Nine ■ Slave Labor or Free in the Southern Factories: A Political Analysis of an Economic Debate

The excited and sometimes bitter debate between those who wished to use slaves in Southern factories and those who wished to use free white laborers quickly passed beyond discussion of the economic advantages of one or the other. Experience could be relied upon to settle the strictly economic question in particular industries and districts. Experience could not be relied upon to settle the social and political questions. A miscalculation of labor costs might produce ruin for a few investors but could make wiser entrepreneurs of their successors; a miscalculation of the effects of raising a class of urban factory slaves or white proletarians could prove fatal to the Southern social system. This debate over a seemingly economic question cannot be understood unless studied in its political context, the main feature of which was the intention of the rural slaveholders to maintain their hegemony at all cost.

The case for Negro labor, which always meant slave labor

since no one proposed using free Negroes, took several forms, basically social or political. Negroes were sometimes held to be as efficient as whites, all things being equal, but were rarely held to be more efficient. The proponents of Negro labor argued that all things were not equal and that, even if less efficient on a day-to-day basis, Negroes were more so on a season-to-season basis since they could not readily leave their jobs.

The Natchez *Ariel*, referring to the hemp factories of Kentucky, commented in 1827: "Why are slaves employed? Simply because experiment has proved that they are more *docile*, more constant, and cheaper than freemen, who are often refractory and dissipated; who waste much time by frequenting public places, attending musters, elections, etc., which the operative slave is not permitted to frequent."[1] This theme recurred throughout the antebellum period. In 1845, the Pensacola *Gazette* noted the use of slaves by the Arcadia Manufacturing Company and added: "It is determined to incur this last expense at once, in order to avoid the possible inconvenience of white operatives becoming disatisfied and leaving their work" [*sic*].[2] Samuel D. Morgan, the big Tennessee iron producer, said simply in 1852 that slaves did not strike and could not demand wage increases as their skill and productivity improved.[3]

William Gregg set the case in a more elaborate theoretical framework when he wrote that whereas labor and capital were becoming antagonistic in industrial countries, slavery united the interests of labor and capital in the person of the slave and thereby avoided the class struggle. Besides, he added, manufacturers "are not under the necessity of educating [slaves] and have, therefore, their uninterrupted services from the age of eight years."[4] Gregg admitted that the question of which kind of labor was the cheaper remained unsettled, and he soon made himself famous by his work at Graniteville, which relied on whites.

Slave labor had hidden virtues. Manufacturers found it difficult to induce planters to invest liquid capital in factories but easier to induce them to lease slaves in exchange for shares of stock. Under conditions of capital shortage and less than optimum cotton prices slave labor took on a special attractiveness, whatever the manufacturers' judgment of its relative efficiency.

The other side of the same appeal offered slaveholders a chance to improve their economic position by deflecting surplus slaves into industry. As Governor Aaron V. Brown of Tennessee wrote to the New Orleans Railroad Convention:

> You will never adjourn, I hope, without making the strongest appeals to our capitalists, and especially our planters, to engage in [industry]. The latter can build the houses necessary with their own hands. Two or three or half a dozen can unite in one establishment. They can select from their own stock of slaves, the most active and intelligent ones for operatives, without the necessary advances in money to white laborers. . . . I earnestly desire to see one-fourth of southern slave labor diverted from the *production* to the *manufacture* of cotton. One-fourth of such labor abstracted, would give a steadiness and elevation of prices to the raw material, which would better justify its cultivation.[5]

As Southern hopes for territorial expansion dimmed, manufacturing became, for some, a guarantee against a labor surplus.[6] In its more extreme political form this argument emerged as an appeal to "bring slave labor directly into competition with Northern labor."[7] E. Steadman, using an argument similar to Brown's, added, "And this is not all. These laborers from producers are turned into consumers. They convert a considerable portion of the cotton produced by those who remain in the field, and thus still further enhance the value of the crop."[8]

Tobacco factories buttressed the plantation regime on the

countryside in two ways: they provided a ready market for the crops and hired those slaves who were not needed in the fields.[9] The cotton textile industry, on the other hand, shifted to white labor as the years went by, although numerous slaves worked in factories in Alabama and elsewhere.[10] The iron industry in both the Lower and Upper South absorbed large numbers of slaves, as did the railroads, despite complaints, such as that of Confederate Senator Wright of Georgia, who described Negro colliers as irresponsible and worthless.[11] Slaves, sometimes purchased, more often rented, were generally recruited locally and provided a strong bond of interest between the planters and manufacturers.

Dependence on slave labor had its drawbacks, for rising slave prices might at any time dry up the sources of supply. In Charleston, South Carolina, for example, the industrial progress of the 1840s received a severe jolt from the return of high cotton prices in the 1850s, which generated a derived demand for slaves. Estimates placed the number of slaves sold out of Charleston during the 1850s at ten thousand.[12] "It was," writes Griffin, "the fervent hope of all the factory owners that immigration would bring sufficient white people back into the [industrial region of Georgia] so they could dispense with hiring slaves."[13]

If manufacturers had mixed experiences and unsettled thoughts on slave labor, planters found their own reasons for uneasiness. On the one hand, they had an economic stake in slave hiring and a deep suspicion of white labor; on the other hand, they looked askance at the social consequences of industrial urban slavery. On balance, Russel may be right when he observes, "It is hard to escape the conclusion that many Southerners were interested in manufactures only so long as it appeared possible to conduct them with slave labor; when experience finally demonstrated the superiority of white labor, their interest declined."[14]

That demonstrated superiority of white labor grew out of

superior incentives and training and was therefore not universal, for slaves often obtained both. Unfortunately, the more incentives and training they got, the more the rural slaveholders looked on with dismay. How were planters to react upon learning, for example, that slaves in the tobacco-manufacturing towns selected their own employer, received money with which to obtain food and lodgings as they pleased, and expected bonuses for extra work?[15] What were planters to think when they learned that so long as the slaves at Tredegar did their job they were, in the words of Kathleen Bruce, "pretty much on the basis of free labor"?[16] The story was the same in the hemp factories of Kentucky, the gold mines of Virginia, the railroads of Tennessee, and generally.[17] It could not be other, for the secret of making the slave into a good industrial worker lay precisely in giving him incentives well beyond those available to field hands. That this tendency could not be permitted to go far enough to undermine plantation discipline was lost on no reasonably alert planter.

"Whenever a slave is made a mechanic," James H. Hammond told the South Carolina Institute in 1849, "he is more than half freed, and soon becomes, as we too well know, and all history attests, with rare exceptions, the most corrupt and turbulent of his class."[18] The South Carolina legislative Committee on Negro Population considered several memorials asking for laws to prohibit slaves from hiring their own time and working in the mechanic arts. J. Harlston Read, Jr., the committee's chairman, agreed with the memorialists that the practices were "evil" and denounced the practice of allowing slaves "to conduct themselves as if they were not slaves." The practices were so deeply rooted in custom and interest, he explained, that nothing could or should be done.[19] In short, the antipathy of the slaveholders as a class had to be weighed against the established rights and interests of individual slaveholders.

The behavior of the urban Negroes gave planters reason

for concern. The attitude of New Orleans slaves toward whites shocked the sensibilities of all who knew of it. According to Tregle: "It was not unusual for slaves to gather on street corners at night, for example, where they challenged whites to attempt to pass, hurled taunts at white women, and kept whole neighborhoods disturbed by shouts and curses. Nor was it safe to accost them, as many went armed with knives and pistols in flagrant defiance of all the precautions of the Black Code."[20] The early experience of the Charleston District left a permanent impression. At the end of the eighteenth century "trustworthy slaves were practically in a state of industrial freedom," but the Denmark Vesey conspiracy of 1822 frightened the slaveholders into an intense reaction.[21]

An elite stratum of urban slaves offered advantages to the regime by giving the more talented and intellectually vigorous Negroes privileges to protect by good behavior, but it offered more serious disadvantages by tempting them into disorders, giving them opportunities to become literate, providing them with access to political news, and arousing their hopes for freedom. When Nathaniel A. Ware, a prominent banker, planter, and nationalistic economist, wrote an anonymous article for Cassius Clay's *True American* in which he drew logical conclusions from the practices associated with urbanizing Negroes and advocated gradual emancipation for slaves and political rights for free Negroes, the reaction was swift: it was this article which led to the famous mob assault against the crusading, antislavery newspaper.[22]

The use of whites did not guarantee a better work force than did the use of Negroes, for the South lacked an adequate pool of disciplined free workers. S. Mims, a close friend of Daniel Pratt, wrote in his eulogistic "History of Prattville": "Hands had to be trained. These were brought up from the piney woods, many of them with no sort of training to any kind of labor; in fact, they had to learn everything, and in learning many mistakes and blunders were made fatal to success."[23] At Graniteville, the South's other industrial showcase, the same story was told by Gregg's associate, James H. Taylor. Southern white labor was not disciplined to sustained labor, he admitted, but only time was needed to bring it up to Northern standards.[24] A prominent Negro politician of reconstruction days told of having had to keep accounts and write letters, while still a slave, for white workers in the Alabama salt works during the war.[25]

In many industries the problem remained unsolved. Southern timber, for example, had to be sent to Northern yards instead of supplying a Southern shipbuilding industry, primarily because labor costs, with a shortage of skills, were prohibitive.[26] Since laborers ranked far down in the social scale, progress had to be slow. Factory workers did not command as much respect as the poorest farmers or even the landless agricultural workers.[27] As James Martin, the Florence, Alabama, industrialist, wrote in 1858: "We have not yet a sufficient amount of trained labor to enable companies to do well. . . . The strange notion that our young men have, in believing the training of the mind and hand to any kind of handicraft causes them to lose caste in society" [*sic*].[28] In spite of the difficulties, sufficient progress did occur to enable Richard W. Griffin to write that the cotton textile industry came out of the war battered but with its most valuable resource intact—"the skilled labor and experienced supervisors."[29]

In view of the backwardness of the employable whites the main disadvantage of slave labor lay in the sacrifice of flexibility and the tying up of capital occasioned by purchase or renting. This disadvantage would have lost its significance if the whites had proved militant in the defense of their interests, but many Southern spokesmen expressed confidence in their steadiness and docility. As the debate proceeded, the main argument of the advocates of white labor became the social one: society's

responsibility to do something for the poor. William Gregg, abandoning his earlier concern for slave labor, led the appeal on behalf of the poor whites. Industry would absorb the thousands of landless poor, he argued, and would simultaneously uplift society's downtrodden, widen the home market, and help raise the economic and cultural level of society as a whole.[30]

Most participants in the debate went further than Gregg in the social argument and warned that the absorption of the poor whites by industry was essential to the maintenance of the slaveholders' regime. Increasingly, the appeal for industrial expansion based on white labor took this form. Whites should be employed in factories, J. H. Lumpkin of Georgia wrote in 1852, so that they can receive moral instruction under proper supervision.[31]

Hammond, as usual, spoke out bluntly in his address to the South Carolina Institute in 1849:

> But it has been suggested that white factory operatives in the South would constitute a body hostile to our domestic institutions. If any such sentiments could take root among the poorer classes of our native citizens, more danger may be apprehended from them, in the present state of things, with the facilities they now possess and the difficulties they now have to encounter, than if they were brought together in factories, with constant employment and adequate remuneration. It is well known that the abolitionists of America and Europe are now making the most strenuous efforts to enlist them in their crusade, by encouraging the use of what is called "free labor cotton," and by inflammatory appeals to their pride and their supposed interests. But all apprehensions from this source are entirely imaginary. The poorest and humblest freeman of the South feels as sensibly, perhaps more sensibly than the wealthiest planter, the barrier which nature, as well as law, has erected between the white and black races . . . Besides this, the factory operative could

> not fail to see here, what one would suppose he must see, however distant from us, that the whole fabric of his fortunes was based on our slave system . . .[32]

Hammond's argument was echoed by others, but no one, not even Hammond himself, presented it so clearly as Gregg's associate, James H. Taylor. Taylor's words about "a great upbearing of our masses" have often been quoted, but too often out of context:

> . . . Because an effort has been made to collect the poor and unemployed white population into our new factories, fears have arisen, that some evil would grow out of the introduction of such establishments among us. . . . I take the ground, that our institutions are safe if we are *true to ourselves;* and, *that truthfulness* must not only be manifest in our statesmen and politicians, but must be an abiding *principle* in the *masses* of our people. The poor man has a vote, as well as the rich man; and in our State, the *number* of the first will largely overbalance the last. So long as these poor, but industrious people, could see no mode of living, except by a degrading operation of work with the negro upon the plantation, they were content to endure life in its most discouraging forms, satisfied that they were *above* the slave, though faring, often worse than he. But the progress of the world is "onward," and though in some sections it is still slow, still it is "onward," and the great mass of our poor white population begin to understand that they have rights, and that they too, are entitled to some of the sympathy which falls upon the suffering. They are fast learning, that there is an almost infinite world of industry opening before them, by which they can elevate themselves and their families from wretchedness and ignorance to competence and intelligence. *It is this great upbearing of our masses that we are to fear, so far as our institutions are concerned.*
>
> Let our slaves be continued where they have been, and where they are of immense value; let them raise from the earth the cotton, rice, corn, etc., which they are so well fitted to do, and then furnish the white population with

employment in the manufactory and mechanical arts: and every man, from the deepest principle of self-interest, becomes a firm and uncompromising supporter of our institutions. But crowd from these employments the fast increasing white population of the South, and fill our factories and workshops with our slaves, and we shall have in our midst those whose very existence is in hostile array to our institutions.[33]

The full implications of this line of reasoning appeared, as might be expected, from the logical mind and facile pen of George Fitzhugh:

> As ours is a government of the people, no where is education so necessary. The poor, too, ask no charity, when they demand universal education. They constitute our militia and our police. They protect men in possession of property, as in other countries; and do much more, they secure men in possession of a kind of property which they could not hold a day but for the supervision and protection of the poor. This very property has rendered the South merely agricultural, made population too sparse for neighborhood schools, prevented a variety of pursuits, and thus cut the poor off as well from the means of living, as from the means of education.[34]
>
> Educate all Southern whites, employ them not as lacqueys, ploughmen, and menials, but as independent freemen should be employed, and let negroes be strictly tied down to such callings as are unbecoming white men, and peace would be established between blacks and whites.[35]

Finally, Fitzhugh made the point in language even dolts would understand: "The path of safety is the path of duty! Educate the people, no matter what it may cost."[36]

The arguments of the Hammonds, Taylors, and Fitzhughs made headway, but slowly and in the face of stubborn opposition and even more stubborn apathy. Much of the resistance

to chartering Graniteville had arisen from displeasure with Gregg's plan to use white labor.[37] When Gregg defended his policy before the South Carolina Institute a few years later, he was sharply attacked by the *Charleston Mercury* and even denounced by an irresponsible gossip for allegedly advocating a doctrine identical with that of "Free Soil and Free Labor."[38] In a more rational vein, C. G. Memminger wrote to Hammond arguing that Negroes, not whites, ought to be employed in factories because a white proletariat would represent the greatest possible threat to the regime. These "Lowellers," he punned in a grim and worried letter, would soon all become abolitionists.[39]

Memminger's fears did not impress men like De Bow, who pointed out that Southern factory workers did not have contact with immigrants and foreign "isms."[40] The presence of four million slaves, according to one commentator, deterred immigration, for if foreigners did come, "it would probably be to starve."[41] Edmund Ruffin expressed the general feeling of the planters when he wrote: "One of the great benefits of the institution of African slavery to the Southern states is its effect in keeping away from our territory, and directing to the north and northwest, the hordes of immigrants now flowing from Europe."[42] Griffin attributes the docility and passivity of white workers in the textile mills to the newness of employment and to "the lack of European emigrants, who brought a more highly developed class consciousness with them to the North."[43]

Reliance on the isolation of native workers from foreign placed the advocates of increased manufacturing in a contradiction, for one of the effects of industrial expansion and the rising demand for skilled labor was certain to be greater immigration. C. T. James, to whom many Southern pro-industrial spokesmen looked for support and guidance, laid great stress on the certainty that the South would attract skilled labor just

as soon as it could pay for it.[44] J. L. Orr, an advocate of industrial expansion, chose consistency over safety and advocated liberal naturalization procedures in the Confederacy, praising foreign mechanics as "everywhere useful citizens."[45]

Not many Orrs were to be found in the slave states. The foreign-born population of the Southern cities continued to cause apprehension among the rural slaveholders. With only 20 per cent of Charleston's population foreign-born in 1848, foreigners led natives by almost two to one in the race for poorhouse admission.[46] Elsewhere, except in New Orleans, conditions were about the same: unskilled Irish workers struggling to stay alive, Jewish peddlers and small merchants doing a necessary job but arousing considerable resentment by their mode of life, German artisans falling under the suspicion of antislavery feelings, and so forth.[47] Enthusiasm for manufacturing waned as it became clear that whites, not blacks, would be employed and that many foreigners would be joining the natives. The triumph of the Know-Nothings, in the streets and at the polls in the Southern cities, dealt a heavy blow to the industrial impulse, although ironically most Know-Nothings had been Whigs who were favorable to manufacturing. Even more ironically, the Know-Nothing upsurge tied the foreign-born workers more firmly to the Democratic party, which was rapidly becoming the party of the proslavery extremists.[48]

However docile the urban working class may have been relative to its Northern counterpart, it was becoming sufficiently rebellious to give pause to those who saw it as a political bulwark of the slave regime. Arthur C. Cole suggests that the class consciousness of the urban workers rose distinctly above that of the rural poor.[49] Labor organizations, although few, appeared with sufficient force and regularity to cause alarm. In the Upper South, unions grew more easily than further south. During the 1850s Baltimore, St. Louis, and Louisville gave rise to militant unions, which conducted strikes for higher wages and a ten-hour day.[50] Significant labor groups

appeared sporadically in Virginia, South Carolina, and Louisiana during the 1830s.[51] At least two strong unions functioned in New Orleans during the 1850s: the Screwman's Association, which raised wages by 20 per cent by a successful strike in 1854; and the New Orleans Typographical Society, which successfully struck to defeat a wage-cutting campaign by the Associated Press during the same year.[52] Throughout the 1850s strikes and working-class demonstrations broke out, and the resort to slaves could not always be relied upon by employers to break a strike.[53]

Labor militancy disturbed the slaveholders on two counts: it indicated an unruliness among the lower class that offended their conservative sensibilities and made them apprehensive about the security of property in general; and it raised the specter of antislavery agitation. The direct and indirect workings of the slave system threatened the very freedom of the white workers. Richard B. Morris writes: "Confronted, on the one side, with competition from Negro labor and, on the other, with some influx of foreign immigrant and Northern labor, the position of white labor in South Carolina steadily deteriorated in the ante-bellum period. As labor controls in general tightened, many white workers suffered in fact a loss of their freedom of occupational choice, and their mobility, and suffered at law a denial of their right to take concerted action . . ."[54] The use of slaves, and even free Negroes, as mechanics, not to mention strikebreakers, led to serious and mounting agitation among urban white workers. It was only a short step from specific complaints about such practices to more general demands for social and political reform.[55] Anti-Negro feeling among the workers inhibited the growth of antislavery feeling, but the two were not incompatible and the latter did make strides. When the editor of the *Charleston Mercury* publicly approved George Fitzhugh's doctrine that slavery was the natural condition of all labor, the white mechanics burned him in effigy in a wrathful demonstration.[56] As

organized Southern labor made steady, if slow and painful, progress during the 1850s, its leaders exhibited increasing hostility to the slave regime.[57] The use of Negro slaves to break strikes and of the state apparatus to imprison strike leaders pulled the white workers, however reluctantly, into fundamental opposition.

The pleas of the Hammonds, Taylors, and Greggs for the employment of white labor in factories must be evaluated in the light of these events. The growth of working-class consciousness, manifesting itself in conflicts with this or that feature of the slave regime, bore out the fears of those slaveholders who refused to yield to such pleas.[58] The sophisticated arguments of Hammond and Taylor, were, after all, mostly humbug. They rested on the assumption that the non-slaveholders would represent a greater danger to slavery under conditions of rural poverty than they would under conditions of urban industrial employment. Logic and experience suggested the reverse.

Taylor's famous remarks about a "great upbearing of our masses" are a case in point. A careful reading of his words reveals that he feared, or pretended to fear, that dissatisfaction would follow the inevitable rise in the expectations of the rural poor. He never did prove that expectations were in fact rising or about to rise. Whatever rise was occurring or was expected to occur might be traced to the impact of industrial expansion. Why then should slaveholders not conclude that industrialization, on any kind of a labor basis, would awaken their slumbering masses and cause trouble? Rural poverty and isolation, with its attendant cultural backwardness and absence of a direct and exploiting employer, generally produced acquiescence in the status quo. Urbanized workers, victimized by racism, might accept slavery in the abstract but were much more likely to collide with its political and social apparatus, and every such collision carried with it the danger of arousing a more profound consciousness of class interest.

Hammond and Taylor were really too clever. Industrialization would bind the workers to the regime by giving them jobs and flattering their feelings of racial superiority and would bind the industrialists to the regime by forcing them to rely on the slaveholders' black strikebreakers and political power to handle working-class unrest. Unfortunately, both workers and industrialists would benefit from public education, internal improvements to open new markets, increased urban political power, and a variety of other measures that the slaveholders could not easily accept. Unfortunately too, the workers could not be counted on to confine their class hostility to the manufacturers while the latter's dependence on the planters' power was so blatant.

Rural slaveholders had to view industrialization with either slave labor or free with misgivings. They needed more local manufacturing to supply the needs of the plantations and to guarantee the economic and military power of their states, but could not afford to permit too much. The exigencies of nineteenth-century life confronted the slaveholders with insoluble problems, with which they grappled as best they could. In the end, they could take no step along the industrial road without exposing themselves to perils so grave as to endanger their existence as a class.

NOTES

1 Quoted by Thomas P. Jones, M. D., "The Progress of Manufactures and Internal Improvements in the United States and Particularly on the Advantages to be Derived from the Employment of Slaves in the Manufacturing of

Cotton and Other Goods," first published in the *American Farmer* (1827) and republished in *THR*, III (July 1962), 156. Original emphasis.

2 "Notes on the Arcadia (Florida) Manufacturing Company," Pensacola *Gazette*, Sept. 13, 1845, as reprinted in *THR*, II (July 1961), 163.

3 *South-Western Monthly*, II (Sept. 1852), 173–75.

4 Gregg, *Essays on Domestic Industry*, p. 48; *cf.* Mitchell, *William Gregg*, p. 23.

5 Brown, *Speeches, Congressional and Political*, p. 547.

6 See, *e.g.*, *DBR*, VIII (Jan. 1850), 25, 75–76; XII (Feb. 1852), 182.

7 *DBR*, XII (Feb. 1852), 185.

8 "A Brief Treatise on Manufacturing in the South," reprinted in *THR*, II (April 1962), 112.

9 Joseph R. Robert, *The Tobacco Kingdom* (Durham, N.C., 1938), p. 198.

10 *Cf.* Ernest M. Lander, Jr., "Slave Labor in the South Carolina Cotton Mills," *JNH*, XXXVIII (April 1953), 164–65 and *passim;* Richard W. Griffin, "Cotton Manufacture in Alabama to 1860," *AHQ*, XVIII (Fall 1956), 291–93.

11 Speech on the exemption bill, Sept. 20, 1862. *Proceedings of the Confederate Congress*, ed. Douglas Southall Freeman, *Southern Historical Society Papers*, XLVI, 192. For the iron industry see Lester J. Cappon, "Iron-Making—a Forgotten Industry of North Carolina," *NCHR*, IX (Oct. 1932), 341; Ernest M. Lander, Jr., "The Iron Industry in Ante Bellum South Carolina," *JSH*, XX (Aug. 1954), 350; Robert E. Corlew, "Some Aspects of Slavery in Dickson County," *Tennessee Historical Quarterly*, X (Sept. 1951), 229; Woodward, *Alabama Review*, VII (July 1954), 200. For the railroads see Black, *Railroads of the Confederacy*, pp. 29–30.

12 Leonard Price Stavisky, "Industrialism in Ante Bellum Charleston," *JNH*, XXXVI (July 1951), 319.

13 Richard W. Griffin, "The Origins of the Industrial Revolution in Georgia: Cotton Textiles, 1810–1865," *GHQ*, XLII (Dec. 1958), 363. According to John A. Chapman, Gregg's indifferent results at Vaucluse, in contrast to his later success at Graniteville, were due to his shift from slave to free labor. This opinion has not been corroborated. See his *History of Edgefield County*, p. 100.

14 *Economic Aspects*, p. 55.

15 Robert, *Tobacco Kingdom*, pp. 203 ff.

16 *Virginia Manufacture in the Slave Era* (New York, 1931), p. 252, n. 89.

17 *Cf.* James F. Hopkins, *A History of the Hemp Industry in Kentucky* (Lexington, Ky., 1951), p. 135; Black, *Railroads of the Confederacy*, p. 30; and Morris, *MVHR*, XLI (Sept. 1954), 231–35.

18 *DBR*, VIII (June 1850), 518.

19 *DBR*, XXVI (May 1859), 600.

20 Joseph G. Tregle, Jr., "Early New Orleans Society: A Reappraisal," *JSH*, XVIII (Feb. 1952), 34; Russel, *Economic Aspects*, p. 211.

21 Ulrich B. Phillips, "Slave Labor in the Charleston District," *PSQ*, XXII (Sept. 1907), 427, 429.

22 Smiley, *Lion of White Hall*, p. 261, n. 1.

23 Tarrant (ed.), *Daniel Pratt*, p. 26.

24 *DBR*, VIII (Jan. 1850), 27.

25 Walter E. Fleming, "Industrial Development in Alabama during the Civil War," *SAQ*, III (July 1904), 271.

26 Hutchins, *American Maritime Industries*, pp. 190–91.

27 Bonner, *AHR*, XLIX (July 1944), 670; T. P. Abernethy, *From Frontier to Plantation in Tennessee* (Durham, N.C., 1932), p. 286.

28 *DBR*, XXIV (May 1858), 383.

29 *THR*, II (July 1961), 1.

30 This argument had appeared as early as the *Essays on Domestic Industry* (see esp. pp. 105–13) and was developed in most of his writings thereafter.

31 *DBR*, IX (Jan. 1852), 249; *cf*. Richard W. Griffin, "Poor White Laborers in Southern Cotton Factories, 1789–1865," *SCHGM*, LXI (Jan. 1860), 32 ff.

32 *DBR*, VIII (June 1850), 519–20.

33 *DBR*, VIII (Jan. 1850), 25–26; also XXVI (April 1859), 477–78.

34 *Sociology for the South* (Richmond, Va., 1854), pp. 144–45.

35 *Ibid*., p. 147.

36 *Ibid*., p. 148.

37 Wallace, *THR*, I (Jan. 1960), 21.

38 Lander, *JNH*, XXXVIII (April 1953), 169.

39 Thomas P. Martin (ed.), *JSH*, XI (Aug. 1945), 414: letter dated April 28, 1849.

40 J. D. B. De Bow, *The Interest in Slavery of the Southern Non-Slaveholder* (Charleston, S.C., 1860), p. 8.

41 *SQR*, XXVI, 435.

42 *Address to the Virginia State Agricultural Society*, pp. 16–17.

43 *SCHGM*, LXI (Jan. 1960), 38.

44 C. T. James, *Practical Hints on the Comparative Costs and Productiveness of the Culture of Cotton . . .* (Providence, 1849), *passim;* and *Letters on the Culture and Manufacture of Cotton* (New York, 1850), p. 5.

45 Quoted in Ruth Ketring Nuermberger, *The Clays of Alabama* (Lexington, Ky., 1958), p. 201.

46 Benjamin Joseph Klebaner, "Public Poor Relief in Charleston, 1800–1860," *SCHGM*, LV (Oct. 1954), 218.

47 *Cf*. Herbert Weaver, "Foreigners in Ante-Bellum Towns of the Lower South," *JSH*, XIII (Feb. 1947), 62–73.

48 The foreign-born population of Natchez in 1860 was 25% of the total; Mobile, 24%; Louisville, 34%; Memphis, 36%; Charleston, 15.5% (but 36% of the whites). See Eaton, *Growth of Southern Civilization*, pp. 250 f, for a good discussion of the Southern cities in the 1850s.

49 *The Irrepressible Conflict* (New York, 1934), pp. 37–38.

50 John R. Commons, *et al., History of Labour in the United States* (New York, 1918), I, 358–59, 386–87, 478.

51 Richard B. Morris, "Labor Militancy in the Old South," *Labor and Nation*, IV (May–June 1948), 33; *cf*. Wyatt, *William and Mary College Quarterly*, XVII (Jan. 1937), 20.

52 Philip S. Foner, *History of the Labor Movement in the United States from Colonial Times to the Founding of the American Federation of Labor* (New York, 1947), p. 249.

53 Herbert Aptheker, *The Labor Movement in the South during Slavery* (New York, 1955), pp. 12–14; *cf*. Eaton, *Growth of Southern Civilization*, pp. 165–66.

54 "White Bondage in Ante-Bellum South Carolina," *SCHGM*, XLIX (Oct. 1948), 194–95; and *MHVR*, XLI (Sept. 1954), 219–40.

55 *Cf*. Eaton, *Growth of Southern Civilization*, pp. 167–68; Fletcher M. Green, *Constitutional Development in the South Atlantic States, 1776–1860* (Chapel Hill, N.C., 1930), pp. 159–61.

56 Cole, *Irrepressible Conflict*, p. 55.

57 Bernard Mandel, *Labor: Free and Slave* (New York, 1955), Chap. II, esp. pp. 54–55; Foner, *Labor Movement*, pp. 262–63.

58 Russel, *Economic Aspects*, pp. 52–53; and "Economic History of Negro Slavery in the United States," *Agr. Hist*., XI (Oct. 1937), 321.