machine Age in New Jersey, 1784-1862* (New Brunswick, N. J.: Rutgers University Press. 1940); William Alexander Mabry, *The Negro in North Carolina Politics since Reconstruction. Historical Papers of the Trinity College Historical Society, Series XXIII* (Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press. 1940).

In 1935 Congress created the United States De Soto Commission, consisting of seven members including the chairman, Dr. John R. Swanton, of the Smithsonian Institution. The report of this commission, submitted to Congress in 1939, has been published under the title, *Final Report of the United States De Soto Expedition Commission (House Document No. 71, Seventy-sixth Congress, First Session)*. According to this report the Spanish explorer and his men passed through what is now western North Carolina, going through or near the site of the present town of Highlands, and through the sites of the towns of Franklin and Murphy.

Beginning with the September issue, the *North Carolina Public School Bulletin*, a publication of the State Department of Public Instruction, is carrying a column titled "Tar Heel History," the copy for which is prepared by the Historical Commission.

In collaboration with the State Department of Conservation and Development, the North Carolina Historical Commission has published the second edition of the *Guide to North Carolina Historical Highway Markers*, listing the 294 markers which had been approved through March 1, 1940. Copies of this bulletin may be had by writing to either the Department or the Commission.

The North Carolina Historical Commission has published a large edition of each of two leaflets: *How the North Carolina Historical Commission Serves the Public* and *The Hall of History*. Copies may be had from the secretary.

In press is the fifth volume of the *Records of the Moravians in North Carolina*. Just as the preceding volumes, it will be edited by Dr. Adelaide L. Fries, Archivist of the Moravian Church, Southern Province, and will be published by the North Carolina Historical Commission.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

Dr. Albert Ray Newsome is a professor of history and head of the history department in the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Dr. Thomas Payne Govan is an assistant professor of history in the University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee.

Mr. Fabian Linden is a graduate student in history in Harvard University. His address is 4322 Eighteenth Avenue, Brooklyn, New York.

Dr. Robert J. Parker is a professor of American history in San Francisco Junior College, and an associate editor of the *California Historical Society Quarterly*, San Francisco, California.

Mr. David Leroy Corbitt is chief library assistant of the North Carolina Historical Commission, and managing editor of *The North Carolina Historical Review*, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Rev. Douglas LeTell Rights is pastor of the Trinity Moravian Church and president of the Wachovia Historical Society, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS VOLUME

Dr. Richard E. Yates is an assistant professor of political science in Hendrix College, Conway, Arkansas.

Dr. Delbert Harold Gilpatrick is a professor of history in Furman University, Greenville, South Carolina.

Dr. Elizabeth Gregory McPherson is an assistant in the Manuscripts Division, Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Rosser Howard Taylor is a professor of history in Furman University, Greenville, South Carolina.

Mr. William Morrison Robinson, Jr., is a professional engineer at the Norfolk Navy Yard, and a lieutenant colonel in the army reserve, Portsmouth, Virginia.

Miss Mary Lindsay Thornton is in charge of the North Carolina Collection in the Library of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

Mr. Gaston Litton is an assistant archivist in the Division of Interior Department Archives at The National Archives, Washington, D. C.

Dr. Marguerite B. Hamer is an assistant professor of history in the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Tennessee.

Dr. John D. Barnhart is an associate professor of history in the Louisiana State University, University, Louisiana.

Dr. Albert Ray Newsome is a professor of history and head of the history department in the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

Dr. Thomas Payne Govan is an assistant professor of history in the University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee.

Mr. Fabian Linden is a graduate student in history in Harvard University. His address is 4322 Eighteenth Avenue, Brooklyn, New York.

Dr. Robert J. Parker is a professor of American history in San Francisco Junior College, and an associate editor of the *California Historical Society Quarterly*, San Francisco, California.

Mr. David Leroy Corbitt is chief library assistant of the North Carolina Historical Commission, and managing editor of *The North Carolina Historical Review*, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Rev. Douglas LeTell Rights is pastor of the Trinity Moravian Church and president of the Wachovia Historical Society, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

