

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by John Franklin Kvach entitled “The First New South: J. D. B. De Bow’s Promotion of a Modern Economy in the Old South.” I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in History.

Robert J. Norrell, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Stephen V. Ash

Daniel Feller

Bethany Dumas

Accepted for the Council:

Carolyn R. Hodges,
Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records)

The First New South:
J. D. B. De Bow's Promotion of a Modern Economy in the Old South

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Philosophy
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

John Franklin Kvach
August 2008

Acknowledgments

At age eight I told my grandfather that I would someday become a history professor. With support and patience from my advisor, Robert J. Norrell, and mentoring from Stephen V. Ash, I fulfilled that promise. Their graduate seminars sparked my interest in the nineteenth-century American South and helped guide me to my dissertation topic. I hope that I have embodied many of their personal and professional traits and will someday influence my students as much as they have influenced me. I would also like to express my gratitude to the other members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Daniel Feller and Dr. Bethany Dumas. Their constructive comments were helpful and insightful.

I have made many friends at the University of Tennessee. Their willingness to read drafts of my dissertation, commiserate about graduate school, play golf, and just enjoy life made it much easier for me to finish my work. In particular, I would like to thank Aaron Crawford, Fashion Bowers, Travis Hardy, and Will Bolt. I hope that I can repay the kindness and support that they have shown me. I would also like to thank Larry Madaras for his support.

Finally, I would like to thank my family. I have been lucky enough to have great parents, Jim and Kathy, who have supported me along the way. My father reminded me that getting a Ph.D. is a marathon not a sprint, and I have often used his words to motivate myself for the past five years. There has never been a day in my life that I did not know that I was loved. That is the ultimate gift a parent can give a child. I have also been blessed with in-laws who have loved and supported me as if I was their own child—thank you, Gib and Kate. My vocabulary is not developed enough to find words to thank my wife, Ann, and our two children, Ben and Tom. They have changed my life and made me a better person. Ann's support has been essential to everything that I have accomplished since the day that I sat next to her on an airplane and realized that my future was with her.

The debt that I owe to my family cannot be repaid in an acknowledgment. Instead, I hope to use what I have learned to become the best father, husband, son, and person that I can be.

Abstract

Between 1846 and 1867, J. D. B. De Bow, the editor of *De Bow's Review*, promoted agricultural reform, urbanization, industrialization, and commercial development in the nineteenth-century South. His monthly journal appealed to thousands of antebellum southerners with similar interests in a modern market economy. De Bow's vision and his readers' support of economic diversification predated the rhetoric of postbellum boosters who promised a New South after the Civil War. He created an economic plan that resonated among urban, middle-class merchants and professionals; wealthy planters; and prominent industrialists. They supported De Bow because he understood the necessity of economic diversification. Yet, despite these modern capitalistic leanings, a majority of *Review* subscribers were unapologetic slaveholders and ardent supporters of the social and economic trappings provided by slavery and cotton. These Old South innovators, like their New South counterparts, shared a similar message of hope for the future. De Bow created a similar sense of forward economic momentum that appealed to profit-minded readers with capitalistic and entrepreneurial tendencies. For the first time in southern history, he successfully consolidated modern economic goals into a cohesive plan. His reverence for past traditions helped legitimize his feelings about the future transformation of the South. Progress and modernity were to be embraced, and De Bow campaigned for regional support for his plan. He had anticipated the future, and by 1860 the economic transformation of the South had begun. Although slavery and sectionalism overwhelmed the original intent of the *Review*, De Bow recovered his editorial balance after the Civil War and rededicated himself to regional economic improvement. He asked readers to forget about past mistakes and help reintegrate the South back into the national economy. His comprehensive postwar plan for recovery came from years of prewar experimentation. Although De Bow died before the next generation of boosters began their public campaign for a New South, he had made the first and most significant contribution to their vision. He foresaw the need for a well-rounded, diversified economy. De Bow's anticipation of a modern economy helped create hope for a New South long before the demise of the Old South.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER TWO: THE EDUCATION OF J. D. B. DE BOW, 1820-1845..... 11

CHAPTER THREE: ENTERING A NEW SOUTH, 1845-1849..... 36

CHAPTER FOUR: “IT IS IN THE POWER OF EVERY FRIEND OF THE REVIEW,”:
A COLLECTIVE BIOGRAPHY OF DE BOW’S READERS, 1846-1860..... 62

CHAPTER FIVE: THE CONVULSIONS OF A NATIONALIST, 1848-1854 87

CHAPTER SIX: THE RADICALIZATION OF DE BOW, 1855-1860..... 111

CHAPTER SEVEN: THE REFORMULATION OF DE BOW’S SOUTH, 1861-1867 135

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 162

APPENDICES 176

VITA..... 226

List of Tables

Table 1: De Bow's Review Readership	177
Table 2: 1845 Memphis Commercial Convention: Delegates by State and Occupation	217
Table 3: Distribution of Known Subscribers, By State and Occupation	218
Table 4: Subject of Articles in <i>De Bow's Review</i> , 1846-1866.....	219
Table 5: Comparative Slaveholding Levels, 1860.....	220
Table 6: Investment Patterns of Known Readers in Select Cities and Towns, 1840-1860	221
Table 7: Population Growth in Southern Cities and Towns, 1850-1860.....	222
Table 8: Distribution of <i>Review</i> Readers in Urban Centers.....	223
Table 9: Value of Manufactured Goods in the Southern States, 1850-1860	224
Table 10: Investment Patterns of Individual Subscribers in Alabama and Tennessee, 1830-1860	225

Chapter One: Introduction

James Dunwoody Brownson (J. D. B.) De Bow lived a paradoxical life. Born into a middle-class merchant family in Charleston, South Carolina, he became the chief spokesman for wealthy southern planters, industrialists, and entrepreneurs. Despite living in a rural, agricultural region, he promoted urban development and commercialization as essential to southern society. His reputation as a passionate southern fire-eater belied his earlier affinity for the Union. De Bow supported secession and the creation of a southern nation but quickly rejected both after the Confederacy's defeat and promoted national reconciliation. The culmination of these personal paradoxes has muddled De Bow's place in southern history. One historian referred to him as the "magazinish of the Old South" while another labeled De Bow the first apostle of the New South creed. Although both descriptions are partially accurate, neither places him into the proper context. Between 1846 and 1867 De Bow systematically and cooperatively promoted regional economic development by encouraging agricultural reform, urbanization, industrialization, and commercial growth. *De Bow's Review* appealed to thousands of antebellum southerners with similar interests in a modern market economy. De Bow's vision and his readers' support of economic diversification predated the rhetoric of postbellum boosters who promised a New South in the late nineteenth century. De Bow had anticipated the future, and by 1860 the economic transformation of the South had begun.¹

De Bow's background and early interest in the South's economic development shaped his editorial style. His father had been a successful merchant in Charleston before

¹ Ottis C. Skipper, *J. D. B. De Bow: Magazinish of the Old South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1958), 224; Paul Gaston, *The New South Creed: A Study in Southern Mythmaking* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1970), 42—47.

the Panic of 1819 ruined the family business. The deaths of De Bow's father and mother created unexpected hardship that forced him to work as a grocery clerk and teacher. These early experiences instilled a strong work ethic in De Bow and made him less fearful of personal failure. A strong interest in education offered him an escape from these unsatisfying positions. De Bow raised enough money to attend the College of Charleston and graduated valedictorian of his class. While looking for a vocation, he explored South Carolina's economic institutions on behalf of a local newspaper and became interested in the commercial and industrial development of the state. In late 1845 he accepted a position as a state delegate to the Memphis Commercial Convention. The convention offered him a chance to explore the Southwest, meet John C. Calhoun, and mingle with hundreds of other like-minded southern delegates interested in regional economic development. These experiences reinforced De Bow's desire to start a monthly journal dedicated to southern economic issues. They also created a lifelong interest in the South's commercial convention movement. De Bow would eventually attend more conventions than any other single delegate. In November 1845 he relocated to New Orleans to be closer to the commercial development of the Southwest and to appeal to a wider audience in an expanding South. Although De Bow's name became synonymous with the commercial vibrancy of New Orleans, his past experiences and failures in Charleston had a significant influence on how he viewed the South.

De Bow published the first issue of the *Review* in January 1846, and after some early struggles and a temporary closure in 1849, established it as the preeminent southern journal dedicated to economic development and diversification. De Bow created, borrowed, and accepted contributions from writers interested in the integration of the

South's agricultural, industrial, and commercial sectors. He reasoned that efficient railroads could link plantations to towns and cities to create fluid commercial networks in the region. De Bow began his editorial career as a staunch American nationalist. He hoped to boost the American economy by increasing the South's productivity. Yet he worried that complacent southerners had become too dependent on northern manufacturers and merchants. De Bow believed that the South's loss of economic independence lessened the region's political standing at the national level. The *Review* encouraged southerners to develop their natural resources and regain control of the South's economic future. Interested in providing editorial leadership, De Bow focused on practical solutions that would appeal to readers interested in economic modernization. The *Review* became their forum for new ideas.

Agricultural reform became an important component in De Bow's plan to modernize the South's economy. He understood the importance of cotton but hoped to reduce the region's dependence on a single crop. Notable contributors wrote articles that urged planters to diversify their crop selection and use scientific methods to improve harvest yields. De Bow hoped that productive plantations would infuse the commercial sector with needed capital. Although yeoman farmers might have benefited from these articles, De Bow rarely reached out to them. As the sectional crisis between the North and South intensified, however, he recognized that the planter class needed the political support of small farmers. In 1860 De Bow urged poor whites to support secession and slavery as a way of ensuring their upward mobility and financial security. After the war he amended his agricultural plan to appeal to all farmers.

The importance of internal improvement projects, especially railroad development, became a regular topic in the *Review*. Although De Bow acknowledged the significance of river, canal, and road projects, he focused primarily on railroad construction as the most efficient form of transportation. He saw economic as well as social benefits in railroads and encouraged southerners to invest in a regional transportation system. De Bow believed that railroads created a sense of community. He viewed them as an essential connection between the agricultural and commercial sectors. Planters and merchants needed inexpensive transportation routes to ship crops to urban centers and international port cities. De Bow hoped that railroads would foster additional industrial and urban development. These innovations, he promised, would boost the South's economic profile in national and international markets.

De Bow's natural interest in commerce made him popular among the South's growing business community. Urban, middle-class merchants and professionals constituted a majority of his known readers. They understood the importance of cotton to the South's economy but helped encourage investment in other economic sectors. Many of De Bow's readers lived in cities and towns and promoted their individual communities by investing in private and public projects. De Bow urged merchants and professionals to redirect profits into new businesses, factories, and civic institutions. Their efforts helped revitalize old urban areas and create new ones. In many cases, small crossroad communities became busy commercial towns connected by a growing system of roads, navigable rivers, and railroads. Although the majority of these urban centers owed their existence to staple crop production, an influential group of profit-minded, capitalistic business leaders emerged amid the cotton booms. Many of De Bow's readers worked to

create commercial linkages that would produce personal profit and expand the profile of their community. These town boosters also understood the importance of social and cultural development and spent time building colleges, theaters, and libraries. De Bow had encouraged this type of diversified growth as essential to the South's continual evolution into a more modern society.

De Bow saw industrialization as essential to the South's economic development. He pleaded with readers to invest in factories, mills, and mines. Worried about southern dependence on northern manufacturers, De Bow attempted to create excitement about cotton factories. He hoped to encourage rural southerners to invest in factories that kept manufacturing profits in the South. De Bow envisioned modern factories next to efficient cotton plantations. He assured readers that this combination would boost interest in subsidiary industries such as iron foundries, machine shops, cotton gin factories, and railroads. Instead of sending potential profits to the North or Europe, De Bow argued, southerners could create a self-sustaining manufacturing sector that produced revenue and met the material needs of the South. The *Review* promoted the creation of a domestic market that could support southern manufacturing and export goods to national and international markets.

De Bow's interest in southern economic diversification attracted thousands of southern readers with similar ideas about regional development. They agreed with his approach and supported the *Review*. De Bow became popular with readers in southern towns and cities and on large plantations. Often wealthy and influential, these readers had the inclination and capital to produce change in their communities. The *Review* reflected their interests and became a natural literary extension of the South's economic

development. Early in his career, De Bow identified a growing entrepreneurial spirit in the South and hoped to create a loyal readership around it. Southern readers responded with articles and subscription payments that allowed the *Review* to become the most successful monthly journal in the antebellum South. De Bow believed that his readers could engender a sense of regional betterment that would incorporate the profitability of cotton with the productivity of factories, railroads, and merchant houses. Despite the *Review's* popularity and sizeable readership, De Bow struggled to maintain enough paying subscribers to make the magazine personally profitable. Many readers failed to pay their subscriptions on time. Ironically, De Bow, an accomplished statistician and superintendent of the 1850 federal census, proved incapable of keeping accurate business records. He often lost money and time by sending the *Review* to readers who had discontinued their subscriptions. Despite these hindrances, however, De Bow succeeded where hundreds of other southern editors had failed.

The national debate over slavery and the rise of abolitionism changed De Bow's feelings about the Union. He had exhibited little interest in slavery early in his editorial career and believed in the natural inferiority of blacks. The editorial tone of the *Review* changed, however, when abolitionists opposed the expansion of slavery into western territories. As a virulent national expansionist, De Bow saw these attacks as a threat to southern property and constitutional rights. He worried that southern slaveholders would become economically isolated in their own country. Competition over the route of a new transcontinental railroad added urgency to De Bow's plea for economic development. He became more defensive and less forgiving of northern society and worried that abolitionists had infiltrated the federal government. The Kansas-Nebraska Act and

subsequent violence in Kansas provoked him to support secession. De Bow's reputation as a moderate economic nationalist disappeared, and he assumed a new, more active role in the southern nationalist movement. By the late 1850s he had become one of the South's most notable secessionists. De Bow used the *Review* to catalogue northern slights, both real and perceived, and to promote a more virulent defense of slavery. The *Review* also became a public forum for angry southerners who resented northern attacks on southern institutions. De Bow led a public campaign for southern independence and assured his readers that the region's economy would only benefit from secession.

The Civil War exposed significant weaknesses in the southern economy and in De Bow's economic plan. He had assured readers that productive plantations, modern railroads, large cities, and broad commercial networks would produce economic independence from the North. By 1860 the South had grown appreciably and ranked as one of the most industrialized regions in the world. Yet southern factories had failed to diversify production to meet the needs of regional consumers. These consumers continued to use northern merchants and buy northern goods. This strained the South's commercial sector and limited the size of its domestic market. The continued over-reliance on long-term credit and debt-spending hindered the investment potential of wealthy planters. These limitations later hampered the Confederacy's war effort and led to internal weaknesses and contributed to the South's military defeat. The surrender of Confederate forces in April 1865 signified the failure of secession and slavery. These changes forced De Bow to reevaluate his plan for southern economic development. Confident that the foundation for recovery lay within the pages of the *Review*, De Bow recast old ideas to solve new problems.

Undaunted by wartime destruction and military defeat, De Bow urged postwar southerners to rebuild the South using his prewar vision of economic diversification. He repudiated his secessionist past and hoped for a quick reconciliation between the North and South. He encouraged southerners to invest in a diversified industrial sector, embrace free labor, and devote energy to new crops and urban renewal. Although De Bow accepted the military defeat of the South, he carefully avoided criticism of the Confederate government or the devotion and sacrifice of southern soldiers. Fallen soldiers were to be memorialized as martyrs, and survivors were expected to exhibit the same zeal for economic recovery as they had shown on the battlefield. De Bow hoped to balance the traditions of the past with the necessities of the future. He asked northern business leaders to invest in southern factories and railroads. The *Review* offered basic articles to readers interested in starting a business or buying farm land. De Bow became less concerned about political issues and refocused on providing practical solutions to southerners interested in economic recovery.

Although De Bow's death in 1867 limited his postwar influence, his legacy became part of a later nineteenth-century New South movement that hoped to transform and diversify the region's economy. New promoters such as Henry Grady, Henry Watterson, Joel Chandler Harris, Richard Edmonds, and Daniel H. Hill espoused the same ideas that De Bow had preached before the war. Their vision of a modern postbellum South drew upon many of the ideas that had been published in the *Review*. They saw agricultural reform, urbanization, industrialization, and commercial development as essential to the South's economic salvation from decades of underdevelopment. Postbellum boosters tempted both northerners and southerners with

promises of economic development, social harmony, and national reconciliation. The continuity of their message was easy to trace—an economically diversified South would become a profitable South which in turn would lead to a politically independent South. Although they promoted this vision as a new regional philosophy, it had been De Bow's creed since 1846.

De Bow transcended labels created by New South mythmakers with specific agendas. In order for there to be a New South, postbellum boosters needed to construct a mythic Old South of genteel planters, loyal slaves, and drowsy cotton plantations. These images allowed them to create a sense of change and progress in the postwar South. De Bow challenged their conception of the past because he had anticipated the future. He created a similar sense of forward economic momentum that appealed to profit-minded readers with capitalistic and entrepreneurial tendencies. For the first time in southern history, he successfully consolidated modern economic goals into a cohesive plan. His reverence for past traditions helped legitimize his feelings about the future transformation of the South. Progress and modernity were to be embraced, and De Bow campaigned for regional support for his plan.

J. D. B. De Bow spent much of his editorial career trying to convince readers to change the South's economy. He used the *Review* to implore them to embrace agricultural reform, urban development, industrialization, and commercial growth or risk being isolated by northern progress. He created an economic plan that resonated among urban, middle-class merchants and professionals; wealthy planters; and prominent industrialists. They supported De Bow because he understood the necessity of economic development and diversification in a modern market economy. Although slavery and

sectionalism overwhelmed the original intent of the *Review*, De Bow recovered his editorial balance after the Civil War and rededicated himself to regional economic improvement. He asked readers to forget about past mistakes and help reintegrate the South back into the national economy. His comprehensive postwar plan for recovery came from years of prewar experimentation. Although De Bow died before the next generation of boosters began their public campaign for a New South, he had made the first and most significant contribution to their vision. He foresaw the need for a well-rounded, diversified economy. De Bow's anticipation of factories, railroads, and cities helped create hope for a New South long before the demise of the Old South.

Chapter Two: The Education of J. D. B. De Bow, 1820-1845

Few observers could have predicted the sudden collapse of Charleston's economy in 1819. The end of the War of 1812 had brought economic prosperity to much of the nation. South Carolina planters flooded Charleston's docks with rice, cotton, and indigo for export to Europe. Profit-minded merchants helped transform the port city into the commercial emporium of the South Atlantic seaboard. Garret De Bow's State Street grocery store prospered, solidifying his place in Charleston's mercantile community. By 1818, however, unchecked financial speculation and the sudden collapse of European money markets initiated a global economic panic that devastated the American economy. Banks called in loans to remain solvent, escalating the crisis. The lack of hard currency or state-issued specie made it difficult for Americans to pay their debts. The panic hit American cities especially hard by cutting the income levels of lower- and middle-class workers. This downturn in consumer spending threatened merchants like De Bow who relied on neighborhood customers. De Bow, like thousands of other business owners, struggled to remain solvent.²

Prior to 1819 Charleston had been an incubator for urban and commercial growth. The city had installed a sophisticated sewer and drainage system, laid brick sidewalks, and installed gas streetlights before the American Revolution. Urban planners hoped these aesthetic and practical improvements might attract new residents and businesses to Charleston. Cotton and rice-laden ships left the city for Europe and returned carrying

² Murray N. Rothbard, *The Panic of 1819: Reactions and Policies* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1962), 2—15; Lacy K. Ford, Jr., *Origins of Southern Radicalism: The South Carolina Upcountry, 1800—1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 14—15; Charles Sellers, *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815—1846* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991), 104, 135—39.

European manufactured merchandise. Ambitious planters, slave traders, and merchants created a profitable international commercial network. Charlestonians opened shipyards, sawmills, grist and rice mills, sugar refining houses, wagon and wheelwright shops, a rope factory, a barrel factory, an iron foundry, and South Carolina's first textile mill. Observers estimated that 1,500 mechanics lived and worked in Charleston. Merchants reinforced their economic and social status by investing in prominent cultural institutions. City boosters proudly pointed to the Charleston Library Society and College of Charleston as evidence of the city's emerging international status. It was in this atmosphere that Garret and Mary Bridget De Bow moved to Charleston and opened a grocery store. By 1819 the De Bows lived in a modest home, owned a business and three slaves, and benefited from Charleston's growing economic status.³

The Panic of 1819 crippled Charleston's economy. Between 1818 and 1822, cotton prices dropped 48 percent and rice fell 54 percent. Panic stricken planters flooded the market with cotton in hopes of increasing profits. Instead, they drove South Carolina's economy further downward. Economic hardship loosened social bonds as low

³ Peter Coclanis, "The Sociology of Architecture in Colonial Charleston: Pattern and Process in an Eighteenth-Century Southern City," *Journal of Social History* 18 (Summer 1985): 610—11; Ernest M. Lander, Jr., "Charleston: Manufacturing Center of the Old South," *The Journal of Southern History* 26 (August 1960): 330—32, 337—48; Richard W. Griffin, "An Origin of the New South: The South Carolina Homespun Company, 1808—1815," *The Business History Review* 35 (Autumn 1961): 404—08; George Rogers, *Charleston in the Age of the Pinckneys* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969), 3; Robert Mills, *Statistics of South Carolina: A View of the Natural, Civil, and Military History, General and Particular* (Charleston: Hurlbut and Lloyd, 1826), 427—28; United States Census Office, *Fourth Census of the United States, 1820* (Washington, D.C., 1850). David Moltke-Hansen, "The Expansion of Intellectual Life: A Prospectus," in *Intellectual Life in Antebellum Charleston*, ed. Michael O'Brien and David Moltke-Hansen (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1986), 4—5, 26—28; Maurie D. McInnis, *The Politics of Taste in Antebellum Charleston* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005), 10—13. McInnis focuses on how the built environment and material culture of antebellum Charleston shaped the city's cultural and political past. Her conclusions are similar to those of Richard Bushman's notion of gentility in antebellum America. Bushman, however, sees more democratic forces at work that eventually blur the social lines between elite society and a growing middle class. See Richard Bushman, *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993).

country planters and upcountry farmers left the state at an alarming rate; between 1819 and 1830 more than 69,000 residents and slaves moved away from South Carolina. Charleston merchants watched as export revenues dropped from \$11 million in 1816 to just under \$7.5 million in 1826. Import revenues decreased from \$1.4 million in 1815 to \$511,852 in 1821. Planters grew more rice and cotton to compensate for these losses but instead flooded the market and further lowered prices. Many merchants continued to purchase the same volume of imported merchandise without adjusting to the decrease in consumer spending. These mistakes extended the depression in the city.⁴

Charleston became increasingly engaged in the growing sectional difficulties of the nation. Congressional debates over admitting Missouri into the Union in 1819 had unleashed sectional anxieties throughout the South. Charles Pinckney, a native Charlestonian and signer of the United States Constitution, became a vocal opponent of the Missouri Compromise. Pinckney's role in the congressional debates magnified the growing hostilities between the North and South as he defended slavery on moral and constitutional grounds. His unmatched intensity set a clear precedent for future sectional disputes over slavery, southern nationalism, and secession.⁵

⁴ John David Miller, *South By Southwest: Planters Emigration and Identity in the Slave South* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2002), 30—31, 147; Fletcher Green, *Constitutional Development in the South Atlantic States, 1776—1860* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1930), 147—49; Alfred G. Smith, Jr., *Economic Readjustment of an Old Cotton State: South Carolina, 1820—1860*, (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1958), 13—14.

⁵ Clement Eaton, *A History of the Old South* (New York: Macmillan, 1949), 4—5; Charles S. Sydnor, *The Development of Southern Sectionalism, 1819—1848* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1948), 32; Glover Moore, *The Missouri Controversy, 1819—1821* (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1953), 13—19, 342. William W. Freehling, *Prelude to Civil War: The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina, 1816—1836* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1968), 108—10; Mark D. Kaplanoff, "Charles Pinckney and the American Republican Tradition," in *Intellectual Life in Antebellum Charleston*, 85—90, 99—102; Rogers, *Charleston in the Age of the Pinckneys*, 141, 162—65; J.D.B. De Bow, "Founders of the American Union, Charles Pinckney," *De Bow's Review* 34 (April 1866): 372—78; William R. Taylor, *Cavalier & Yankee: The Old South and American National Character* (New York, George Braziller, Inc., 1957), 37—38.

While much of the nation focused on the continuing effects of the Panic of 1819 and the congressional debates over Missouri, Garret and Mary Bridget De Bow had more immediate concerns in the summer of 1820. The young couple had just given birth to their second son, and financial woes hobbled the family business. Garret, a New York-born descendant of Dutch Huguenots, and Mary, the granddaughter of a prominent planter, struggled to maintain their small grocery store in downtown Charleston. The birth of their son, James Dunwoody Brownson De Bow, on July 10, 1820, stretched an already tight family budget. In the aftermath of the Panic of 1819, Garret struggled to keep his store open as Charleston's import and export markets slowed. In the early 1820s he declared bankruptcy and lost his grocery store. Financially ruined and physically ill, Garret De Bow died in 1826, leaving his sons to support the family.⁶

In July 1822 the exposure of Denmark Vesey's planned slave revolt created hysteria among white Charlestonians. The possibility of more large-scale slave revolts fueled white concerns in a city with the largest urban black population in the nation. The potential for bloodshed led to new slave codes that restricted the movement of blacks in the city. The subsequent arrival of abolitionist material at the city post office solidified white suspicions of racial unrest. White Charlestonians' fears caused them to shut the city off from outside influences. The once cosmopolitan city became insular and defensive to the outside world. As he grew up in this highly charged racial environment, J. D. B. De Bow acquired distinctive attitudes about slavery.⁷

⁶ Skipper, *J.D.B. De Bow: Magazinist of the Old South*, 2—3; *Greenville Republican*, August 19, 1826.

⁷ David Robertson, *Denmark Vesey* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1999), 6—9, 35; John Lofton, *Denmark Vesey's Revolt: The Slave Plot that Lit a Fuse to Fort Sumter* (Kent, Ohio: The Kent State University Press, 1964), 211. Although Lofton takes an overly neo-abolitionist approach to understanding

Slavery had been a part of De Bow's early life. His family had owned three slaves before succumbing to financial pressures after the Panic of 1819, and he remembered visiting slave-owning relatives on South Carolina's Sea Islands. Surrounded by slaves and free blacks in racially diverse Charleston, De Bow, like many antebellum southerners, believed that God had ordained slavery and that historical precedent in the ancient world had legitimized European superiority over servile Africans. The Enlightenment further separated the races, according to De Bow, and made slavery "a blessing [for] the African because it is the only condition in which his moral and physical nature can be developed." He believed that Africans had been cursed by slavery because they had ignored "the cultivation and improvement of the mind [as] the noblest gift which man has received from the hands of his Creator." De Bow expressed no inner turmoil or guilt about slavery. He recognized the economic and social importance of the institution to the South.⁸

Difficult economic times continued to plague the city, and many Charlestonians blamed inequitable federal tariffs for their problems. Many southerners felt that federal tariff laws unfairly protected the North's industrial sector and punished the South's

Vesey's motives and white Charleston's response, he does convincingly argue that the fear of slave revolt and loss of racial control pulled South Carolina further away from the national agenda. Rogers, *Charleston in the Age of the Pinckneys*, 3—12, 159, 162. Rogers argues that by the Nullification Crisis, Charleston's economic and political status had shrunk to the point that "the crucial battle in 1832 and 1833 in Charleston was not so much tariff or no tariff, or slavery or no slavery, as it was whether or not the city should be of the world."

⁸ 1820 Federal Census, United States Census Bureau; J.D.B. De Bow, "Progress of the South and West," *De Bow's Review* 11 (September 1850): 307; Richard C. Wade, *Slavery in the Cities: The South, 1820—1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 20, 91; Robert S. Starobin, *Industrial Slavery in the Old South* (Oxford University Press, 1970), 9—11; Leonard P. Curry, *The Free Black in Urban America, 1800—1850*. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981); J.D.B. De Bow, "Random Thoughts on Slavery," De Bow Papers, Box 1, Perkins Library, Duke University; J.D.B. De Bow, "Address Delivered Before The Clisophic Society—On Education," De Bow Papers, Box 1, Perkins Library, Duke University; Ulrich B. Phillips, *Life and Labor in the Old South* (New York: Little, Brown and Company, 1929); Ralph E. Morrow, "The Proslavery Argument Revisited," *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 47 (June 1961): 79—94.

agricultural community. Aware of the growing dissatisfaction among southerners, John C. Calhoun, South Carolina's preeminent politician, became interested in the right of nullification as a way for individual states to reject unjust federal laws. His threat of disunion over the Tariffs of 1828 and 1832, and Andrew Jackson's swift presidential response to keep South Carolina in the Union, captured the nation's attention. The tariff debates and subsequent Nullification crisis changed Calhoun's feelings about economic nationalism and made him a staunch supporter of states' rights. In South Carolina, strong anti-tariff feelings fused with sectional tendencies to create a southern nationalist movement in the early 1830s. Although De Bow was a young boy during the crisis, his interest in southern nationalism later became intertwined with those who pushed hardest for disunion.⁹

The development of new commercial rivalries hindered Charleston's economic recovery from the Panic of 1819. The advent of the steamboat and construction of new roads and canals shifted existing trade routes away from the city. Merchants in Camden, Columbia, and Hamburg, South Carolina, and Augusta and Savannah, Georgia, challenged Charleston's commercial primacy along the South Atlantic seaboard. The commercial success of Savannah concerned Charlestonians who worried about losing upcountry trade to Georgian merchants. Their concerns were real, and the growing rivalry threatened the economic future of Charleston. De Bow later recalled seeing patches of grass on Charleston's previously busy commercial streets, a memory that shaped his later

⁹ Freehling, *Prelude to Civil War*, 363; J.D.B. De Bow "The Progress of American Commerce," *De Bow's Review* 2 (1846): 412—17; Samuel M. Derrick, *Centennial History of South Carolina Railroad* (Columbia: The State Company, 1930), 1—6; John McCardell, *The Idea of a Southern Nation: Southern Nationalists and Southern Nationalism, 1830—1860* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1979), 4—5, 38—40; J.D.B. De Bow, "States' Rights and Sovereignty," *De Bow's Review* 25 (August 1858): 127.

views on commercial progress and civic boosterism. Some of his hometown pride and latent bitterness toward rival Savannah later manifested itself in his writings. As an adult De Bow acknowledged the heated rivalry that had developed between the two cities during his childhood. He suggested that it stemmed from competition over trade with northern Alabama, western Georgia, and eastern Tennessee. He challenged Savannah's merchants to work with Charleston to become common allies against rival northern ports and concluded that "if Savannah has anything to say to it—let her speak." De Bow's bravado incurred the collective wrath of Savannah's mercantile community.¹⁰

As an adult, De Bow fondly recalled his childhood, despite the loss of his father and the turmoil that surrounded him. He remembered his youth in overly romantic tones—teasing neighborhood girls, stealing grapes from neighbors, engaging in "fisty wars" with local boys, and enjoying "old Christmas" with his family. He recalled taking steamboat rides to visit family and friends in Beaufort and Bay Point, South Carolina, and reminisced about his "beautiful past—the youth of hope and joy . . . the light of other days." Years after leaving the city, De Bow still yearned to "stand again by the banks of the Ashley and the Cooper [Rivers], or hear the waves beating up against the beach of old Sullivan's." For him these images held "everything of life and warmth."¹¹

The reality of De Bow's childhood grimly contradicted his idyllic memories about the past. His father's death forced him to assume many family responsibilities very early.

¹⁰ J.D.B. De Bow, "Progress of Our Commerce and Commercial Cities," *De Bow's Review* 4 (December 1847): 552—60; J.D.B. De Bow, "Charleston and Savannah," *De Bow's Review* 8 (March 1850): 243—45; Tom Downey, *Planting a Capitalist South: Masters, Merchants, and Manufacturers in the Southern Interior, 1790—1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006), 64—73. Downey notes that competition over upcountry trade heightened interstate commercial disputes between South Carolina and Georgia. He argues that Georgia, not the North, had been Charleston's main commercial nemesis from the colonial period to the Civil War.

¹¹ J.D.B. De Bow, "The Light of Other Days," *De Bow's Review* 6 (1848): 236—40; J.D.B. De Bow, "Editor's Department," *De Bow's Review* 8 (March 1850): 311—12.

By age ten he had taken a job as a grocery clerk in a downtown shop. Most days consisted of long stretches of inactivity and boredom separated by stocking shelves, helping customers, and taking inventory. He yearned for more in his life and grew despondent and restless for a change. De Bow confided his feelings to a journal and complained of lapsing into lengthy periods of depression brought on by the slightest inconvenience or loss. He attempted to lift his spirits by attending parties and dances, taking horseback rides, and swimming in a nearby mill pond. Life was tolerable for the youth, but somewhat introspectively, De Bow knew that he suffered from “the want of employment for the body and mind.” Although De Bow seemed destined to follow his father’s career path, the young man wanted more.¹²

De Bow found a cure for his low moods at the Apprentices Library Society in downtown Charleston. Unlike the older, more gentlemanly Charleston Library Society, the Apprentices Library aided young middle- and lower- class men who hoped to improve their lives through practical training and education. For De Bow the library became a private refuge from boredom and work. In the summer of 1836, he read Sir Walter Scott’s *Ivanhoe*, Henry Fielding’s *Tom Jones*, Edward B. Lytton’s *Rienzi* and *Last Days of Pompeii*, Barbara Hofland’s *The Maid of Moscow*, William Wirt’s *Life and Character of Patrick Henry*, Charles Rollins’s *Ancient Histories*, and many newspapers and periodicals. De Bow attended public lectures and sermons at nearby churches as an additional outlet for his growing inquisitiveness. He became interested in writing and studied Parker’s *Exercises of Grammar and Composition*. De Bow kept a personal

¹² J.D.B. De Bow, “Fragments of the Past,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (1866): 630—32; Lewis E. Atherton, “Mercantile Education in the Ante-Bellum South,” *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 39 (1953): 623—26; J.D.B. De Bow’s Personal Journal, April 28, 1836—August 1, 1836, Box 1, De Bow Papers, Perkins Library, Duke University.

journal, and these early entries often mirrored his changing moods and growing intellectual curiosity.¹³

In September 1836 tragedy once again befell De Bow after a cholera outbreak claimed the lives of his older brother and mother on consecutive days. The teenager and his siblings scattered across the city to stay with relatives and friends. His mother's death plunged De Bow into depression and a period of uncertainty. He understood that he was in a precarious position without parents, money, or vocational training.¹⁴

De Bow reevaluated his life and set new priorities to improve his immediate situation and prospects for the future. He vowed to keep less company, read more, practice his writing, study the dictionary and grammar books, and be more industrious with his time. His mind swirled with possibilities. De Bow wanted to write a novel but settled on an article for the *Charleston Courier* on the dangers of unfilled wells. He contemplated leaving the city and living on a farm, but his uncle, a hard-working planter well-acquainted with physical labor, dispelled his nephew's romanticized notion of rural solitude. Unsure of what he wanted to pursue as a vocation, De Bow became increasingly interested in exploring his personal options before choosing a career.¹⁵

¹³ Jane H. Pease and William H. Pease, "Intellectual Life in the 1830s: The Institutional Framework and the Charleston Style," in *Intellectual Life in Antebellum Charleston*, ed. Michael O'Brien and David Moltke-Hansen (Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1986), 234—38, 249—50. Charleston's elite founded and supported a variety of intellectual and cultural institutions in the 1820s. Pease and Pease argue, however, that these institutions avoided true intellectual debate, and instead maintained a non-confrontational "rounded edges" approach that became known as the "Charleston Style." This style mirrored the growing political and social homogenization of South Carolina after the Nullification Crisis. J.D.B. De Bow, "Personal Journal," Box 1, De Bow Papers, Perkins Library, Duke University.

¹⁴ Skipper, *J.D.B. De Bow: Magazinish of the Old South*, 2—3; De Bow, "Personal Journal," Box 1, De Bow Papers, Perkins Library, Duke University.

¹⁵ Walter Fraser, *Charleston, Charleston: The History of a Southern City* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989), 189.

De Bow quit his job at the grocery store and visited relatives on St. Helena Island in the low country. During his two-day journey there, he noted the grandeur of plantations and the large gangs of slaves who worked on them. He arrived at Robert Norton's plantation and found himself surrounded by happy relatives, good food, and as he later remembered, a young slave who repeatedly yelled "Marse James come, Marse James come." Norton, the brother of De Bow's mother, had agreed to let his nephew stay with him for an extended visit. Fatigued from his trip, De Bow retired early with a proslavery treatise from his uncle's library. His interest in slavery had been piqued by his recent observations.¹⁶

Robert Norton's plantation offered De Bow a chance to explore rural southern society. He wandered the fields and roads of St. Helena and observed unfamiliar local customs and attitudes, noting that "the planters are very hospitable but retain many of the aristocratic principles of their ancestors—but little society is kept and comparatively few visits are paid." Rural life was foreign to De Bow, and he often retreated to his bedroom to read and reflect on his life. During his visit he read Sir Walter Scott's biography of Napoleon Bonaparte, several Shakespearean plays, and Plutarch. He also spent time thinking about his future. Concerned about his nephew, Robert Norton confronted De Bow and suggested that he return to Charleston and ask for his old job back. De Bow understood his uncle's message and prepared to return to the city after staying a month.¹⁷

¹⁶ J.D.B. De Bow, "Personal Journal," Box 1, De Bow Papers, Perkins Library, Duke University.

¹⁷ J.D.B. De Bow, "Personal Journal," Box 1, De Bow Papers, Perkins Library, Duke University; Michael O'Brien, *Conjectures of Order: Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810—1860*, 2 vols. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 498—525. Records from the Savannah Library Society show that De Bow's reading habits matched those of other southerners in the late 1830s. By tracing which books had been checked out from the library in 1839, O'Brien finds that romance novels, pedagogy, biography, and history were the most popular genres of books. The average reader checked out

But De Bow remained uncertain about returning to Charleston, and instead he stopped in Robertsville, South Carolina, to visit another uncle. John Norton's plantation offered further sanctuary for the young man and a place to think more about the future. De Bow settled back into his old routine of reading, writing, and taking long walks. He read the Bible, a book about the French Revolution, and Robert Hayne's report on the Charleston and Cincinnati Railroad. He consumed local and national newspapers, becoming more interested in current events. He watched as slaves worked the fields and marveled at work crews building a nearby railroad. For a moment many of De Bow's concerns about the future seemed secondary to his leisurely existence.¹⁸

All this changed on April 27, 1838, when a large fire swept through Charleston and destroyed De Bow's personal possessions. He returned to Charleston as 700 acres of the city lay smoldering. Like disease, fire constantly threatened to disrupt or destroy the social and economic functions of the city. In a later article De Bow stressed the importance of supporting local fire companies as a way of safeguarding commercial and social interests in large cities. He returned to Charleston without a home or much money and wandered the city looking for a job.¹⁹

Unable to find a job in the city, De Bow traveled to western South Carolina and accepted a teaching post at a rural school. What he saw in the upcountry shocked him. In his journal he described the people and their mannerisms. De Bow sneered at how his upcountry brethren used "fellow" as an indiscriminate substitute for gentleman, "woman"

six books a year from the subscription library. De Bow preferred history, philosophy, and biography with little early interest in science or fiction.

¹⁸ J.D.B. De Bow, "Personal Journal," Box 1, De Bow Papers, Perkins Library, Duke University.

¹⁹ Fraser, *Charleston, Charleston*, 204; A.B. Meek, "Fires and Fireman," *De Bow's Review* 4 (1847): 199—208. De Bow listed every major fire in Charleston between 1836 and 1846, noting the physical and financial toll of each fire. Included on this list was the 1838 fire that destroyed De Bow's family home. *Newport Mercury*, May 5, 1838; *Southern Patriot* (Charleston), May 5, 1838.

to describe a “handsome young lady,” and “critter” to denote a horse. De Bow noted that in the upcountry being a Charlestonian meant being “looked upon with eyes of envy, particularly should he read well and be acquainted with books.” De Bow suggested that to upcountry residents grammar was “a kind of Hebrew volume, never looked into or studied by teachers or scholars, considered as a pack of contemptible nonsense.” Geography was “unknown—Dead! Dead! Dead!,” and a school master was “a fellow that can drink his whiskey and sometimes take a drunken frolic . . . particularly if he would teach cheap and all the time.” De Bow felt unsatisfied by teaching and returned to Charleston in late 1838. By the end of that year De Bow’s life seemed as aimless as his previous year’s wanderings.²⁰

De Bow turned to his own education as a possible remedy for his declining situation and enrolled at the Cokesbury Manual Labor School in Cokesbury, South Carolina. The village of Cokesbury, like much of the Abbeville District in South Carolina’s upcountry, had benefited from successive cotton booms that produced almost half of the state’s cotton crop by 1830. The Cokesbury School had been founded by the South Carolina Methodist Conference in 1834 and had been part of a larger state initiative to provide educational opportunities for all white citizens. The school provided practical agricultural and domestic training to interested boys and girls. De Bow soon soured on the realities of manual labor and vocational education, however, and yearned for Charleston and his books. Although he dropped out of the school after less than a year, he acquired an appreciation for the importance of practical training for poor white southerners. He later credited his time at Cokesbury as being personally fruitful and saw

²⁰ J.D.B. De Bow, “Unpublished Papers,” Box 5, De Bow Papers, Perkins Library, Duke University.

value in the “worthy men who trained us, then, to paths of usefulness and guided our wayward tracks.” Yet in 1839 Cokesbury became another personal failure in a growing list of setbacks for De Bow.²¹

The city of Charleston offered De Bow personal solace and familiar surroundings after a year of travel. Friends gave their support, and the Apprentices Society Library provided ample distraction for the nineteen-year old. In early 1840 he decided to take classes at the College of Charleston during the fall semester. The College had been chartered by a group of prominent local planters, merchants, and mechanics in 1785. By the 1830s financial problems plagued the school until it closed. In 1836, however, Charleston’s city council provided financial assistance, and as a ward of the city the College became the nation’s first municipal institution of higher learning. The mission of the school changed. Instead of serving the wealthy sons of absentee planters, the College of Charleston became a liberal arts school open to any white male with tuition money. De Bow raised fifty dollars for one year’s tuition and started classes.²²

Several professors at the College of Charleston engaged De Bow’s intellect. William T. Brantley, the College’s president and professor of moral, intellectual, and political philosophy and of economics and history, awed De Bow with his intelligence and wit. Brantley had attended South Carolina College under the tutelage of noted southern rights’ advocate Thomas Cooper and was classmates with William Harper and William Grayson, noted proslavery supporters. Brantley became a father figure to De

²¹ Downey, *Planting a Capitalist South*, 20; Edgar K. Knight, *Public Education in the South* (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1922), 102; J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial Notes and Miscellany,” *De Bow’s Review* 29 (September 1860): 390—93.

²² J.H. Easterby, *A History of the College of Charleston* (New York: The Scribner Press, 1935), 13, 99—100, 138; Skipper, *J.D.B. De Bow: Magazinish of the Old South*, 7—8.

Bow, and years later the student remembered his mentor as “a man of gigantic stature and giant mind.” De Bow also credited the scholarship and kindness of Lewis R. Gibbes and William Hawkesworth as guiding forces in his collegiate career. Both men challenged De Bow to understand the importance of language, mathematics, history, and science. De Bow’s success in college created personal confidence in his intellectual abilities.²³

Other students and faculty noted De Bow’s dedication to school. He became a leader in a class that included William P. Miles, a future mayor of Charleston, and William Henry Trescott, a future diplomat and assistant secretary of state in James Buchanan’s administration. A classmate reminisced about De Bow as a student: “Studying most of the night, he came to college in the morning with that famous black cravat of his tied loosely around his neck, his hair disheveled—his keen black eyes sparkling above that nose—ready for any discussion or intellectual tilt.” Fellow students elected him to serve as the vice-president of the Cliosophic Literary Society. His debating skills became well-known after delivering papers on the advantages of formal education, the necessities of mental asylums, the horrors of dueling, and the benefits of Indian removal for economic purposes. He later started a school magazine at the request of the school’s administration. These endeavors elevated De Bow’s reputation on campus.²⁴

A city well-endowed with newspapers and journals, Charleston offered De Bow a chance to grow as a writer. The *Charleston Courier*, *Charleston Mercury*, and *Southern Patriot* provided daily opportunities, while the *Southern Quarterly Review* offered more

²³ J.D.B. De Bow, “The Bishop Capers and the Methodist Church,” *De Bow’s Review* 26 (February 1859): 176—77.

²⁴ R. G. B., “The Late J. D. B. De Bow,” *De Bow’s Review* 4 (August 1867): 1—2; J.D.B. De Bow, “The South Carolina Colleges,” *De Bow’s Review* 27 (November 1859): 573; J.D.B. De Bow, “College Days,” Box 5, De Bow Papers, Perkins Library, Duke University; Easterby, *A History of the College of Charleston*, 138.

in-depth analysis for established writers. Richard Yeadon, the unionist editor of the *Courier*, a commercial daily, published De Bow's first article entitled "The Duel's Effect." This fictional but philosophical short story warned readers about the long-term effects of dueling on the participants and their families. He also wrote articles about South Carolina's constitution and charter, the political economy of taxation, usefulness of science, and a memorial for Hugh S. Legaré. These early articles satisfied his growing ambition and made him a minor name in Charleston's literary circles.²⁵

The young writer expanded his literary vision and attempted to express himself in more personal articles. In perhaps his most intimate short story for the *Courier*, De Bow wrote about his childhood in "The Three Philosophers." Assuming the fictional name Oscar Everett, De Bow lamented a childhood marked by "the neglect of the world, the loss of parents, the unkindness of friends, and the keenest adversity." Like De Bow, Everett attempted to escape his personal pain by rejecting the rational world and the philosophies of Bacon, Locke, and Newton. Instead, he looked for an emotional solution to his suffering and ultimately found solace in the character of Zeno in Aristotle's *Physics*. Zeno, a minor Greek philosopher and skeptic, dealt with his own tragedies by steeling "his bosom against the cares of life, and so master the emotions and passions of his nature as to be indifferent to pleasure or pain and even to displace them both," according to De Bow. Like Zeno, Everett attempted to internalize his feelings and harden himself against future disappointment and rejection. Torn between his past and future,

²⁵ *Southern Patriot*, March 6, 1843; David Moltke-Hansen "The Expansion of Intellectual Life: A Prospectus," in *Intellectual Life in Charleston*, 30-33. Moltke-Hansen identifies the generation born in the first decades of the nineteenth century as the impetus for Charleston's sustained cultural growth after 1840. J.D.B. De Bow, "The Duel's Effect," *Charleston Courier*, July 3, 1841; J.D.B. De Bow, "Private Journal, April 30, 1836," Box 1, De Bow Papers, Perkins Library, Duke University; Skipper, *J.D.B. De Bow, Magazinish of the Old South*, 9—10.

Everett unsteadily veered between the realities of hard work and hedonistic pleasures. He eventually retreated to a library, his only sanctuary from pain, to ponder his future. Everett concluded that his misery stemmed from his mother's death, and he bitterly denounced her for abandoning him. An unseen voice, however, reminded Everett that "you had a mother and she loved you." Taken aback, Everett broke down and confessed that "in his childhood, [he] idolized his mother, in her sorrows he had comforted her, and when harm like a barbed arrow had entered her heart, he sought to pluck it forth, and ply some balm to the festering wound." He believed that "his existence ended with her." As the story closed, Everett accepted his feelings about his loss but wondered aloud why fate had "exiled [him] from that society which he would have richly adorned."²⁶

De Bow's short story captured his insecurity that arose from the loss of his parents. His father's death forced an otherwise modest middle-class merchant family into financial hardship and, in De Bow's mind, to lose status in a city consumed with social rank. The loss of his mother created an emotional void in De Bow. His sensitive mind searched for answers. He mourned the loss of his parents but also felt bitterness toward them. Garret De Bow would have had the means to provide his son with a proper education, a chance to learn the family business, and assume eventual control of the grocery store itself. De Bow wondered if his personal setbacks might have been avoided if his parents had lived. He had made his own way in life through hard work and experimentation. De Bow's trepidations about his future were as real as his past sense of loss and abandonment.²⁷

²⁶ J.D.B. De Bow, "The Three Philosophers," *Charleston Courier*, October 27—28, 1841.

²⁷ Taylor, *Cavalier and Yankee*, 55—63.

De Bow's hard work in the classroom and willingness to branch out into new directions earned him the rank of valedictorian of his class at the College of Charleston. On June 28, 1843, a parade of students and various civic groups marched down Archdale Street toward St. John's Lutheran Church to celebrate graduation. The day opened with a prayer and numerous speeches about the importance of self-education, the power of association, influences of government upon the happiness of mankind, public opinion, and the past and present condition of the United States. De Bow delivered a pre-commencement speech entitled "Oration—The Religion of Beauty," before William Brantley conferred degrees to eleven students. De Bow delivered a valedictory speech and ended his college career. Hard work and perseverance, not privilege or wealth, marked his steady rise. De Bow's commitment to learning allowed him access to other social realms that might have been closed to the son of a merchant and certainly to an uneducated orphan.²⁸

Unsure of what to do next, De Bow decided to pursue a legal career in Charleston. He ventured forward with a new sense of confidence and later admitted that his legal education consisted of "a single perusal of Blackstone, the work of a few weeks, with some plausibility and address." On May 15, 1844, De Bow passed the bar exam in Columbia, South Carolina, and returned to Charleston hoping that his new vocation would be "a ready passport to all the privileges, dignities, and immunities, of attorney at law." But he soon became dissatisfied with his work and spent much of his free time at the Charleston Library Society. He also served as secretary for the local Democratic

²⁸ *Southern Patriot*, June 27, 1843.

Party, attended the Augusta Baptist Convention, and managed the state Sunday School Union. Slowly, De Bow's name became more commonplace in Charleston.²⁹

The allure of writing led De Bow to seek out new opportunities with the Charleston-based *Southern Quarterly Review*. He had his first article published in July 1844 and soon after became a familiar presence in the *Review's* editorial office. He learned about publishing, editing, and writing from Daniel K. Whitaker, the *Review's* editor. Whitaker, a New England-born Harvard graduate, had moved to the South in the 1820s and served as the editor of the *Southern Literary Review*, worked as a cotton planter, and practiced law before reviving the *Southern Quarterly Review* in 1842. The *Review* originally had been published in New Orleans, but subscription problems and poor editorial decisions to publish political articles damaged the reputation of the journal. Whitaker hoped to revive sagging public support by moving to Charleston and starting over. This was a risky proposition for Whitaker. Whitaker's decision proved to be correct, and the *Review* once again enjoyed better times. De Bow took note of these struggles and later pledged political neutrality to his own readers in the first edition of his journal in 1846.³⁰

De Bow gained professional experience as an assistant editor of the *Review* and continued to write articles on a wide variety of topics. The *Charleston Courier* reviewed his article, "Oregon and the Oregon Question," and declared it useful and well-written despite the author's "natural fervor of youth and of youthful patriotism." On his next article about South Carolina politics, De Bow received heavy criticism from Richard

²⁹ J.D.B De Bow, "Law and Lawyers, No. 2," *De Bow's Review* 19 (September 1855): 398; O'Brien, *Conjectures of Order*, 508

³⁰ J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial—Book Notices," *De Bow's Review* 23 (July 1857): 104.

Yeadon, his old editor at the *Courier*, about his understanding of nullification. Yeadon believed that De Bow had unfairly characterized the Union Party in South Carolina and had made flippant remarks in the “spirit or prejudice of party.” Yeadon reminded readers that “the chronicler neither saw nor was part of the great events he has undertaken to narrate.” De Bow conceded that he wrote the article without books or references and may have made factual mistakes. Daniel Whitaker, mindful of past editorial mistakes and their consequences, publicly scolded De Bow for his careless writing. He wrote a retraction that distanced himself from De Bow, declaring “I know of no Junior Editor of the *Review*.” De Bow felt betrayed by Whitaker’s stance and left the *Review*. Unlike his past disappointments or failures, De Bow departed feeling satisfied about the valuable experience and training he had received from Whitaker.³¹

Shortly after leaving the *Review*, De Bow received a temporary writing assignment from the *Southern Patriot* to travel around South Carolina and write a bi-weekly newspaper column on his observations. Writing under the name “Swinton,” De Bow visited historic sites, small towns, rural plantations, and new factories. He lavished praise on the cultured society of Cowper, South Carolina, but cautioned that too much finery created a “morbid, and if I may be allowed the doctor-like expression, a dyspeptic state of the social system.” He celebrated the Fourth of July in Camden, South Carolina, before visiting William Gregg’s cotton factory in Graniteville. Gregg, a passionate industrialist and rising public figure, had recently written a series of articles for the *Charleston Courier* on the necessities of manufacturing in South Carolina. These articles

³¹ *Charleston Courier*, July 22, 1845; *Charleston Courier*, September 5, 1845; J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial Department,” *De Bow’s Review* 9 (1850): 125.

eventually became Gregg's *Essays on Domestic Industry*, which critically assessed South Carolina's incorporation laws and attitudes toward industrial development.³²

Although De Bow and Gregg held similar feelings about industrial development, De Bow criticized Gregg in the *Southern Patriot* for not doing more to help South Carolina and for his negative characterization of state political figures. De Bow overlooked Gregg's efforts to change state incorporation laws. The editors of the *Southern Patriot* publicly distanced themselves from De Bow's harsh comments about Gregg but agreed with his assessment on industrial development, admitting that the region needed "a class whom we have long been anxious to see among us—a cool business-headed class—watchful of facts—of the practical and useful—shrewd in finding out the way, and prompt and energetic in taking possession of it." Perhaps feeling the anxiety of yet another public rebuttal, De Bow left Graniteville without further engaging Gregg. He ended his trip by visiting Vardry McBee's cotton factory and flour mill complex outside of Greenville. De Bow's last newspaper column highlighted the encouraging gains made by men like Gregg and McBee and applauded the positive steps that had been made in southern industry.³³

Back in Charleston in October 1845, De Bow learned that he and twenty-four other men had been chosen as delegates to a commercial convention in Memphis, Tennessee. Only eight of the twenty-five actually went to Memphis. Each had previously

³² *Southern Patriot*, "A Visit to the High Hills of Santee," July 8, 1845; *Southern Patriot*, "Carolina Manufactures," July 30, 1845.

³³ *Southern Patriot*, "Gregg's Essays on Domestic Industry," August 1, 1845; Tom Downey, "Riparian Rights and Manufacturing in Antebellum South Carolina: William Gregg and the Origins of the 'Industrial Mind,'" *Journal of Southern History* 69 (1999): 77—78. Downey argues that these legal changes in incorporation laws altered the political economy of South Carolina, moving the state toward becoming a capitalist society rather than just a society with capitalist features. William Gregg, "Domestic Industry—Manufacturers at the South," *De Bow's Review* 8 (February 1850): 134; *Southern Patriot*, "Visit to McBee's Factory," July 31, 1845.

served their community in some capacity before 1845. William H. Trescott and De Bow, classmates at the College of Charleston, were known because of their recent literary and intellectual pursuits in the city. Ker Boyce, Charles Magwood, and William C. Gatewood were experienced businessmen and Alexander Black and James Gadsden had been instrumental in developing the South Carolina Railroad Company. These men had invested in banks, railroads, harbor improvements, and public health projects. Although they worked for private profit, they hoped to strengthen the commercial and industrial sectors of the city to create a more balanced economy.³⁴

None in this group personified the role of entrepreneur-booster more than Ker Boyce. An upcountry transplant from Newberry, South Carolina, Boyce moved to Charleston in 1817 and became a successful city merchant, banker, and investor. In 1836 he purchased a failing sugar house, reorganized it, and opened the Charleston Sugar Refining Company with \$50,000 in capital, thirty-five employees, and modern steam-powered equipment. He later served as the president of the South Carolina Paper Manufacturing Company. In addition to these duties he sat on the board of directors of the Bank of Charleston, South Carolina Railroad, South Carolina Insurance Company, Charleston Gaslight Company, and was the largest stockholder in William Gregg's

³⁴ *Southern Patriot*, October 4, 1845; *Charleston Courier*, October 6, 1845; The men nominated to be delegates included: John C. Calhoun, James Gadsden, James Petigru, Ker Boyce, J.S. Ashe, James Adger, H. Bailey, William Dearing, Henry Gourdin, William C. Gatewood, William Gregg, Edward Serring, Charles A. Magwood, W.S. King, James Bowie, Alexander Black, John Bryce, S.P. Ripley, Alexander Mazyck, Wade Hampton, Moses Mordecai, William Henry Trescott, S.Y. Tupper, L.A. Edmondson, and De Bow; *Charleston Courier*, July 21, 1845; Fraser, *Charleston! Charleston!*, 221—23.

Graniteville Manufacturing Company. Boyce also owned significant shares in more than twenty other companies and invested heavily in real estate.³⁵

Although the Memphis commercial convention would be the first large-scale conference to address southern economic issues, smaller regional cotton planters' conventions had been held in the late 1830s. The Panic of 1837 precipitated a convention in Augusta, Georgia, and another one in Charleston a year later. Delegates focused on direct trade with Europe and the promotion of commercial enterprise as solutions for the declining economy of the South Atlantic seaboard states. These early conventions harbored little sectional discord, focusing instead on southern commercial improvement within the larger global context. Yet some delegates, still angry about existing protective tariffs, used the conventions to express their discontent with unjust laws.³⁶

De Bow saw merit in the commercial convention movement and parlayed his newfound appointment into another writing job. The *Charleston Courier* asked him to write a series of articles that promoted the convention's agenda. He began the series by warning southerners about the impending sectional crisis that threatened the nation. He worried that unchecked northern prosperity, unfair tariff laws, attacks on slavery, and southern economic decline created an unbalanced relationship between the North and South. De Bow saw these issues manifesting themselves in the growing economic contest over western markets and implored southerners to act. A strong relationship between the South and West served two purposes in De Bow's mind: it strengthened the southern

³⁵ John Belton O'Neill, *The Annals of Newberry in Two Parts* (Newberry: Aull & Houseal, 1892), 97—101; Derrick, *South Carolina Railroad*, 11—24; Lander, "Manufacturing Center of the Old South," 347, 350.

³⁶ John G. Van Deusen, *The Ante-Bellum Southern Commercial Convention* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1926), 9—14; Herbert Wender, *Southern Commercial Conventions* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1930), 17—21; Weymouth T. Jordan, "Cotton Planters' Conventions in the Old South," *Journal of Southern History* 19 (August 1953): 321—45.

economy and it thwarted northern efforts to expand into western territories. “The South must sympathize with the West, or be alone,” De Bow warned. He reminded readers that “the day has passed when a sympathy between the North and the South, or any union of action or of interest has been deemed feasible by the most sanguine.”³⁷

In the newspaper series De Bow highlighted the importance of southern railroad development, agricultural reform, and economic diversification. He stressed the importance of developing a domestic manufacturing sector, arguing that if southerners lessened their dependence on northern factories, a more balanced economic relationship between the North and South would emerge. De Bow recommended that the South become more like the North “if the only weapons by which they can be resisted must be fashioned after the models in their own hands . . . we should snatch up those weapons and strike the blow which is to make us free.” He reminded southern readers of his sectional loyalty but added that “it is only on this principle that we advocate Southern manufactures . . . whilst ‘agriculture is the blessed employment of man,’ manufactures then is the twin sister, treading together with her ever the ways of pleasantness and peace.”³⁸

De Bow’s articles anticipating the Memphis convention gave him the idea to start a monthly journal dedicated to southern economic development. He placed an announcement of his intention in the *Courier*, saying that the new business periodical would be based in New Orleans. Charleston’s competitive literary market was crowded.

³⁷ *Charleston Courier*, “The Memphis Convention,” October 9—18, 1845.

³⁸ *Charleston Courier*, “The Memphis Convention,” October 9—18, 1845; De Bow’s sense of southern identity was similar to what Susan-Mary Grant refers to as “northern nationalism” or the creation of a specific regional identity to influence the evolution of a national one. Susan-Mary Grant, *North Over South: Northern Nationalism and American Identity in the Antebellum Era* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000), 39.

He read about New Orleans in Erasmus Fenner's *Southern Medical Journal*. De Bow hoped to experience the economic and social vibrancy of New Orleans and the Southwest. He also wanted to understand the developmental differences between the newer Southwest and older Southeast.³⁹

De Bow would take much of Charleston with him in his outlook on the South's society and economy. A product of a city in economic and social decline, his childhood had been altered by the Panic of 1819 and subsequent death of his father. These circumstances cost him opportunities and social standing in a city obsessed with rank and privilege. The Missouri compromise, Denmark Vesey conspiracy, and Nullification crisis turned a worldly city inward and shaped De Bow's conceptions of his sectional identity. He became intrigued by what it meant to be a southerner. Yet he had never lived on a farm or plantation, had no practical experience with slaves, and was a product of public education from grade school to college. De Bow's intellectual curiosity allowed him to seek out and explore new opportunities that placed him increasingly in the public spotlight. Many of his future editorial opinions on agriculture, industry, and commerce can be linked to specific experiences in his youth.

De Bow's last days in Charleston were bittersweet as he prepared for the Memphis convention and his permanent relocation to New Orleans. He spent days wandering the city and saying goodbye to friends and family. The editors of the *Charleston Courier* asked him to stop in New Orleans on his way to the convention and report on John C. Calhoun's first visit to the Crescent City. They also asked him to travel with Calhoun up the Mississippi River and record the collective mood of South

³⁹ *Charleston Courier*, October 9, 1845; J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial Notes, Etc.," *De Bow's Review* 35 (July 1866): 109.

Carolina's delegation. De Bow agreed to do both, eager for the opportunity to spend time with Calhoun. As he left Charleston aboard an ocean steamer bound for New Orleans, he recognized the importance of the moment and later commented on its significance: "it was our first trip, from which we did not return, and hence the *Review*."⁴⁰

⁴⁰ *Charleston Courier*, November 19, 1845.

Chapter Three: Entering a New South, 1845-1849

On his way to Memphis, De Bow stopped in New Orleans for a brief visit to familiarize himself with his new home. He explored the city and became better acquainted with the nation's second busiest port behind only New York City. Thousands of ships crowded the city's docks, creating a forest of masts and clouds of steam and smoke. De Bow noted that in the month he visited New Orleans, eighty-one ships, twenty-two barks, thirty-three brigs, thirty-nine schooners, and two hundred and twenty steamboats arrived or departed from the city. Hundreds of uncounted flatboats from states and territories along the Mississippi River and its tributaries also crowded city docks. He later estimated that by the mid-1840s city merchants annually exported 900,000 bales of cotton, 200,000 hogsheads of sugar, 100,000 hogsheads of molasses, 600,000 barrels of flour, 430,000 sacks of corn, and 135,000 barrels of wheat. At times the pace of the city unsettled De Bow, leaving him nostalgic for the more leisurely life of Charleston. He felt unprepared for the frantic pace of New Orleans and retreated to the tranquility of a local cemetery to recollect his thoughts. After spending the day thinking about his future, De Bow emerged from his temporary sanctuary with renewed confidence about his decision to move to New Orleans and start a monthly magazine.¹

The city's social and cultural growth and diversity made it unique in the antebellum South. By 1840 over 19,000 free blacks lived and worked in the city as skilled artisans and unskilled laborers. Hundreds of blacks worked as carpenters, masons, shoemakers, mechanics, and painters, while thousands more toiled as stevedores, day

¹ J.D.B. De Bow, "New Orleans," *De Bow's Review* 2 (July 1846): 53–55; J.D.B. De Bow, "Commerce of American Cities," *De Bow's Review* 4 (November 1847): 395; J.D.B. De Bow, "Summer Ramblings," *De Bow's Review* 9 (September 1850): 347.

laborers, and sailors. In addition to free blacks, the city was home to descendants of French and Spanish settlers and Creoles who gave the city a distinctive feeling in comparison to other southern cities. Visitors to the French Quarter noted its European flair and often commented on the frequency of hearing French spoken. Market day became an important part of the social fabric of the city. A visitor noted that market day became a pageant of “youth and age, beauty and not-so-beautiful, all colors, nations, and tongues . . . [and] one heterogeneous mass of delightful confusion.” Unburdened by the oppressive social hegemony found in older southern cities like Charleston, New Orleans retained the aura of a boomtown. For De Bow the city became a cultural and social release for his intellectual and personal curiosities. He worried, however, that the city lacked a sense of community and would only develop into “a great depot of merchandise . . . in which every inhabitant is a mere transient adventurer, without any kind of feeling or bond of union.”²

De Bow’s arrival in New Orleans coincided with statewide political changes that threatened to alter Louisiana’s economic future. After 1834, Whig candidates swept into office promising better days. They instituted pro-business policies of tariffs, internal improvements, and a banking system. Initially their agenda created positive changes for many Louisianans, but the Panic of 1837 derailed their economic plans. Democrats took advantage of the situation. By 1845 Democrats had regained enough momentum to call

² Robert C. Reinders, “The Free Negro in the New Orleans Economy: 1850–1860,” *Louisiana History* 6 (Summer 1965): 273–75; Henry B. Hill and Larry Gara, “A French Traveler’s View of Antebellum New Orleans,” *Louisiana History* 1 (Fall 1960): 336–38; Benjamin F. Norman, *Norman’s New Orleans and Environs* (New York: D. Appleton, 1845), 135; Roger W. Shugg, *Origins of Class Struggle in Louisiana: A Social History of White Farmers and Laborers During Slavery and After, 1840–1875* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1966), 37. Shugg notes that although “Louisiana was as raw and young as the whole Southwest . . . New Orleans belied its age, and was more like a boom town than a city over a century old.” J.D.B. De Bow, “The Moral Advance of New Orleans,” *De Bow’s Review* 2 (November 1846): 349–51.

for a constitutional convention with hopes of erasing all Whig tenets from the existing state constitution. Democrats wanted more liberal suffrage laws and stricter residency requirements and promised to forbid the use of public money to fund private transportation projects. For many Louisianans who supported economic growth and broader global linkages, the political interference of Democrats came at an inopportune time. Competition from other markets and commercial centers threatened New Orleans's position as a commercial emporium, and local merchants chafed at the limitation of public funding put on new railroad projects.³

John C. Calhoun's arrival excited New Orleans residents. Local politicians and newspaper editors urged residents to put aside their political differences and help decorate city streets, public buildings, and the waterfront in his honor. On the morning of November 7, 1845, cannon fire and music announced Calhoun's arrival in the city. De Bow marveled at the crowds that packed the streets and balconies to catch a glimpse of the famous statesman.⁴

Calhoun accepted a seat at the Memphis Convention to advocate federal aid for internal improvement projects. He especially wanted to promote direct commercial ties between Memphis and Charleston by asking for federal money and a reduction in the iron tariff in order to build a railroad that connected the two cities. Calhoun feared that the South Atlantic states would become economically isolated if they failed to create a commercial relationship with the Southwest and western territories beyond the Mississippi River. In speeches in Alabama prior to his arrival in New Orleans, Calhoun

³ William H. Adams, "The Louisiana Whigs," *Louisiana History* 15 (1974): 217–19; Shugg, *Origins of Class Struggle in Louisiana*, 134—35; Joseph G. Tregle, *Louisiana in the Age of Jackson: A Clash of Cultures and Personalities* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1999).

⁴ *Charleston Courier*, November 2, 1845.

had called for a stronger relationship between the South and the West. He hoped to use his visit to New Orleans to buttress feelings of southern unity.⁵

The commercial and agricultural development of the Mississippi River Valley provided southerners like Calhoun, James Gadsden, and later De Bow with hope that the South could partake in the nation's rapid economic growth. Southwestern farmers needed access to domestic and international markets to sell their harvests. Earlier internal improvement projects had funneled raw material from the Northwest to factories in New England and the Middle Atlantic states. Southerners believed that the Southwest could offer a similar stimulus to the commercial and industrial development of the South. Southern delegates heading toward Memphis in November 1845 hoped to build a transportation and commercial system that could accommodate future growth, unify the South, and limit the influence of northern competition in the Mississippi River Valley.⁶

But Calhoun's economic plan to connect the South and West through Memphis worried planters and merchants in the lower Mississippi River Valley. A growing commercial rivalry existed between New Orleans and Memphis. While attending a ball held in his honor in New Orleans, Calhoun attempted to soothe local concerns by offering a toast: "The Valley of the Mississippi—Take it all in all, the greatest in the world. Situated as it is, between the two oceans, it will yet command the commerce of the world, and that commerce may be centered in New Orleans." As a southerner, Calhoun understood the need to maintain New Orleans's commercial primacy in the global

⁵ *Charleston Courier*, November 13, 1845.

⁶ Ulrich B. Phillips, *A History of Transportation in the Eastern Cotton Belt to 1860* (New York: The Columbia University Press, 1908), 17—19, 168—69; R.S. Cotterill, "Southern Railroads, 1850—1860," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 10 (March 1924): 396—405; Jere W. Roberson, "The South and the Pacific Railroad, 1845—1855," *The Western Historical Quarterly* 5 (April 1974): 163—86.

economy; but as a South Carolinian, he needed to create direct transportation links between his home state and western markets. James Gadsden, a South Carolina friend and political ally of Calhoun's, reminded him that the South's future strength was dependent on an alliance with the West. "If they do not come to us, we will be overwhelmed by the power that has combined for our ruin . . . I shall look confidently at your being at Memphis—and if not there, South Carolina will not be heard in the Great Enterprise."⁷

Calhoun's departure from New Orleans was as boisterous as his arrival in the city two days earlier. As the festivities of the last night came to a close, he and many of the delegates from South Carolina and Louisiana made their way to the city's waterfront. Excitement for the convention had risen during Calhoun's visit, and a sizeable delegation from New Orleans also boarded the steamer for Memphis. De Bow watched his political idol encourage southerners to look beyond local rivalries and support a broad, pan-southern agenda. He witnessed southerners rally around their political leader. As dusk fell over the city, the *Maria*, a steam packet that normally hauled cotton, but now carried convention delegates, pushed upstream toward Memphis.⁸

De Bow used his time aboard the *Maria* to promote his plan to start a southern economic journal. He told delegates that he hoped to avoid the "strewn wrecks" of past literary failures that had confined themselves "*exclusively* to literature, in its lighter walks of fancy, or its statelier tread of philosophy." He proposed a more practical journal that

⁷ *Southern Patriot* (Charleston), November 15, 1845; Smith, Jr., *Economic Readjustment of an Old Cotton State*, 17–19; James Gadsden to Calhoun, Charleston, South Carolina, 21 October 1845, *The Papers of John C. Calhoun*, Volume XXII, Eds. Clyde N. Wilson (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995), 236.

⁸ J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial Notes and Miscellany," *De Bow's Review* 29 (September 1860): 388; *Charleston Courier*, November 13, 1845; *Tri-Weekly Memphis Enquirer*, January 27, 1846.

would appeal to “men struggling with the wilderness, subduing soil into cultivation, opening trade, and creating for it avenues.” He wanted his articles to advance the efforts of men who intended to support the economic development of the South, which he called “the physical good.” De Bow believed that “the physical want precedes, in order of time, the intellectual.” Or in other words, “ploughshares come before philosophy.” Calhoun, Gadsden, fellow South Carolinian Joel R. Poinsett, and other delegates on board the *Maria* encouraged De Bow to his ideas.⁹

Memphis’s sudden rise as an inland port for southwestern cotton planters made the city a logical choice for a regional commercial convention. Situated high above the Mississippi River at the confluence of the Wolf River, Memphis had grown from what one early observer had called a “small town, ugly, dirty, and sickly, with miserable streets” to a fair-sized city by 1845. Timber shacks and crude buildings had given way to brick homes and planned neighborhoods. Between 1840 and 1845 the city’s population had doubled to 4,000 residents. International demand for cotton made Memphis a key inland port for planters in western Tennessee, northern Mississippi, and eastern Arkansas. In 1826 only 300 bales of cotton passed through the city; by 1845 that number had increased to 75,000 bales. The demand for cotton energized the local economy and created a new business class of merchants and professional men who oversaw the development of the city. An observer noted that by 1845 the city had seven newspapers, ten churches, three banks, five insurance companies, and seven shipping lines. De Bow

⁹ *Charleston Courier*, November 19, 1845; “R.G.B.,” “The Late J.D.B. De Bow,” *De Bow’s Review* 37 (July & August 1867): 2–5.

later reported that “no place in all the West has greater facilities of trade than Memphis; and the whole appearance of the city is that of activity and enterprise.”¹⁰

Memphis had been in the forefront of supporting internal improvement projects. Corporations had been formed to support plank roads, turnpikes, and railroads. Residents invested in projects that promised to link Memphis with Cincinnati, Louisville, St. Louis, and New Orleans. New stagecoach lines carried passengers and mail to Nashville, Charlotte, and Jackson, Mississippi. The initial call for a commercial convention in Memphis arose after a dispute over a road into Arkansas. Although many of these early schemes failed because of mismanagement or lack of interest, a group of public-minded middle-class merchants and professionals emerged to support their city’s efforts to broaden its commercial network.¹¹

By 1845 Charleston and Memphis represented divergent economies and cultures within the South. For many contemporary observers, Charleston represented an older, decaying Southeast while Memphis reflected a newer, more energetic Southwest. Better situated to capitalize on the region’s expanding cotton economy, Memphis became home to many regional business leaders. In Charleston, status was based more on past, or even lost, wealth of elite merchant families. De Bow noticed these differences and hoped to

¹⁰ Carolyn Pittman, “Memphis in the Mid-1840s,” *The West Tennessee Historical Society Papers* 23 (1969): 30–36; James Roper, *The Founding of Memphis: 1818–1820* (Memphis: The Memphis Sesquicentennial, 1970), 20, 25; J.D.B. De Bow, “Cities of the Mississippi and Ohio,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (February 1846): 146.

¹¹ J.P. Young, *Standard History of Memphis, Tennessee: From a Study of the Original Sources* (Knoxville: H.W. Crew & Co., 1912), 78–83, 377–81, 587–88; Forrest Laws, “The Railroad Comes to Tennessee: The Building of the LaGrange and Memphis,” *The West Tennessee Historical Society Papers* 30 (October 1976): 24–42.

balance the South's overall economic development by linking the commercial futures of both cities through railroad development.¹²

Excitement grew as hundreds of delegates converged on the Methodist-Episcopal Church for the beginning of the Memphis Commercial Convention on November 12, 1845. (see appendix two) Delegates nominated John C. Calhoun to serve as president of the convention and a nominating committee chose De Bow to serve as one of seven recording secretaries for the convention. De Bow's new position gave him unfettered access to convention meetings and reports. He enjoyed the harmoniousness of the sessions and sensed a willingness to cooperate among delegates.¹³

John C. Calhoun's opening speech set the tone of the convention and became influential in De Bow's later views on southern economic development. Federally-funded internal improvement projects, he argued, would create new domestic and international markets for southern goods and foster industrial growth. He encouraged private individuals and corporations to take more active roles in expanding the South's railroad system but invited federal participation in river navigation improvements. Calhoun justified his position by suggesting that the Mississippi River was an "inland sea . . . on

¹² Freehling, *The Road to Disunion*, 28–29, 36, 164–65. Freehling uses geography and economics to divide the antebellum South into an "Old South" and "New South." He argues that the South Atlantic seaboard states represented an "Old South," dominated by planters resistant to modernity, while the Southwest represented a more economically liberal and commercially vibrant "New South." Vernon L. Parrington uses similar divisions in *Main Currents in American Thought: The Romantic Revolution in America* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1927), 3–4, 8, 104–05. Instead of economics, however, Parrington stresses the philosophical and political divisions between the different regions of the antebellum South. He concludes that those living in the antebellum "Old South" came from an enlightened Jeffersonian tradition that assumed slavery was a dying institution, and that southerners living in the antebellum "New South" followed a more realistic philosophy espoused by John C. Calhoun in his defense of slavery.

¹³ *Tri-Weekly Memphis Enquirer*, January 3, 1846; James B. Cook, "The Gayoso Hotel," in *Tennessee Encyclopedia of History and Culture*, ed. Carroll Van West (Nashville: Rutledge Hill Press, 1998), 353; *Journal of the Proceedings of the South-Western Convention, Begun and Held at the City of Memphis on the 12th November, 1845* (Memphis, 1845), 3–6.

the same footing with the Gulf and Atlantic coast, the Chesapeake and Delaware Bays, and the Lakes, in reference to the superintendence of the General Government over its navigation.” Congress had a constitutional obligation to protect interstate commerce. Calhoun avoided previous constitutional debates, deflecting his sectional sentiments by suggesting that these changes would “strengthen the bonds of our Union, and to render us the greatest and most prosperous community the world ever held.” De Bow agreed with Calhoun’s call to action and applauded his nationalistic tone. Like Calhoun, De Bow hoped to maintain the South’s political authority by increasing the region’s economic power. In 1845 both men worried about the South’s growing dependence on northern merchants and industrialists.¹⁴

Although Calhoun’s speech drew loud applause from those at the convention, it later garnered sharp criticism from those who felt abandoned by his call for federal support of southern initiatives. A South Carolina correspondent for *The Young America Magazine* reported that Calhoun’s speech alienated many of his constituents. The *Cincinnati Weekly Herald and Philanthropist* wondered how much political support Calhoun had sacrificed in his home state. The editor of the *Southern Quarterly Review*, normally sympathetic to Calhoun, cautioned southerners to invest in agriculture and not

¹⁴ *Journal of the South-Western Commercial Convention*, 7—14; John C. Calhoun’s attempt to encourage private and public funding of internal improvement projects in 1845 was similar to earlier attempts by the state of Virginia to create a “mixed enterprise” system by blending both private and public funding. Earlier conflicts between liberal and conservative economic forces created a popular backlash against public works projects by the 1840s, and Calhoun’s open call for federal aid to improve river navigation diverged from the prevailing mood of the nation in 1845. John L. Larson, *Internal Improvement: National Public Works and the Promise of Popular Government in the Early United States* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001), 3–7, 92, 19–93, 239; Gerald M. Capers, *John C. Calhoun-Opportunist: A Reappraisal* (Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1960), 46—52, 229; Charles M. Wiltse, *John C. Calhoun: Nationalist, 1782–1828* (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1944), 289—92; Clyde N. Wilson and Shirley Bright Cook, eds., *The Papers of John C. Calhoun, Volume XXIII, 1846* (Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 1996), 574; Freehling, *The Road to Disunion*, 261; Theodore R. Marmor, “Anti-Industrialism and the Old South: The Agrarian Perspective of John C. Calhoun,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 9 (July 1967): 377–78, 399–400.

worry about the West. The *Knoxville Whig* editor William Brownlow suspected political ambition in Calhoun's "coming over to the Whigs," noting that his "grand summersault . . . ought to astonish no one who reflects that Mr. C. wishes to obtain western aid in making him the Presidential nominee of the next [Democratic] national caucus."¹⁵

In De Bow's mind, constitutional discussions about government funding became secondary when confronted with the loss of western markets to northern interests. He agreed that the South needed to expand its economy and attract western commerce. Although Calhoun foresaw a time when sectional interests would feed into larger political battles, De Bow viewed the dispute in more commercial terms as "a contest . . . between the North and South, not limited to slavery or no slavery, to abolition or no abolition, nor to the politics of either Whigs or Democrats, as such, but a contest for the wealth and commerce of the great valley of Mississippi." De Bow worried that states' rights advocates and strict constructionists would halt commercial progress. He believed Calhoun understood the stakes: He and Calhoun recognized the economic consequences of losing the West; projections estimated future commerce along the Mississippi River to exceed \$571 million annually. De Bow felt Calhoun's speech galvanized a regional agenda and became the hallmark of the convention.¹⁶

¹⁵ *Young American Magazine*, December 13, 1845; *Cincinnati Weekly Herald & Philanthropist*, November 26, 1845; *Jonesborough Whig and Independent Journal*, December 31, 1845; "Internal Improvements," *Southern Quarterly Review* 9 (January 1846): 267—69; McCardell, *The Idea of a Southern Nation: Southern Nationalists and Southern Nationalism*, 114—19.

¹⁶ J.D.B. De Bow, "Convention of the South and West," *De Bow's Review* 1 (January 1846): 7—22; J.D.B. De Bow, "The Merchant: His Character, Position, Duties," *De Bow's Review* 3 (February 1847): 98; J.D.B. De Bow, "American Legislation, Science, Art, and Agriculture," *De Bow's Review* 2 (September 1846): 87—90; J.D.B. De Bow, "New Orleans, Her Commerce and Her Duties," *De Bow's Review* 3 (January 1847): 40—41. In *Statesmen of the Old South*, William Dodd agrees with De Bow's assessment of the Memphis Convention and Calhoun's personal motives for attending the meeting. Dodd argues that Calhoun had always been a American nationalist and that the convention offered a way for him to create an economically- and politically-unified South. For Calhoun, this perception of a unified South became increasingly important as political events escalated regional antagonisms. His obsession for political unity

Convention delegates spent the next three days attempting to create a comprehensive economic plan that integrated the region's agricultural, commercial, and industrial sectors. The committee on railroad development reported that the Memphis and Charleston line should pass through the cotton growing regions of Georgia, Alabama, Tennessee, and Mississippi in order to "bring into intimate connection the ancient cities of Charleston, Savannah, and Augusta, with the more modern cities of Macon, Knoxville, and Nashville; and with Natchez, Grand Gulf, Vicksburg, and the modern Memphis of the American Nile." The committee on manufacturing concluded that the South needed more cotton factories and encouraged southerners to act before northern and European competitors made industrial development unlikely. The convention's final report concluded that "beyond a doubt a new era is fast approaching to the Southern States . . . people of the South [need] to economize their capital, erect mills and factories of *all kinds*, bring into use the powers of the present age." De Bow read these reports and later reprinted them in their entirety in his new journal.¹⁷

For De Bow the Memphis convention became an example of what southerners could accomplish when they worked together. For four days he mingled with men from cities and small hamlets, middle-class merchants and wealthy planters, forward-thinking visionaries and staunch traditionalists. He watched as citizens from the South Atlantic seaboard and Southwest traded ideas and attempted to create a consensus for future economic development. These feelings became part of De Bow's editorial style that

became most obvious in South Carolina according to Lacy Ford, Jr. See William E. Dodd, *Statesmen of the Old South: From Radicalism to Conservative Revolt* (New York: The McMillan Company, 1911), 133—34, 149—51; Ford, *The Origins of Southern Radicalism*, 145—47.

¹⁷ *Charleston Courier*, November 24, 1845; *Proceedings of the South-Western Convention*, 29—43, 99.

would make him popular among southern readers. Although no immediate political or economic changes emerged from the proceedings in Memphis, the agenda and tone for future commercial conventions and for De Bow's own literary career had been set. De Bow would attend ten subsequent commercial conventions. The Memphis Commercial Convention became the first large-scale meeting of southerners focused on securing a better economic future for the South. The message of the Memphis meeting became the initial source for ideas for his new journal.¹⁸

De Bow returned to New Orleans and began preparing for the initial edition of *The Commercial Review of the South and West*. Although De Bow's writing duties diminished over time, he wrote and edited every article in the journal's inaugural January 1846 issue. Stressing many of the same points he had used to promote his journal to delegates, De Bow provided practical articles on agriculture, commerce, manufacturing, internal improvements, and southern literature. He defended his decision to focus on commerce and his use of Thomas Carlyle's quote "Commerce is King" as the journal's masthead motto by reminding readers that "there is no end to the diversities and ramifications of commercial action . . . touch agriculture, touch the arts, the professions, fortifications, defenses, transportations, legislation of a country, and the chances are a thousand to one you touch commerce somewhere." Mindful of Daniel Whitaker's earlier

¹⁸ Vicki Vaughn Johnson, *The Men and the Vision of the Southern Commercial Conventions: 1845–1871* (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1992), 17–18, 26. De Bow attended ten conventions between 1845 and 1859. In the overall commercial convention movement, 5,716 men served as delegates to at least one commercial convention between 1845 and 1871. Of that number, 648 delegates attended two conventions, seventy-nine attended three sessions, twenty-seven attended four, seven served at five, and three men attended six conventions. De Bow attended more conventions than any other southerner.

problems with the readership of the *Southern Quarterly Review*, De Bow promised readers that his *Review* would remain free of political rhetoric or party intrigue.¹⁹

The remainder of the January 1846 issue became a template for future editions of the *Review*. De Bow ranged widely to appeal to as many southern readers as possible. He republished the proceedings of the Memphis convention and promoted future conventions. In an article on Oregon and California, he challenged southern readers to look for new markets in the East Indies and Pacific Ocean. De Bow compared the civic fortunes of Charleston and New Orleans, paying close attention to the economic growth of both cities. Noting the unrestrained development of New Orleans, he hoped that future prosperity might be better distributed among all southern cities. In addition to full-length articles, De Bow included statistics and brief summaries on a variety of topics ranging from commerce on the Ohio River to the military defenses of the Gulf of Mexico. In most articles he focused on regional improvement but within the larger national context. De Bow avoided creating a false sense of progress and chided southerners for opposing railroad construction, not investing in needed technological improvements, and allowing the poor relationship that existed between planters and industrialists. He supported his contentions with statistics from newspapers, governmental reports, and census records. De Bow's reliance on quantitative evidence became a hallmark of the *Review*.²⁰

De Bow became an advocate of railroad construction and published monthly reports on the development of key southern railroads. He understood the importance of railroads in the overall development of a regional transportation system. He urged southerners to forego canal construction and was never an enthusiastic supporter of plank

¹⁹ J.D.B. De Bow, "The Commercial Review," *De Bow's Review* 1 (January 1846): 2—6.

²⁰ J.D.B. De Bow, *De Bow's Review* 1 (January 1846): 1—93.

roads. Instead of funding expensive or temporary projects, he hoped that southerners would create a rail system that connected urban commercial centers with regional plantations, factories, and mines. He used the Mississippi and Atlantic Railroad and the Mobile and Ohio Railroad as two early examples of progress. Both lines promised to link interior domestic markets with southern ports. De Bow believed that these railroads would allow southerners to funnel agricultural products and manufactured goods to global markets. He hoped that a developed southern railroad system could be linked to a transcontinental railroad system. The promise of new markets in China, Japan, and Hawaii intrigued De Bow. In June 1847 his efforts were recognized by the directors of the Columbia and Greenville Railroad Company, who applauded his intent to “to devote a large portion of the *Commercial Review* to the Railroad interest of the South.” More important for De Bow, the directors, led by Joel R. Poinsett, recommended that interested southerners subscribe to the *Review*.²¹

De Bow’s familiarity with cities gave him unique perspective on the necessity of fostering urban development in an agricultural region like the South. He often used New Orleans as an example of a modern southern city with broad global connections to larger markets. He understood that New Orleans’s commercial primacy rested on the agricultural success of farmers and planters in the Mississippi River Valley. Cities created new industries, commercial routes, and a sense of progress by allowing the South’s business class to develop in a concentrated area. De Bow believed that these

²¹ J.D.B. De Bow, “Mississippi and Atlantic Railroad,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (January 1846): 22—33; J.D.B. De Bow, “Mobile and Ohio Railroad,” *De Bow’s Review* 3 (April 1847): 328—39; J.D.B. De Bow, “Atlantic and Pacific Railroad,” *De Bow’s Review* 3 (June 1847): 475—84; Marshall S. Legan, “Railroad Sentiment in Northern Louisiana in the 1850s,” *Louisiana History* 17 (1976): 125—39; For examples of De Bow’s interest in individual railroads see: J.D.B. De Bow, “New Orleans, Her Commerce and Her Duties,” *De Bow’s Review* 3 (January 1847): 39—48; J.D.B. De Bow, “Railroad Enterprises at the South,” *De Bow’s Review* 3 (June 1847): 559—60.

developments offered the South its best chance to overtake northern competition and create domestic markets. The creation of stronger internal markets, he implored, would “build up your cities and towns; it will educate your people, it will give you rank, wealth, and importance; it will break the shackles of your dependence upon others, and give influence and prosperity beyond example.” St. Louis, Baltimore, Savannah, and Mobile became successful examples of urban development in the *Review*. De Bow published articles that explained the benefits of cities and towns to rural readers.²²

The development of cities posed new problems for southerners unaccustomed to urban life, and De Bow responded by publishing articles that supported public health initiatives. Although New Orleans had long been an established port, the city struggled to keep up with its growth. As the city’s population expanded and its borders encroached on swampy lowlands, the threat of disease became more prevalent. Yellow fever epidemics had ravaged New Orleans every year since 1812, and cholera, typhus, dysentery, tuberculosis, and malaria outbreaks became commonplace. Local hospitals struggled to limit the spread of illness, but the physical location of New Orleans made it difficult to eradicate disease. Many residents fled the city during the summer months, creating an economic void. These daily reminders gave De Bow insight into the connection between public health and commercial development. He initially suggested that New Orleans was healthier than most European and North American cities but retracted his statement after

²² J.D.B. De Bow, “The Progress of American Commerce,” *De Bow’s Review* 2 (December 1846): 426; J.D.B. De Bow, “Cities of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (February 1846): 146—58; J.D.B. De Bow, “The City of St. Louis,” *De Bow’s Review* 3 (April 1847): 325—28; J.D.B. De Bow, “Southern Cities,” *De Bow’s Review* 6 (September 1848): 226—33; Blaine A. Brownell and David R. Goldfield, ed., *The City in Southern History: The Growth of Urban Civilization in the South* (Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1977), 54—5. Goldfield argues that southern cities would have been nonexistent without interconnecting with railroads and plantations. Planters recognized this reality and often invested heavily in railroad projects that might lead to potentially large profits.

witnessing the deplorable conditions of his city. He believed that cities with less disease attracted more outside investors and created more new opportunities.²³

De Bow enlisted the help of a small group of southern physicians to discuss the connection between public health initiatives and urban development. He worried about the economic implications of disease, noting that “New Orleans is, unfortunately, almost deserted annually, and all its principal business operations suspended, for at least one-fourth of the year.” Dr. W. P. Hort reminded readers that public health affected every citizen of a city and “upon [it] depends the hope or prospect of advancement, and commerce can exercise no empire when controlled by the adverse and blighting influences of disease and death.” Dr. Josiah Nott of Mobile contributed articles on the importance of keeping statistical records to track epidemics. Nott believed that better recordkeeping could save lives by tracking and predicting epidemics. Although these innovations interested De Bow from a commercial point of view, he also recalled the personal toll that disease had taken on his family in Charleston.²⁴

De Bow recognized the importance of merchants and professionals to his economic plan and realized that their needs sometimes contradicted those of the agricultural sector. Western migration had created new towns and cities in the Southwest,

²³ Norman, *New Orleans and Environs*, 70–79; Shugg, *Origins of Class Struggle in Louisiana*, 55; J.D.B. De Bow, “Southern and Western Statistics, Commerce, Agriculture, Etc.,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (January 1846): 82; C. Vann Woodward links public health and disease prevention with the commercial advancement of the postbellum South. He marks 1906 as the beginning of a new era in public health because of new medical discoveries and increased publicity. C. Vann Woodward, *Origins of the New South, 1877—1913*, Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1951): 227—28, 425—26. John Ellis, *Yellow Fever and Public Health in the New South* (Lexington, KY: University Press of Kentucky, 1992); David R. Goldfield, *Cotton Fields and Skyscrapers: Southern City and Region* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), 41—42.

²⁴ Albert Bly, “On the Revival of Roman Baths,” *De Bow’s Review* 2 (October 1846): 228–30; W.P. Hort, “Public Health and the Prevention of Disease in Southern Cities,” *De Bow’s Review* 3 (March 1847): 250; Josiah Nott, “Life Insurance at the South,” *De Bow’s Review* 3 (May 1847): 367–76.

forcing southwestern planters to use local merchants to sell their cotton crops to commission houses in Mobile and New Orleans. He argued that the South's business class connected rural and urban interests. De Bow advocated a system of cotton warehouses that could be used to store crops during periods of overproduction and low prices. He understood that many planters resisted production control and warehousing but believed that they would create higher profits and better credit ratings if merchants could control the flow of cotton to national and international markets. In some cases, he supported tariff protection. Louisiana sugar planters had invested heavily in new machinery and technology and wanted federal trade protection. This position opposed the prevailing attitude among cotton planters who felt cheated by federal tariff laws that favored the manufacturing sector. De Bow hoped that limited protection for the sugar industry might encourage more innovation and growth. He wanted the South to become more active in the global economy and hoped that southerners would accept some concessions on tariffs for the general betterment of the region.²⁵

Industrialization became an important factor in De Bow's plan for economic diversification, but he understood that regional apathy and resistance existed. Hoping to encourage southerners to invest in local factories, De Bow asked fellow South Carolinian William Gregg to write an article for southerners interested in "legitimate home manufactures." Gregg's cotton mills became an early example of how southerners could bring factories closer to cotton fields and produce commercial goods for internal and external markets. De Bow also noted industrial growth among Louisiana's sugar planters

²⁵ J.D.B. De Bow, "The Warehousing Policy," *De Bow's Review* 1 (January 1846): 61—64; J.D.B. De Bow, "American Legislation, Science, Art, and Agriculture," *De Bow's Review* 2 (September 1846): 91—96; J.D.B. De Bow, "The Origins, Progress, and Influences of Commerce," *De Bow's Review* 1 (February 1846): 116.

and Virginia's iron producers. He wondered why so many other southerners had failed to embrace industrial development and help end the South's economic dependence on the North. Richard Abbey, a planter from Yazoo City, Mississippi, expressed his frustration about the state of southern manufacturing. Abbey, an innovative cotton planter, complained in the *Review* that economic necessity forced him to buy northern equipment and supplies because southern suppliers failed to meet his demands.²⁶

Daniel Pratt wrote to describe his industrial success in Prattville, Alabama. Pratt estimated that his factories produced 500 cotton gins annually and 6,000 yards of cloth on a daily basis. De Bow saw Pratt as a pioneer in southern manufacturing and an exemplar to other southerners. He visited Prattville and applauded its achievement. Prattville's factories had attracted other merchants and businesses, and at the time of De Bow's visit, the growing town included a gin factory, sawmill, foundry, grist mill, general store, a horse mill factory, and tin shop. In addition to these businesses, Pratt had constructed a plank road that connected his town with a nearby landing on the Alabama River.²⁷

De Bow's *Review* became a platform for like-minded men to promote economic diversification. John Pope, a *Review* subscriber and delegate at the Memphis convention, worried that planter apathy and northern competition would soon make it impossible for southerners to recast their economic destiny. Pope blamed planters for failing to invest in other sectors of the economy and insisted that these "men must be spoken to in the

²⁶ J.D.B. De Bow, "Louisiana Sugar," *De Bow's Review* 1 (January 1846): 53—56; J.D.B. De Bow, "Southern and Western Commerce, Statistics, Agriculture, Etc.," *De Bow's Review* 1 (March 1846): 277—81; J.D.B. De Bow, "Internal Improvement—Mining, Railroads, Etc.," *De Bow's Review* 5 (January 1848): 87—95; Richard Abbey, "The Cotton Culture," *De Bow's Review* 2 (September 1846): 133, 142.

²⁷ Daniel Pratt, "Cotton Gins," *De Bow's Review* 2 (September 1846): 153—55. Curtis J. Evans agrees with De Bow's initial assessment about Prattville and notes that Pratt's accomplishments became an industrial monument in the agrarian South. By 1860, however, Pratt's cotton factory had only added 485 new spindles in ten years. Curtis J. Evans, *The Conquest of Labor: Daniel Pratt and Southern Industrialization*, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001), 28—33, 75—76.

language of dollars and cents . . . let then, the cotton planters of the South arouse from their *criminal* lethargy on this subject and evince to the world that this is their own business; that they have the whole thing in their own hands.” He worried that another downturn in the cotton market, as southerners had experienced in the late 1830s and early 1840s, or another period of overinvestment in slavery might further limit the South’s economy, putting it further behind the North. Pope agreed with De Bow on a plan to control cotton production and encourage industrial development and investment in domestic commercial markets. Like most early articles in the *Review*, Pope’s avoided inflammatory sectional discussions or references. Like De Bow, Pope held little antipathy to the North; both men wanted to improve the South but within the confines of the Union.²⁸

James Gadsden worried that the South’s reliance on the agricultural sector limited the region’s economic independence and made it vulnerable to northern competition. What was needed, Gadsden wrote in the *Review*, was a dedicated effort to increase investment in industry and commerce and avoid regional dependence on outside producers. Gadsden also pushed southerners to think about investing in more schools and libraries as ways of creating better leaders and fostering a sense of community. He

²⁸ John Pope, “Agriculture and Manufactures,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (March 1846): 228–38; For more background on the debate over why planters failed to invest in the industrial and commercial sector of the antebellum South, see: Holland Thompson, “The Civil War and Social and Economic Changes,” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 154 (January 1931) 11—20; Eugene Genovese, *The Political Economy of Slavery: Studies in the Economy and Society of the Slave South* (New York: Pantheon, 1965); Gavin Wright, *The Political Economy of the Cotton South: Households, Markets, and Wealth in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1978); Fred Bateman and Thomas Weiss, *A Deplorable Scarcity: The Failure of Industrialization in the Slave Economy* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981); Douglas R. Egerton, “Markets Without a Market Revolution: Southern Planters and Capitalism,” *Journal of the Early Republic* 16 (Summer 1996): 207—21.

believed that southerners would meet the challenge and become a great commercial as well as agricultural region.²⁹

De Bow made the *Review* a forum for agricultural reform. He encouraged planters to view their plantations as profitable businesses and called for readers to submit practical agricultural articles. Readers responded by offering advice on soil improvement and fertilizers, plantation management, and crop diversification, and information on new tools, machinery, and varieties of cotton. De Bow published articles outlining cultivation and harvest techniques for Indian corn, grain, and rice. Others urged southerners to experiment with exotic crops such as coffee beans, olives, cork trees, and silk. De Bow encouraged southern planters and farmers to join local agricultural groups and share new farming techniques. He published reports from state and local agricultural associations and societies in which contributors described sub-soil plowing, field drainage, and pest control.³⁰

De Bow saw agricultural reform as advancing the southern economic strength and independence. New crops might lessen southern dependence on agricultural production from outside the region. Agricultural improvements would create larger profits for planters, which could be reinvested in time-saving agricultural devices or other sectors of the southern economy. Better agricultural management also allowed planters to reclaim land originally thought barren in the older parts of the South Atlantic seaboard. De Bow noted that “it is a common complaint, founded, alas, upon too melancholy a truth, that the

²⁹ James Gadsden, “Commercial Spirit at the South,” *De Bow’s Review* 2 (September 1846): 119—32.

³⁰ For representative examples of De Bow’s interest in agricultural diversity see: J.S. Duke, “Coffee and the Coffee Trade,” *De Bow’s Review* 2 (November 1846): 303—22; J.D.B. De Bow, “Agriculture of the South and West: Cultivation of the Olive in the Southern States,” *De Bow’s Review* 3 (March 1847): 265—68; J.D.B. De Bow, “The Grain and Flour Trade,” *De Bow’s Review* 4 (October 1847): 159—64; J.D.B. De Bow, “Agricultural Associations,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (February 1846): 164.

Southern States have been content to prosecute agriculture with little regard to system, economy, or the dictates of liberal science.”³¹

Sidney Weller, a *Review* subscriber and planter in North Carolina, embodied De Bow’s call for southern agricultural reform. Weller, the largest grape grower and winemaker in the South, had created a diversified plantation on 400 acres in Brinkleyville, North Carolina. Weller had experimented with a variety of agricultural schemes in hopes of finding new crops for southern planters and farmers. He eventually settled on growing grapes and wrote extensively on vineyards and winemaking. Weller wrote numerous articles for De Bow about his experiences and encouraged southern farmers to follow his lead in searching for new agricultural innovations.³²

Although many readers accepted De Bow’s agricultural contributions, others like Thomas Affleck challenged his vision. A planter and newspaper editor from Mississippi, Affleck proposed that the South remain an exclusively agricultural region and focus on supplying Europe with cotton. De Bow rejected Affleck’s assessment, reminding readers that “the cardinal motive with us, in establishing the *Review*, was the elucidation of ALL THE GREAT PRINCIPLES OF PROGRESS . . . [and] that all the complicated machinery be understood, and each division brought under distinct observation.”³³

³¹ J.D.B. De Bow, “Agricultural Associations,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (February 1846): 161—69; J.D.B. De Bow, “Southern and Western Agricultural and Mechanic Associations,” *De Bow’s Review* 4 (December 1847): 419.

³² J.D.B. De Bow, “Agriculture and Manufacture in the South and West,” *De Bow’s Review* 4 (September 1847): 128—37; C.O. Cathy, “Sidney Weller: Ante-Bellum Promoter of Agricultural Reform,” *The North Carolina Historical Review* 31 (1954): 6—17; Sidney Weller, “American Native Wines,” *De Bow’s Review* 4 (November 1847): 310—18.

³³ J.D.B. De Bow, “The Cotton Plant,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (April 1846): 289—98; By a Southwestern Planter, “Remedy for the Cotton Planters,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (May 1846): 434—36; Thomas Affleck, “The Cherokee Rose,” *De Bow’s Review* 5 (January 1848): 83—84.

Although a nominal Democrat early in his editorial career, De Bow's economic vision resembled the Whig Party's pro-business platform that supported national economic progress through internal improvements, manufacturing, and technological development. He rarely discussed political topics in the *Review*. De Bow's strong feelings about Calhoun were more personal than political, and he viewed Henry Clay's ability to create sectional compromises as more important than his American System. De Bow often borrowed rhetoric and ideas from Democrats and Whigs without betraying his personal feelings about either party. He understood the importance of political ambiguity to attract the widest variety of southern readers.³⁴

Despite De Bow's aversion to political topics in the *Review*, he commented on the economic disruption caused by the highly politicized Mexican War. Although a fervent national expansionist who hoped to secure Mexican land, he had misgivings about the Mexican War. Joel R. Poinsett, ex-envoy to Mexico and noted South Carolina unionist, wrote four articles that opposed the war on political and economic grounds. Poinsett reasoned that republican virtue existed on both sides of the Rio Grande River and that war would create unnecessary tension between the two nations. De Bow followed Poinsett's article with skeptical articles by William L. Hodge and Judah Benjamin, members of New Orleans's business class, who predicted that any commercial disruptions in southern commerce would benefit northern competitors. Hodge warned that "the great evil that New Orleans has to dread, is a state of war; for even with an inferior power, the injury would be very great." Benjamin supported Hodge's contention

³⁴ J.D.B. De Bow, "Position of the Commercial Review," *De Bow's Review* 1 (January 1846): 6; J.D.B. De Bow, "Some Thoughts on Political Economy and Government," *De Bow's Review* 9 (September 1850): 257—71.

and worried that a naval blockade would shut New Orleans off from the rest of the world. De Bow asserted that the Mexican War was an economic issue rather than a political one, and he tried to maintain his promise to avoid political debates.³⁵

Although De Bow understood the significance of slavery to the South, he showed little interest in discussing the subject early in his editorial career. He waited eleven months to publish the first full-length article on slavery in the *Review* and six more months to print a follow-up piece on the subject. In the latter article, De Bow offered his first public opinion about the growing national debate over slavery. He seemed puzzled by northern attacks and suggested that “the *argument* for or against the institution . . . so far as the South is concerned, should never more be mooted . . . as Southerners, as *Americans*, as MEN, we deny the right of being called to account for our institutions.” He believed that the moral debate over slavery’s existence had been settled and that southerners needed to focus on making the institution more profitable.³⁶

De Bow made personal friendships in New Orleans that broadened his views about the South. Although he maintained close associations with such leading merchants and politicians in New Orleans as James Robb and Pierre Soule, few of De Bow’s friendships exceeded the depth and closeness of his relationship to Maunsel White.

White, an immigrant from Ireland and veteran of the Battle of New Orleans, had become

³⁵ The anti-war contributions of Poinsett, Hodge, and Benjamin give credence to Paul Buck’s observation that men of business are often men of peace. Paul Buck, *The Road to Reunion: 1865–1900* (New York: Vintage Books, 1937), 165; Joel Poinsett, “The Mexican War,” *De Bow’s Review* 2 (July 1846): 21–24; William L. Hodge, “New Orleans,” *De Bow’s Review* 2 (July 1846): 59–61; Judah Benjamin, “Blockade,” *De Bow’s Review* 2 (June 1846): 499–503; Ernest M. Lander, *Reluctant Imperialists: Calhoun, the South Carolinians, and the Mexican War* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1979).

³⁶ B.F. Porter, “Slavery, Ancient and Modern,” *De Bow’s Review* 2 (November 1846): 351—54; “The Negro: By a Citizen of Mississippi,” *De Bow’s Review* 3 (May 1847): 420—22; A Southern Planter, “Prospective Emancipation Examined—The Colonization Society, etc.,” *De Bow’s Review* 21 (September 1856): 265—70.

one of New Orleans's most successful merchants by the early 1840s. Despite retiring from active business life in 1845, he continued to invest in factories, real estate, and businesses around the South. White made financial and literary contributions to the *Review*. He wanted to build a state university in New Orleans and wrote articles that highlighted the importance of education in the South. De Bow agreed with White's assessment and supported a public university as a civic tool to attract new investment into the city. De Bow also had personal reasons for publicly supporting White's campaign to establish the University of Louisiana in New Orleans (later Tulane University). White had offered De Bow a faculty position at the new university. As expected, White recommended De Bow for the position, and two years later the school's board of administrators hired De Bow to become the first Chair of Political Economy, Commerce, and Statistics at the University of Louisiana.³⁷

Energized by his faculty appointment, De Bow began a public campaign to ensure proper funding for a state university. He implored his readers to support such cultural improvements throughout the South, reminding them that student tuition and fees, not public funds, produced the majority of revenue needed to open and operate a school. He beseeched fellow Louisianans to look at the long-term benefits of education rather than at

³⁷ Clement Eaton, *The Mind of the Old South*, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1964), 69–89; J.D.B. De Bow, "Reminiscences of the West," *De Bow's Review* 2 (September 1846): 177–79; Maunsel White, "The University of Louisiana," *De Bow's Review* 3 (March 1847): 263–65. Kenneth R. Johnson explores the relationship between towns and universities in the New South and concludes that many New South boosters saw institutions of higher learning as an important component in attracting new commercial and industrial enterprises to their cities or towns. Johnson specifically examines the development of Florence, Alabama, and links the city's economic growth with efforts to attract a college. Interestingly, three of the men most responsible for promoting Florence and luring a college to the city were antebellum subscribers to *De Bow's Review*. Porter King, Thomas Watts, and John Tyler Morgan became instrumental in the postwar recovery of Alabama. Kenneth R. Johnson, "Urban Boosterism and Higher Education in the New South: A Case Study," *The Alabama Historical Quarterly* 42 (Spring and Summer 1980): 40, 45–54; Eaton, *Mind of the Old South*, 80–81; *Southern Patriot* (Charleston), February 24, 1848.

the short-term inconveniences of opening a state-funded school. De Bow published a curriculum that focused on commerce, agriculture, and manufacturing in the South. He gave public lectures and then published them in the *Review*. The initial excitement, however, eventually gave way to despair. In spite of De Bow's enthusiastic support and White's financial gift, student apathy and financial mismanagement eroded support for the school, ending De Bow's tenure in education.³⁸

The *Review's* reputation continued to grow. The Charleston Chamber of Commerce published two public resolutions praising De Bow's efforts as an editor, and a writer for the *Semi-Weekly Natchez Courier* suggested that the *Review* benefited southerners "in the practical pursuits of life . . . [for] the planter as well as the merchant—to the mechanic as well as the professional man." Jesse T. McMahon, editor of the *Weekly Memphis Enquirer* and a Memphis Convention delegate, praised De Bow for his work and reminded him to "see to thy mail books and to thy exchange list."³⁹

De Bow's overall vision for economic reform relied heavily on the actions of individuals and communities. In De Bow's mind, individual planters and farmers would operate well-managed agricultural units and supply the region with needed produce and cash crops for export. Equally efficient factories would produce needed goods and supplies for southerners and reduce the region's dependence on northern and European manufacturing. Smaller peripheral towns would then become conduits for local trade and funnel commerce to larger international ports, and a system of railroads would link the South together and ultimately create a unified region built equally around commerce,

³⁸ J.R. McCormick, "Defective Organization of American Universities," *De Bow's Review* 5 (March 1848): 241–43.

³⁹ *Southern Patriot* (Charleston), November 2, 1846; *Semi-Weekly Natchez Courier*, July 16, 1847; *Tri-Weekly Memphis Enquirer*, January 24, 1846.

manufacturing, and agriculture. This plan, he argued, would allow the South to become independent of northern interests and assume a larger role in national and global affairs.⁴⁰

Much of De Bow's plan coincided with larger developments occurring in the South in the late 1840s. Steady commercial and industrial development had transformed New Orleans, Mobile, Charleston, and Baltimore into important global ports. A growing agricultural market had increased the regional status of Memphis, Vicksburg, Montgomery, Knoxville, and Augusta. A growing transportation system linked these urban centers. Plans for new railroads existed in almost every southern state with tangible growth in South Carolina, Alabama, Tennessee, and Virginia. Although substantially behind their northern counterparts, southern industrialists and merchants had become increasingly more visible and influential in southern society. More southerners invested in factories and other small manufacturing enterprises.

In the first three years of the *Review*, De Bow expressed a new economic vision to southern readers and they responded. He collected ideas that had been part of the southern dialogue for generations and published them in a practical, succinct message for likeminded southerners. He recognized themes that interested southern readers and did it within the larger national context of American progress. De Bow's time with Calhoun strengthened both his sense of American nationalism and his southern identity. Most of his personal motivation to create a better South was set within the confines of the Union, not in the nascent ideas of southern nationalists. De Bow had offered the South a comprehensive economic vision for how to compete in a modern world, but he had to wait to see if southerners would be truly willing to act on his words.

⁴⁰ J.D.B. De Bow, "The Cherokee Rose," *De Bow's Review* 5 (January 1848): 82—83.

Chapter Four: “It is in the Power of Every Friend of the Review,”

A Collective Biography of De Bow’s Readers, 1846-1860

De Bow’s Review attracted southerners with similar feelings about regional economic development. Most readers lived on large plantations or in towns or cities. De Bow had less appeal among yeoman farmers and poor white laborers. He published articles that focused on regional problems or innovations that required large amounts of capital. Enough middle- to upper-class southerners, however, read the *Review* to make it a popular and influential magazine. De Bow’s readership reflected his vision of a diversified southern economy. Many urban subscribers worked to improve their cities and towns, and rural planters experimented with ideas they read about in the *Review*. A significant number of readers accepted the primacy of cotton but hoped to redirect agricultural profits to fund transportation projects, civic improvements, and new factory construction. De Bow hoped to appeal to subscribers motivated by profit and civic responsibility. Who read the *Review* mattered, and De Bow understood the necessity of appealing to readers who could effect change in their communities.

In 1848 De Bow had 825 subscribers—but almost two-thirds of those readers had not paid their subscriptions. Although thousands of southerners subscribed annually to the *Review* by the mid-1850s, the identities of many have been lost because of De Bow’s poor recordkeeping. Enough partial subscription lists, personal letters, and business correspondence exists however, to recreate a list of 1,404 known readers. This list

provides insight into who read the *Review* and how they interacted with the world around them.¹

Almost 90 percent of De Bow's identified readers lived in the South. (see table two) The others were mainly merchants in Cincinnati, New York City, or Boston. Within the region, 63 percent lived in the Lower South that stretched westward from South Carolina to Texas and 25 percent lived in the Upper South and the border states. Almost half of all De Bow's known readers lived in Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas, while only 37 percent lived along the South Atlantic seaboard. The geographic diversity of these readers encouraged editorial balance.²

De Bow's readers reflected the rapid development of the Southwest. Inexpensive land in Mississippi, Arkansas, western Tennessee, and Alabama had lured planters and merchants away from the Atlantic Coast. This migration defined the values of new communities and redefined the status of older ones. Fifty-four percent of De Bow's readers had been born in South Atlantic states; only 16 percent were native to the Southwest. Of Alabama's 182 known subscribers, thirty-six had been born in Alabama, thirty-two in Georgia, twenty in Virginia, twenty-six in South Carolina, ten in Europe, and ten in various northern states. Conversely, of South Carolina's 138 readers, only nineteen had been born outside of the Palmetto State. Although De Bow accounted for

¹ O'Brien, *Conjectures of Order*, 542—43; J.D.B. De Bow, "To Our Southern and Western Friends," *De Bow's Review* 6 (August 1848): 162; O'Brien, *Conjectures of Order*, 531; Paul F. Paskoff and Daniel J. Wilson, eds. *The Cause of the South: Selections from De Bow's Review, 1846—1867* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), 8. All composite readership statistics have been calculated from individual entries in the *Seventh Census of the United States, 1850* and the *Eighth Census of the United States, 1860*. Hereafter cited as Composite Census Records, 1850—1860.

² Composite Census Records, 1850—1860; James Oakes, *The Ruling Race: A History of Slaveowners* (New York: W.W. Norton and Co., 1982).

these demographic changes, he benefited from the cultural persistence created by interregional emigration.³

De Bow's message of integrated economic development resonated among readers who lived in the Southwest's Black Belt regions that stretched from central Alabama through much of northern Mississippi and into parts of Arkansas, Louisiana, and western Tennessee. His vision of economic development corresponded with the plantation system being created by wealthy planters and urban merchants. Isolated from coastal cities, southwestern planters and merchants created interior markets and sufficient transportation routes that connected small towns to international ports such as Mobile or New Orleans. Planters consigned their crop to local cotton merchants, more commonly known as factors, who extended credit on the future sale of what planters produced. Factors in small interior towns then shipped the cotton to associates who sold the commodities on the international market. The linkage between small-town cotton factors and large coastal factorage houses reduced the region's dependency on banking but increased planter dependency on credit. Many of De Bow's readers in these areas, regardless of background or occupation, invested in projects that expanded the commercial profile of their community. The preservation of plantation culture and slavery relied on the successful commercial integration of the Southwest's planters and business class with global markets.⁴

³ Composite Census Records, 1850—1860; David Hackett Fischer and James C. Kelly, *Bound Away: Virginia and the Westward Movement* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2000), 135—40, 200—301. Although Fischer and Kelly disagree with Frederick Jackson Turner's frontier thesis and the formation of common American values, they acknowledge cultural similarities between Virginia and places settled predominately by Virginians in the Old Northwest and Old Southwest.

⁴ Phillips, *A History of Transportation in the Eastern Cotton Belt to 1860*, 1—20; Ford, *Origins of Southern Radicalism*, 44; Charles S. Aiken, *The Cotton Plantation South: Since the Civil War*, (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998, 57—58; Harold D. Woodman, *King Cotton & His Retainers:*

De Bow's Review became popular in Alabama's Black Belt region because it offered planters and merchants a template for economic development. Seventy percent of Alabama readers lived in Black Belt counties in central and western parts of the state. Planters and merchants created a network of interior commercial centers linked by roads and railroads. The towns of Cahaba, Selma, Eutaw, and Marion became prosperous cotton towns with substantial numbers of *Review* subscribers—eleven readers lived in Cahaba, seventeen in Selma, ten in Eutaw, and fifteen in Marion. Although not large or well-developed towns, these urban centers became important to the economy of Alabama's Black Belt region.⁵

Cooperation between market-oriented planters and merchants typified the economic relationship between *Review* readers in Dallas County, Alabama. Located in west-central Alabama, this Black Belt county had rich farm land and access to the Alabama River. De Bow's readers in Selma, the largest town in the county, hoped to expand their community's profile by investing in railroad projects and other civic improvements. The development of Selma served as an example of the growth De Bow promised when private and public motives intermingled. Citizens lobbied for and received state support for a bank and a \$190,000 loan to connect the town with the Alabama and Tennessee Rivers Railroad. De Bow's readers in Selma, regardless of occupation, supported transportation and commercial improvements. Thornton Boykin Goldsby, a *Review* subscriber and planter who lived near Selma, invested in five railroad

Financing & Marketing the Cotton Crop of the South, 1800—1925 (Lexington: University of Kentucky Press, 1968), 16—20.

⁵ Composite Census Records, 1850—1860; Randall Martin Miller, *The Cotton Mill Movement in Antebellum Alabama* (New York: Arno Press, 1978), 5; Roger L. Ransom and Richard Sutch, *One Kind of Freedom: The Economic Consequences of Emancipation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 116. Although Ransom and Sutch focus on the economic development of the postbellum South, they acknowledge the importance of urban cotton centers such as Selma to the antebellum South's economy.

projects, a plank road corporation, and telegraph company. John W. Lapsley, a town merchant and *Review* reader, also hoped to connect his town with larger markets and solidify Selma's commercial prominence. He invested in the same railroads and plank road as Goldsby and also bought stock in a gaslight company, coal mine, and a lime works. Both men worked within a community of likeminded southerners who read the *Review*. Selma continued to expand, and during the Civil War its industrial capacity, railroad connections, and proximity to Montgomery made it an important munitions center for the Confederacy.⁶

The popularity of the *Review* extended into the Black Belt region of western Tennessee. Almost 49 percent of De Bow's known readers in Tennessee lived in the far southwestern corner of the state. As in Alabama, these readers lived in small towns or on large plantations. By 1860 the top 5 percent of planters owned 46 percent of the wealth in western Tennessee. Their interests corresponded with market forces generated by cotton. Hiram S. Bradford, a *Review* subscriber and planter from Haywood County, owned almost \$50,000 in real estate and had amassed a personal estate of \$72,000. Despite his success as a cotton planter, he invested in the Big Hatchee Turnpike and Bridge Company. He also followed De Bow's advice and invested in equally important social institutions such as the Brownsville Academy, Union University, and Brownsville Female Institute. Bradford's son told De Bow about his father's admiration of the

⁶ *Acts of Alabama, 1830—1860*, (Catawba: Allen & Brickell); Thomas M. Owens, *History of Alabama and Directory of Alabama Biography, Volume II*, (Chicago: S.J. Clark Publishing Company, 1921), 672; J. Mills Thornton, III, *Politics and Power in a Slave Society, Alabama, 1800-1860*, (Baton Rouge, Louisiana State University Press, 1978), 276—77; Composite Census Records, 1850—1860. Brian Schoen, "The Lower South's Antebellum Pursuit of Sectional Development through Global Interdependence," in *Global Perspectives on Industrial Transformation in the American South* ed. Susanna Delfino and Michele Gillespie (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2005), 61. Schoen notes that cotton profits in Alabama and Mississippi forged a relationship between planters and merchants who pursued economic diversification and commercial development as way of maintaining profits.

Review, noting that “your work is Herculean and all we say is keep your shoulder to the wheel, it will begin to move at first by inches after a while it will come out of the mire and that’s what a country we will have.”⁷

De Bow’s popularity in Alabama and Tennessee diminished outside of each state’s Black Belt region. His focus on large plantations and well-connected urban centers made the *Review* less applicable to yeoman farmers living in mountainous, isolated regions in the South’s upcountry. In eastern Tennessee, where small farmers produced wheat and corn and livestock with little slave labor, De Bow’s readership was almost nonexistent. In northern Alabama, few readers lived outside of Huntsville. De Bow spent little time exploring these regions or writing about possible economic innovations that might link them into the larger southern economy. This lack of understanding or interest in mountainous areas extended to western North Carolina, where De Bow had no readers west of Alamance in the north-central part of the state.⁸

Readers in the southern Atlantic plantation belt had characteristics similar to those of readers in the Southwest’s Black Belt. The eastern cotton belt extended from south-central North Carolina through the Piedmont and part of the upcountry of South Carolina and into south-central and western Georgia. Large concentrations of *Review* subscribers lived on large plantations and in commercial towns linked to the cotton industry. In Georgia, De Bow had sixteen readers in Atlanta, thirty-four in Augusta, twenty in Macon, and thirteen in Rome. In South Carolina readers clustered in Camden, Edgefield, and Columbia. Unlike in the Southwest, rural planters and urban merchants initially had a

⁷ Composite Census Records, 1850—1860; Robert T. McKenzie, *One South or Many?: Plantation Belt and Upcountry in the Civil War-Era* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 59; Letter from A.W. Bradford to De Bow, July 9, 1866, De Bow Papers, Perkins Library, Duke University.

⁸ Composite Census Records, 1850—1860.

contentious relationship in the eastern cotton belt. Planters resisted railroad development and opposed the creation of town culture. Undeterred by this resistance, South Carolina merchants altered state incorporation laws and perceptions about private profit to become more acceptable to area planters. In Georgia, politicians overcame planter interference by partially funding a state railroad system. By 1850 four railroads linked Georgia's interior cotton towns to coastal ports. The gradual commercial transformation of the southern Atlantic states encouraged De Bow to believe that older parts of the South could once again become competitive in global markets.⁹

The growth of the urban South provided De Bow with a natural audience for his ideas. The South's urban population had more than tripled between 1790 and 1850, creating new linkages and opportunities for profit-minded southerners. When integrated into the regional railroad system that was quadrupling in size during this same period, these urban centers became incubators for southern economic development. Sixty-two percent of De Bow's known readers resided in southern cities and towns. Charleston and New Orleans, the two largest cities in the Lower South, had only three more combined readers than St. Louis and Richmond. The size of the municipality also had little influence on subscription numbers. Wharton, Texas, and Halltown, Virginia, had more individual readers than Petersburg or Mobile. Overall, thirty-three urban centers had

⁹ Downey, *Planting a Capitalist South*, 17, 38; George R. Taylor, *The Transportation Revolution, 1815—1860*, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1951), 90—91; James M. Russell, *Atlanta, 1847—1890: City Building in the Old South and the New* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988), 10—11, 41, Ford, *Origins of Southern Radicalism*, 47; Peter Wallenstein, *From Slave South to New South: Public Policy in Nineteenth-Century Georgia*, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1987), 12—17.

more than ten subscribers to the *Review*. De Bow's urban readership increased as his focus on the necessity of cities and towns expanded.¹⁰

De Bow's readership in Richmond, Virginia, exemplified the support he had among the business elite in many southern cities. Fifty-four subscribers lived in the South's most industrialized city. Hugh W. Fry and Joseph R. Anderson each owned large iron foundries and produced finished goods that ranged from nails to railroad locomotives. Fry embodied the entrepreneurial spirit that De Bow hoped to cultivate in other middle-class southerners. Fry had opened a small commission house and wholesale grocery in the late 1840s. By 1854 he had become successful enough to start the Belle Isle Manufacturing Company and produce iron products. Eager to expand production, Fry funded construction of a railroad bridge that linked his factory with nearby coal pits. He and Charles Wortham, another *Review* subscriber, later purchased the Old Dominion Iron and Nails Company. They used slave labor and became wealthy industrialists in the city. Likewise by 1860, Joseph R. Anderson's Tredegar Iron Work had become the largest iron foundry and rolling mill in the South, employing almost 900 free and slave laborers on a five-acre complex. Lewis D. Crenshaw and Richard B. Haxall, both *Review* readers, leased land from Anderson and built the largest flour mill in the nation. Crenshaw and Haxall used profits from the mill to invest in a woolen factory and in the James River and Kanawha Canal Company. Other subscribers such as James Lyons became involved in the commercial development of the city by helping raise money for railroad projects.

¹⁰ Composite Census Records, 1850—1860; J.D.B. De Bow, "Cities of the Mississippi and Ohio," *De Bow's Review* 1 (February 1846): 146; Lawrence H. Larson, *The Rise of the Urban South* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1985), 4—5; David R. Goldfield, "Pursuing the American Dream: Cities in the Old South." In *The City in Southern History: The Growth of Urban Civilization in the South* eds. Blaine A. Brownell and David R. Goldfield (Port Washington: Kennikat Press, 1977), 52—60; Lawrence H. Larsen, *The Urban South: A History* (The University Press of Kentucky, 1990), 23—48; Taylor, *Cavalier and Yankees*, 33.

Lyons chaired a committee for the Richmond and Danville Railroad that raised \$600,000 from private investors to supplement the \$900,000 donation from the state. He also became involved with the Virginia Central Agricultural Society. These were the type of men that De Bow hoped to attract to the *Review*. They had the capital and spirit to change their community.¹¹

The diversified economic development of Nashville attracted similar business leaders to the *Review*. The growing city had fifty readers who represented each sector of the southern economy. William W. Berry, the owner of the largest drug store in the city and estimated to be worth over \$500,000, later became a founder and benefactor of the Bolivar Female Academy. James Woods began as a city merchant and eventually created a profitable iron works in the city. He was engaged in a partnership with Thomas Yeatman, another *Review* reader, and later founded the Cumberland Iron Works. The foundry produced annual revenues that exceeded \$300,000. Later in his career, Woods was in business with John Beaty, a *Review* reader, and started a soap factory in Nashville. In addition to iron production, Woods served as a commissioner for the Bank of Tennessee, Tennessee Marine and Fire Insurance Company, and the New Orleans and Ohio Telegraph Company.¹²

Immigrants became increasingly common in southern cities, and De Bow's readership reflected this demographic change. Almost 5 percent of the *Review's* known

¹¹ Charles Dew, *Bond of Iron: Master and Slave at Buffalo Forge* (New York: W.W. Norton, 1994), 116—17; Ronald Lewis, *Coal, Iron, and Slaves: Industrial Slavery in Maryland and Virginia, 1715—1865* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1979); David R. Goldfield, *Urban Growth in the Age of Sectionalism, 1847—1861* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977), 193—94; Virginia, Volume 43, pg. 204, R.G. Dun & Company Records, Baker Business Library, Harvard University.

¹² Tennessee, Volume 6, pg. 8, R.G. Dun & Company Records, Baker Business Library, Harvard University; Tennessee, Volume 6, pg. 172—73, R.G. Dun & Company Records, Baker Business Library, Harvard University; *Acts of Tennessee, 1830—1850*.

subscribers came from Europe. De Bow encouraged southerners to accept immigrants as a way of bolstering the South's white population. Although many European immigrants worked as common laborers, some became prominent business owners. Maunsel White had left Ireland as a young boy and became a wealthy merchant-planter in Louisiana. John Bones emigrated from Ireland to Augusta, Georgia, where he opened a successful hardware store. He later became a director of the National Bank of Augusta and opened a new store across the Savannah River in Hamburg, South Carolina. Despite the rise of anti-immigrant rhetoric in the South in the mid-1850s, residents in Charleston accepted, for example, John C. Gravely. An anonymous agent for R. G. Dun & Company, the nation's largest credit bureau, reported that Gravely, a *Review* subscriber and immigrant from England, did "moderate business with planters and mechanics, [is] safe and respectable, and accepted by the city." De Bow's willingness to accept immigrants made him popular among Europeans moving to the South.¹³

Transplanted northerners accounted for 13 percent of De Bow's known readers. Many of these northern-born southerners made significant contributions to their communities and to the South. Daniel Pratt had been born in New Hampshire and moved to Alabama in 1833. He developed a model factory complex in Prattville and became an example of industrial success in the *Review*. Despite his success, however, some of Pratt's neighbors remained skeptical of his allegiance to the South. In 1853 an agent from R. G. Dun & Company noted that Pratt had made \$100,000 in charitable contributions to local schools and churches, yet remained unpopular with nearby residents because he

¹³ Composite Census Records, 1850—1860; Georgia, Volume 1B, pg. 5, R.G. Dun & Company Records, Baker Business Library, Harvard University; Alabama, Volume 15, pg. 115, R.G. Dun & Company Records, Baker Business Library, Harvard University.

insisted on having “things his own way and monopolize everything.” De Bow took little notice of Pratt’s northern lineage, perhaps thinking about his own family ties to New Jersey and New York. Oren Metcalfe, another northern-born reader of the *Review*, purchased a large cotton plantation outside of Natchez, Mississippi, and became a respected member of his community. Aside from operating his plantation, Metcalfe opened a general store, worked as a physician, sold insurance, and served as the county sheriff for thirty years. He invested in local transportation projects and served on the board of directors of Jefferson College, Mississippi’s first institution of higher learning.¹⁴

De Bow’s interest in commercial development attracted southern merchants who lived in towns and cities around the South. Of the 1,022 *Review* subscribers with known occupations, 20 percent identified themselves as merchants in federal census records. The growth of cities and new commercial networks in the Southwest increased the profile of the South’s merchants. De Bow saw merchants as an essential link to regional, national, and international markets. He described the role of the merchant as “the promoter of enterprise, the encourager of agriculture, the friend of peace.” De Bow viewed commerce as the motivation behind industrial development and reminded his agricultural readers

¹⁴ Jonathan D. Wells, *The Origins of the Southern Middle Class, 1800—1861* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004), 164—66; Composite Census Records, 1850—1860; J.D.B. De Bow, “Population of Southern States in 1850,” *De Bow’s Review* 19 (September 1855): 328; Fletcher M. Green, *The Role of the Yankee in the Old South* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1972), 1—6; Alabama, Volume 2, p. 12, R.G. Dun & Co. Collection, Baker Library, Harvard Business School; Goodspeed, Volume 2, 432; Ford, Jr., *Origins of Southern Radicalism*, 277. Lacy Ford, Jr. notes that successful merchants in South Carolina’s Upcountry became “shrewd Yankee traders.” Lawrence N. Powell, *New Masters: Northern Planters during the Civil War and Reconstruction* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980).

that “in vain does the farmer labor in the finest climate, on the most fertile soil, if he is beyond the reach of that mercantile agency without which his products are worthless.”¹⁵

The merchants of Charleston supported the literary efforts of their native son. Sixty-two *Review* subscribers lived in the city, making up 35 percent of all known South Carolina readers. A new generation of commercial leaders had emerged in Charleston by the early 1850s. Unlike past generations of merchants who had benefited from Charleston’s early commercial primacy, younger merchants were often self-made and profit-oriented. Bernard O’Neill exemplified the type of merchant De Bow attracted. An immigrant from Ireland, O’Neill worked first as a grocery clerk but within five years opened his own wholesale grocery business. His success as a business owner provided him status in the community, and he became the vice-president of the South Carolina Loan and Trust Company, president of the Hibernia Bank, and a director of the South Carolina Railroad Bank. He later served as a city alderman. An agent from R. G. Dun & Company noted that O’Neill had started with “a few barrels of potatoes and apples” in 1847 and, by 1860, owned nine slaves and a carriage. O’Neill needed the commercial information provided in the *Review*, and De Bow needed readers like O’Neill who encouraged and supported commercial development.¹⁶

¹⁵ In many older monographs such as Frank Owsley’s *Plain Folk of the Old South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1949), urban “plain folk” are rarely mentioned and a southern mercantile class is nonexistent. In *Origins of the New South*, C. Vann Woodward concludes that the emergence of urban, middle-class southerners became significant after the Civil War. Frank J. Byrne, *Becoming Bourgeois: Merchant Culture in the South, 1820—1865* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2006), 17—35; Ford, Jr., *Origins of Southern Radicalism*, 88—95; Thornton, *Politics and Power in a Slave Society*, 273, 310—314; J.D.B. De Bow, “The Merchant—His Character, Position, and Duties,” *De Bow’s Review* 3 (February 1847): 93.

¹⁶ *Cyclopedia of Eminent and Representative Men of the Carolinas of the Nineteenth Century*. (Madison: Brant and Fuller, 1892), 372—73; South Carolina, Volume 6, p. 183, R.G. Dun & Co. Collection, Baker Library, Harvard Business School.

Merchants in Mobile, Alabama, had a similar influence on the development of their community. For many years the city had languished in relative obscurity as transient merchants flooded Mobile during harvest time but then left the city for the remainder of the year. The development of the city stagnated, threatening its commercial position, until a permanent merchant group assumed control of Mobile's future. Albert Stein and Charles Le Baron, both *Review* readers and city merchants, symbolized the commercial ascent of Alabama's largest city. Stein, a transplanted German civil engineer, developed and built the city's water works and improved the freight capacity of Mobile Bay. Le Baron, a commission merchant from Pensacola, Florida, moved to Mobile in 1840 and promised to "leave politics and politicians alone, and devote myself entirely to business pursuits, and to the development in every way of the resources of our Southern country." Le Baron understood the importance of linking the South's interior with Mobile and became a major investor in the Mobile and Ohio Railroad Company. He also helped expand Mobile Bay's commercial capacity. As the owner of a large commission house that dealt with clients in Europe and South America, Le Baron needed unfettered access to domestic and international markets. By 1851 De Bow claimed that Le Baron had become the "identified heart and soul with his adopted city of Mobile and her prosperity."¹⁷

Outside of large coastal cities, merchants became important to the development of small towns throughout the South. The merchant class often invested in a variety of private and public projects that would raise the profile of their community. Their

¹⁷ Thornton III, *Politics and Power in a Slave Society*, 40—42; Albert Stein, "Mobile River and Bay," *De Bow's Review* 16 (March 1854): 225—30; J.D.B. De Bow, "Gallery of Industry and Enterprise: Charles Le Baron of Mobile, Merchant," *De Bow's Review* 10 (June 1851): 694.

interaction with outside market forces provided broad insight into transportation and commercial innovations. Samuel Lancaster, a *Review* subscriber and merchant in Jackson, Tennessee, owned a successful dry goods store. Between 1831 and 1849 Lancaster invested in ten different transportation projects that promised to connect Jackson with larger markets. The commercial success of the western Tennessee town pleased Lancaster, and he later became involved with civic projects that improved the quality of life in Jackson. Lancaster's commitment to commercial and civic development typified the role of merchants in many southern towns. Likewise, in southwestern Virginia, Thomas Boyd, a hotel owner in Wytheville, embodied many of the same traits as Lancaster. Boyd had furnished needed capital for the Virginia and Tennessee Railroad Company when eastern tidewater planters threatened to block state appropriations. He understood the importance of a rail connection to Wytheville's commercial future. Boyd also understood the necessity of civic improvements to attract new growth and invested in public works projects. This type of diversified, entrepreneurial spirit in Jackson and Wytheville embodied De Bow's economic vision for a more commercially integrated South.¹⁸

De Bow hoped that merchants would help integrate the agricultural, industrial, and commercial sectors of the South and serve as intermediaries between urban and rural areas. Southerners, like many other early nineteenth-century Americans, had been conditioned to question the motives of merchants and to fear urban space. De Bow hoped to change those perceptions. Southern merchants became increasingly independent of

¹⁸ *Acts of Tennessee, 1830—1850*; Composite Census Records, 1850—1860; Virginia, Volume 53, pg. 603—04, R.G. Dun & Company Records, Baker Business Library, Harvard University; Kenneth W. Noe, *Southwest Virginia's Railroad: Modernization and the Sectional Crisis in the Civil War Era* (Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2003), 59, 125—26.

planter hegemony. They shaped the interests of rural planters to meet their own needs. Past fears gave way to excitement as commercial development provided new opportunities. Merchants often invested in their communities' development as a way of expanding commercial interest. Urban space became important because it allowed the South's business community to grow more organically without interference from planters and farmers fearful of market forces.¹⁹

Many of De Bow's readers worked in professional positions that supported commercial and industrial development in southern towns and cities. Of De Bow's readers with known occupations, 21 percent worked as lawyers, doctors, or bankers, or in insurance offices. They often provided the capital and leadership needed to fund large projects and became promoters of their growing communities. De Bow became aware of such men and the importance of town boosterism after his visit to Memphis in 1845. At the Memphis convention, he became acquainted with Robertson Topp, a Memphis lawyer, who looked for new ways to promote his adopted hometown. Topp invested in early railroads and helped improve the city's waterfront. He developed neighborhoods in South Memphis and built the Gayoso House, the city's largest hotel. He served two terms in the Tennessee House of Representatives as a Whig. Topp later became the president of the Memphis and Charleston Railroad Company and was an early subscriber to *De Bow's Review*. Impressed with De Bow's work, Topp pledged to find ten new subscribers to prove his support.²⁰

¹⁹ Downey, *Planting a Capitalist South*, 222—26; Wells, *The Origins of the Southern Middle Class*, 6—18.

²⁰ Robert A. Sigafos, *Cotton Row to Beale Street: A Business History of Memphis* (Memphis, TN: Memphis State University Press, 1979), 22–23; Shields McIlwaine, *Memphis: Down in Dixie* (New York:

Robert C. Brinkley, also of Memphis, exhibited the same passion and willingness as Topp to blend personal motivation with public interest. De Bow noted that Brinkley had “set the example himself in improvements, and constantly kept it up by the construction of extensive and substantial buildings in the city, realizing thus an almost princely income from property at first unproductive.” Brinkley served as president of the Little Rock and Memphis Railroad Company and the Planters Bank of Memphis. He later built the Peabody Hotel in downtown Memphis as a symbol of his city’s prosperity. De Bow noted that Brinkley encouraged “with a most liberal hand, every public enterprise, the intent and effect of which are to promote the prosperity and growth of Memphis.”²¹

In Huntsville, Alabama, Thomas Fearn helped make the city into an important commercial and industrial center in the northern part of the state. Fearn had been born in Virginia and spent time studying medicine in the North and Europe before moving to Huntsville in 1820. Although trained in medicine, he became a leading member of the city’s business community by investing in local canals, railroads, turnpikes, and banks. He also served in the state legislature, was a trustee of the University of Alabama, and helped fund the construction of the city’s water works. Fearn’s commitment to Huntsville was absolute, yet others found his efforts self-serving and manipulative. The local Democratic newspaper suggested that he belonged to a “Royal Party” of prominent merchants and ridiculed public projects that yielded private profits. Local opponents worried that greed and mismanagement of public funds might create a privileged aristocracy that would corrupt the republican values of the community. Although

E.P. Dutton and Company,, 1948), 85; State of Tennessee, *Acts of Tennessee* (Nashville, TN: [s.n]), 38:48.2, 47:223.3, 48:182.2.

²¹ J.D.B. De Bow, “Gallery of Industry and Enterprise, R.C. Brinkley Esq. of Memphis, Tennessee,” *De Bow’s Review* 11 (September 1851): 339.

opposition to commercial progress continued, the city's commitment to growth created commercial and industrial momentum in northern Alabama.²²

De Bow's interest in the South's railroad system made him popular among southerners who saw economic and social benefits in railroad construction. Railroad promoters such as James Robb and Judah Benjamin used the *Review* to encourage general transportation development in the South. Others like Samuel Tate, Milton Brown, and Vernon K. Stevenson benefited from De Bow's willingness to endorse individual railroads. Tate, the president of the Memphis and Charleston Railroad Company, alerted De Bow to possible connections between his rail line and mineral deposits in northern Alabama and western Tennessee. Tate later moved to Alabama and helped develop Birmingham's postwar railroad and iron industry. Milton Brown, the president of the Mississippi Central and Tennessee Railroad Company and later the Mobile and Ohio Railroad Company, linked Jackson, Tennessee, to markets in the Ohio River Valley and the lower Mississippi River Valley. Vernon K. Stevenson, another *Review* reader and president of the Nashville and Chattanooga Railroad and the Nashville and Northwestern Railroad companies, began his career as the owner of a dry goods store and eventually became Tennessee's foremost railroad promoter. He understood the necessity of linking Nashville to markets in the North and South and raised money to build railroads and promote towns. De Bow relied on individual investors and railroad executives to

²² Owen, *History of Alabama and Dictionary of Alabama Biography*, 590–92. Daniel S. Dupre, *Transforming the Cotton Frontier: Madison County, Alabama, 1800–1840*. (Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press, 1997), 49, 73–82; The evolving relationship between antebellum southerners and a modern market economy has been well-documented. The negative reaction in Huntsville to the Royal Party was similar to reaction in South Carolina's Upcountry and in northern Georgia. See Lacy Ford, Jr., *The Origins of Southern Radicalism: The South Carolina Upcountry, 1800–1860* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988); Steven Hahn, *The Roots of Southern Populism: Yeoman Farmers and the Transformation of the Georgia Upcountry, 1850–1880* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983).

encourage transportation development. Between 1850 and 1860 more railroad mileage was constructed in the South than in any other part of the nation.²³

De Bow's readership reflected the steady growth of industry in the antebellum South. Some of the South's largest industrialists—Daniel Pratt, William Gregg, and Joseph R. Anderson—subscribed to the *Review*. Other less prominent industrialists helped their communities become more economically diversified. Robert Jemison, a reader in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, owned a saw mill, flour mill, toll bridge, and stagecoach line. He also served as president of the Northeast and Southwest Alabama Railroad and on the board of the Warrior Manufacturing Company. East of Tuscaloosa in Bibb County, David Scott built a large cotton factory in 1834 and continued to manufacture cloth goods until his factory was burned by James Wilson's raiders in 1865. In Clover Hill, Virginia, James H. Cox symbolized the successful integration of industrial and transportation development in the South. In 1840 he purchased land outside of Richmond and started the Clover Hill Mining Company. Rich coal deposits produced high profits, and by 1853, Cox built a twenty-one mile railroad spur that connected his coal pits to the Richmond and Petersburg Railroad. Eager to build on his coal and railroad empire, Cox constructed a large hotel on his property and transported city tourists on trains that had supplied coal to Richmond's factories. De Bow hoped that successful examples of industrialization would encourage other southerners to think about factories and mills.²⁴

²³ Tennessee, Volume 29, pg. 52, R.G. Dun & Company Records, Baker Business Library, Harvard University; Jesse C. Burt, Jr., "The Nashville and Chattanooga Railroad, 1854—1872: The Era of Transition," *East Tennessee Historical Society Publications* 23 (1951): 58—76. Woodward, *Origins of the New South*, 126—27.

²⁴ Horace M. Bond, "Social and Economic Forces in Alabama Reconstruction," *The Journal of Negro History* 23 (July 1938): 320—22; James F. Doster, "The Shelby Iron Works Collection in the University of Alabama Library," *Bulletin of the Business Historical Society* 26 (December 1952): 215; Robert C. Black, III, *The Railroads of the Confederacy* (Durham: The University of North Carolina Press,

The diversified economic growth of Montgomery, Alabama, served as an example of how a group of *Review* subscribers collectively influenced the direction of an individual community. In 1848 De Bow noted that the “the music of the saw, hammer, and trowel is heard in almost every street” of Montgomery. The city had benefited from strong political support by a group of transplanted Georgians who moved from the Broad River area of eastern Georgia to Alabama’s Black Belt, where they built a town along the Alabama River. Montgomery steadily grew as local cotton planters and merchants made it their regional hub for commercial and industrial activity. De Bow’s readership reflected the diversified development of the city. Of Montgomery’s thirty-three identified readers, nine were planters, ten worked as merchants, nine maintained professional careers, and three worked in manufacturing. Many of these readers invested in transportation projects and public works projects that expanded the commercial influence of the city. Of the sixteen readers with known investment records, twelve owned shares in local railroads, five in plank road companies, seven helped establish gas lighting in the city, and seven more served on the board of directors of manufacturing firms. Revisiting the city in the pages of the *Review* in 1858, De Bow claimed that “Montgomery is destined . . . to rank first among Southern inland towns.”²⁵

No other resident of Montgomery or perhaps the South represented the entrepreneurial spirit of De Bow better than his reader Charles Teed Pollard. Pollard understood the necessity of linking agriculture, commerce, and industry to create an

1952), 145, 157—58; Marshall Boshier, *Chesterfield County, Virginia: A Collection of Notes Peculiar to its Early History* (Chesterfield Historical Society, 1989), 192, 218.

²⁵ J.D.B. De Bow, “Montgomery, Alabama,” *De Bow’s Review* 4 (November 1847): 402—03; Composite Census Records, 1850—1860; Thornton, *Politics and Power in a Slave Society*, 8—12; J.D.B. De Bow, “Montgomery, Alabama,” *De Bow’s Review* 26 (January 1850): 117.

integrated economic system. He had been born in Virginia and worked as a clerk and bookkeeper before moving to Alabama in 1828. Pollard settled in Montgomery and married the daughter of John B. Scott, an original Broad River land speculator and settler in Alabama's Black Belt. Pollard invested in a merchandizing firm and partnered with Francis Meriwether Gilmer, Jr., another *Review* subscriber, to open a cotton storage warehouse. Pollard invested heavily in railroads and mining companies. He later became president of the Montgomery and West Point Railroad Company and other regional lines. In addition to his railroad investments, Pollard also served on the boards of the Bank of Mobile, Montgomery and Tuscaloosa Plank Road Company, Exchange Hotel, Montgomery Gas Light Company, the city's first ice factory, and the Montgomery Copper Mining Company in Talladega, Alabama. Understanding the importance of social and cultural development, he helped start the Alabama Bible Society and University of the South and served as chairman of the building committee that oversaw construction of the new state capital building. Pollard continued to wield influence on local and regional urban development and railroad growth until his death in 1888.²⁶

Other *Review* readers benefited from Montgomery's diverse development and helped support the city's growth. Thomas Hill Watts, a wealthy lawyer and successful politician, invested in railroad companies and in the Pine Barren Manufacturing Company. William Taylor and Joseph Winters underwrote railroad and plank road construction and gas lighting in the city. Winters also commanded the local militia unit known as the Metropolitan Guards. Enough general readers lived in Montgomery to

²⁶ Owen, *History of Alabama, Volume IV*, 1373; Thornton, *Politics and Power in a Slave Society*, 271—77; Alabama, Volume 20, p. 259, R. G. Dun & Co. Collection, Baker Library, Harvard Business School; Mildred Beale, "Charles Teed Pollard, Industrialist," *Alabama Historical Quarterly* (Spring 1940): 72—85; (Summer 1940): 189—202.

support Arnond Pfister's bookstore. In 1846 four *Review* readers, Pollard, Francis M. Gilmer, Jr., Charles Crommelin, and William Taylor, joined to construct the Exchange Hotel. By 1860 city merchants handled over a million bales of cotton, manufacturers had started thirteen factories, and four railroads connected or would soon connect Montgomery to other parts of the nation. Frederick Law Olmstead, the northern traveler who rarely complimented southern institutions, described Montgomery as "a prosperous town, with very pleasant suburbs, and a remarkably enterprising population among which there is a considerable portion of Northern and foreign-born business-men and mechanics." Despite Olmsted's claim of northern influence on the city's business leaders, only six of De Bow's thirty-three readers had been born in the North or Europe. Like thousands of other southern planters, merchants, and industrialists, these men read the *Review* because it represented how they felt about the South's future.²⁷

Only 23 percent of De Bow's known readers identified themselves as planters or farmers in census records. Many more subscribers in all likelihood owned and farmed land but gave a different occupation as their primary source of income or interest. De Bow focused on improvements to large plantations, and his readership reflected this decision. Of 323 planters and farmers who subscribed to the *Review*, 13 percent owned more than \$100,000 in real estate and 17 percent had more than that amount in personal property. At a time when only 2.5 percent of all southerners possessed more than fifty slaves and the average slaveholder owned ten slaves, De Bow's average agricultural

²⁷ William Garrett, *Reminiscences of Public Men in Alabama* (Spartanburg: The Reprint Company, Publishers, 1872), 723—25; Owen, *History of Alabama and Directory of Alabama Biography, Volume IV*, 1653; William W. Rogers, *Confederate Home Front: Montgomery During the Civil War* (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999), 15; Garrett, *Reminiscences of Public Men in Alabama*, 554; Rogers, *Confederate Home Front*, 3—5; Frederick Law Olmsted, *Journey in the Seaboard Slave States: With Remarks on their Economy* (New York: Mason Brothers, 1861), 549.

reader owned 81 slaves. Most of these planters lived in the eastern cotton belt of South Carolina and Georgia, and the Black Belt of central Alabama, northern Mississippi, and southwestern Tennessee. These areas had become the foundation of the South's plantation economy, and De Bow understood his reader's reliance on cotton and slavery.²⁸

The *Review* became reading material for some of the largest plantation owners in the antebellum South. Joshua and Mayham Ward of Georgetown, South Carolina, inherited five rice plantations with over 1,100 slaves from their father Joshua John Ward. The Wards attempted to operate their rice empire using strict business practices as prescribed by De Bow but admitted that it was difficult to control the hourly routines of slaves. Despite these problems, the five plantations produced 4.4 million pounds of rice in 1860. Another reader, Meredith Calhoun, a sugar planter from Rapides Parish, Louisiana, purchased 14,000 acres from his father-in-law in 1836 and divided the land into four plantations. With the help of hundreds of slaves, he built a large plantation and one of the state's most modern sugar mills. He also developed an inland port near Colfax, Louisiana, to ship sugar directly to buyers. Calhoun purchased a newspaper and supported the Democratic Party. He was reputed to be the model for the character Simon Legree in Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin*.²⁹

De Bow's political ambiguity during the 1840s and part of the 1850s made the *Review* appealing to a wide spectrum of southern readers. Before the collapse of the two-

²⁸ Composite Census Records, 1850—1860; Aiken, *The Cotton Plantation South*, 10—11; Oakes, *The Ruling Race*, 65; Gavin Wright, *The Political Economy of the Cotton South: Households, Markets, and Wealth in the Nineteenth Century* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1978), 32; J.D.B. De Bow, "The Future of the South," *De Bow's Review* 10 (February 1851): 132.

²⁹ Charles Joyner, *Down by the Riverside: A South Carolina Slave Community* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984), 23—24; Glenn R. Conrad, *Dictionary of Louisiana Biography, Volume I* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana Historical Association, 1988), 146; *Washington Post*, August 31, 1896.

party system in the mid-1850s, *Review* readers with known political affiliations were divided equally between the Democratic and Whig parties. As a nominal Democrat with Whig proclivities, De Bow understood how to appeal to both groups. His political education had come from following John C. Calhoun's career, and much like his idol, De Bow understood the importance of building broad support among southerners.³⁰

De Bow usually discussed political topics within the context of economic reform. He made few assumptions about the political feelings of his subscribers. Most of his readers assumed pro-business characteristics normally associated with the Whig Party, but many of them were Democrats. Among industrialists, Daniel Pratt and Joseph R. Anderson were prominent Whigs, whereas James H. Cox and Malcolm E. Smith were staunch Democrats. In the agricultural sector, *Review* readers who owned highly mechanized sugar plantations differed politically with cotton planters in Alabama's Black Belt. De Bow understood the economic position of both groups. Some readers like Nathaniel Greene Foster of Madison, Georgia, and Thomas H. Watts of Montgomery, Alabama, began reading the *Review* as a Whig, switched to the American Party in the mid-1850s, and joined the Democratic party by the time of the Civil War. Throughout these political changes, both men continued to subscribe to the *Review*. De Bow's editorial vision encompassed pro-southern ideas that both parties advocated and supported.³¹

³⁰ William Cooper, *The South and the Power of Slavery, 1828–1856* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978); Michael F. Holt, *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Daniel Walker Howe, *The Political Culture of the American Whigs* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979); Charles Sellers, "Who Were the Southern Whigs?" *American Historical Review* 59 (1954): 335–46.

³¹ Composite Census Records, 1850–1860.

Despite their common economic outlook, many of De Bow's readers shared an inability to pay their subscriptions on time. Despite De Bow's reputation as a successful editor, the shortage of paying customers hurt the *Review*. De Bow pleaded with subscribers to pay their bills, reminding them that "the first necessity of such a journal is money . . . [and] the experience of ten years has enabled the editor to acquire facilities possessed by few, if any others." Aaron V. Brown, an ex-governor of Tennessee, wrote De Bow a personal apology and included money for two unpaid years. In frustration, De Bow reprinted an article by the *New York Mirror* that blamed southerners for neglecting their own writers and periodicals. The pro-southern editor of the *Mirror* noted that he often received "an unremitting shower of public and private praise from the South, accompanied with an unremitting neglect to subscribe and pay for the paper." De Bow felt proud of his work and reminded readers of its uniqueness in the South. Reader apathy bothered him because he felt it reflected on the *Review*. In late 1854 he asked his readers a question: "Should the planter or the manufacturer, the merchant or the railroad advocate, or shareholder deriving benefit, direct or even indirect, from the labors which have been performed, not cheerfully appropriate a modicum of that benefit to the support of those labors?"³²

De Bow had gathered support by offering practical articles to readers interested in commercial growth, urban development, industrialization, agricultural reform, and railroad construction. These parts of the southern economy needed to be connected before

³² J.D.B. De Bow, "To Our Subscribers," *De Bow's Review* 18 (April 1855): 558; J.D.B. De Bow, "Notes," *De Bow's Review* 18 (May 1855): 590; Aaron V. Brown to J.D.B. De Bow, November 9, 1855, Martha De Bow Casey Collection, Tennessee State Library; J.D.B. De Bow, "Events of the Month, Personal Notices, Book Notices, Etc." *De Bow's Review* 18 (March 1855): 316—19; J.D.B. De Bow, "Address to Subscribers and Others," *De Bow's Review* 17 (December 1854): 644.

the South could compete with the North. Although De Bow wanted broad support, he directed much of his editorial content toward a small but growing cohort of middle- to upper-class southern merchants, professionals, entrepreneurs, and planters. The 1,404 known *Review* subscribers represent a larger group of readers who embraced economic diversity and modernity. De Bow became their public advocate. As much as southern readers came to rely on the *Review*, De Bow needed their support to remain in business. Without their support, his message of regional economic growth and personal self-improvement might have gone unnoticed by uninterested or complacent southerners. He spoke to his readers directly through the *Review*, and they often responded with letters and articles that embraced his ideas. Not all southern readers supported De Bow's efforts or agreed with his general themes, but enough did to make the *Review* the preeminent southern journal by the early 1850s.

Chapter Five: The Convulsions of a Nationalist, 1848-1854

De Bow struggled constantly to keep the *Review* financially viable. Readers failed to pay their subscription payments on time, and he compounded the problem by keeping poor records. His agents took money from subscribers but sometimes did not forward the money to him. De Bow neglected to print advertisements that had been paid for, and high printing costs and an ill-advised investment in a printing press further diminished his resources. He failed to print issues for July and August 1847 and May 1848. Anxious to maintain his business, De Bow borrowed money to keep publishing. In August 1848 he reported he had lost \$8,000. He pleaded with readers to submit their payments. “What have the Editor and Publishers realized from the three years of unremitting toil? Literally nothing! . . . send us the *pittance* that *remains due, even if it must be borrowed from a friendly neighbor.*” He reduced the size of the *Review* and appealed again to readers to pay their subscriptions: “Remember us, we pray you, for our funds are very low, and ought, in all conscience, to be replenished forthwith.” Unable to pay his expenses, De Bow closed his office in December 1848.¹

News of De Bow’s failure circulated among affluent southerners who read or contributed to the *Review*. Maunsel White pledged financial support to his friend, and readers from around the South sent subscriptions. R. F. W. Allston of South Carolina delivered eight new paid orders, intending to give them to friends. Miles McGehee of Bolivar, Mississippi, bought ten subscriptions and hoped to resell them to neighbors. James H. Hammond, a former governor of South Carolina, sent money and a letter that

¹ J.D.B. De Bow, “Publishing Business,” *De Bow’s Review* 6 (August 1848): 159—60; J.D.B. De Bow, “Editor’s Arm Chair,” *De Bow’s Review* 6 (October/November 1848): 378.

chastised southerners for their literary neglect. Without continued financial support, however, De Bow warned his readers, the next closure might be permanent.²

Even with the *Review* shuttered in early 1849, De Bow continued to accumulate material for future articles. In June 1849 he took an extended trip to Tennessee, Kentucky, and Indiana. He canvassed Louisville, Kentucky, for new readers and met Hamilton Smith, a local factory owner and *Review* subscriber. De Bow enjoyed Smith's lavish home and visited his cotton factory in Cannelton, Indiana. Located along the northern bank of the Ohio River, the town of Cannelton had become the financial centerpiece for a group of northern investors who hoped to develop 7,000 acres of land, mine nearby coal deposits, and construct a cotton factory. Smith hoped that the cotton factory's proximity to southern cotton fields would decrease production costs and undercut competitors in New England. Like Prattville and Graniteville, Cannelton became a cotton manufacturing center. Smith's entrepreneurial spirit intrigued De Bow, and before continuing to Frankfurt, Kentucky, he elicited a promise from Smith to write articles for the *Review*. De Bow's visit to Louisville left him invigorated and eager to get the *Review* going again.³

² J.D.B. De Bow, "The Publishing Business," *De Bow's Review* 7 (July 1849): 101—02.

³ J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial Note of Travel and Books," *De Bow's Review* 7 (August 1849): 189—90; Hamilton Smith, "Southern and Western Manufacturers," *De Bow's Review* 7 (August 1849): 128—34; Barbara Wriston, "Who Was the Architect of the Indiana Cotton Mill, 1849—1850," *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 24 (May 1965): 171—73; Holland Thompson, *From the Cotton Field to the Cotton Mill: A Study of the Industrial Transition in North Carolina* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1906), 53—54. Thompson argues that few southerners wanted cotton factories in the South because the introduction of industry would have violated their spirit of independence and hindered their chances of becoming a part of the planter class. Thompson's dismissive conclusion ignored the steady rise of cotton mills in the South between 1840 and 1860. Robert S. Starobin points out that the value of cotton manufacturing increased from \$1.5 million to \$4.5 million during this time and that investments in cotton factories doubled during the same period. Starobin, *Industrial Slavery in the Old South*, 11—13.

During the closure, De Bow focused his attention on the *Review*'s business affairs. He brought in his younger brother Benjamin F. De Bow to serve as his business manager. With renewed subscriptions, more borrowed money, and new promises of support, he resumed publication of the *Review* in July 1849.⁴

De Bow was even more determined in his advocacy of southern industrial development as a natural extension of the agricultural sector. Instead of sending cotton to northern and European factories, southerners could produce and market their own finished products, De Bow argued. Hamilton Smith challenged southerners to become producers of finished goods as well as consumers. Mark R. Cockrill of Nashville proposed the construction of regional cotton factories staffed with slaves from large plantations. Cockrill argued that one-fifth of the total slave population could be redirected to factories without jeopardizing cotton production. He encouraged planters to build roads and railroads that linked isolated plantations with factories and regional ports. Cockrill's reputation as an innovative planter and stock breeder—he owned a 5,500 acre plantation outside of Nashville and two others in Mississippi—lent credibility to his ideas. De Bow seconded these ideas, rousing his readers to “action, Action, ACTION!!!!—not in the rhetoric of Congress, but in the busy hum of mechanism, and in the thrifty operations of the hammer and the anvil.” Cockrill and De Bow believed that increased cotton manufacturing would develop new domestic markets for finished goods in the South.⁵

⁴ Skipper, *J. D. B. De Bow: Magazinst of the Old South*, 23—24.

⁵ Mark R. Cockrill, “Manufacture of Cotton by its Producers,” *De Bow's Review* 7 (December 1849): 484—90; J.D.B. De Bow, “The Cause of the South,” *De Bow's Review* 8 (July 1850): 120; Broadus Mitchell, *The Rise of Cotton Mills in the South* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1921), 48. Mitchell asserts that the industrial heritage of the antebellum South offered little foundation for the South's

Almost every subsequent issue of the *Review* provided an overview of industrial growth in the South. Full-length articles and brief dispatches updated readers on the development of southern manufacturing. De Bow scoured local newspapers and relied on friends and contributors to provide information and articles on successful endeavors. In August 1850 he published a brief list of cotton factories in Alabama submitted by Daniel Pratt, who estimated that twelve new factories with almost 20,000 spindles had been put into operation in the state. Similar reports from Charleston, Atlanta, and Augusta mentioned the construction of individual cotton factories in each city. By November 1850 De Bow counted sixteen factories in South Carolina, thirty-six in Georgia, and thirty in Tennessee. Looking at past governmental reports, he noted that southern factories had increased their consumption of cotton from 75,000 bales in September 1848 to 110,000 bales a year later. De Bow created a sense of progress that he hoped might inspire other southerners to invest in new industrial projects.⁶

De Bow featured successful entrepreneurs in other industries. Joseph R.

Anderson's Tredegar Iron Works in Richmond earned special distinction for producing

postbellum economic growth. He marks the South's "industrial birth" to be the 1880s and 1890s and to have reached maturity after World War I in Broadus Mitchell and George S. Mitchell, *The Industrial Revolution in the South* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1930), 1—12. Later studies have asserted that the 1840s and 1850s were periods of intense industrial development. In "The Southern Industrial Gospel Before 1860," *Journal of Southern History* 12 (August 1946): 386—402, Herbert Collins traces the impetus for southern cotton manufacturing back to the mid-1840s. Robert S. Starobin notes that during this time the South accounted for 20 percent of the national capital invested in industry and that the value of southern manufacturing increased \$34 million in 1840 to almost \$100 million in 1860. Starobin, *Industrial Slavery in the Old South*, 12—16; George Stueckrath, "Incidents in the Early Settlement of the State of Tennessee, and Nashville," *De Bow's Review* 27 (July 1859): 84—94.

⁶ Daniel Pratt, "List of Cotton Factories in the State of Alabama," *De Bow's Review* 9 (August 1850): 214; J.D.B. De Bow, "Department of Manufactures and Commerce," *De Bow's Review* 9 (August 1850): 214—15; Hamilton Smith, "Influence of Manufactures on the Growth of Cities," *De Bow's Review* 9 (October 1850): 436—39; J.D.B. De Bow, "Progressive Manufacture of Coarse Cottons," *De Bow's Review* 9 (November 1850): 557; J.D.B. De Bow, "Gallery of Industry and Enterprise, William Gregg of South Carolina," *De Bow's Review* 10 (March 1851): 348—52; William Gregg, "Manufactures in South Carolina and the South," *De Bow's Review* 11 (August 1851): 123—25, 131—33; J.D.B. De Bow, "Southern Manufacturing Competition," *De Bow's Review* 9 (November 1850): 558; J.D.B. De Bow, "Progress of the Cotton Manufacture in the United States," *De Bow's Review* 8 (March 1850): 272.

raw iron and finished locomotives and railroad axles that were then sold to southern customers. De Bow wrote a lengthy biographical article on John G. Winter, a prominent entrepreneur and industrialist, who settled in Alabama after making his fortune in banking and finance in Georgia. Winter used his wealth to fund the Montgomery Iron Works, a flour mill, a paper mill, and a plank road. De Bow lauded his industrial spirit and sense of risk. He hoped that future generations of southerners would become familiar with these early industrial leaders and recognize that “with the material upon the spot, with an abundance of water power, or with inexhaustible coal and iron fields, provisions without stint, and cheap labor, particularly that of the slave, which is always practicable, it will be strange if the South and West permit much longer their wealth to be drained away by northern manufacturers.”⁷

De Bow supported industrial slavery as the most cost-effective form of labor for southern factories and railroads. In October 1850 he visited Saluda Factory near Columbia, South Carolina, and watched slaves work under white supervision. A visiting weaver from Lowell, Massachusetts, confirmed De Bow’s feelings about the excellent quality of work being done at Saluda. De Bow’s visit reaffirmed his belief that slavery could infuse the South’s manufacturing sector with new energy. He rejected counterarguments that slaves lacked the intelligence or work ethic to operate expensive or complicated machinery. He also believed that railroad companies could save money by buying slaves instead of renting them from planters. A *Review* contributor confirmed De Bow’s argument after studying the use of slave labor on two railroad companies in

⁷ J.D.B. De Bow, “Home Manufactures,” *De Bow’s Review* 7 (November 1849): 454—55; J.D.B. De Bow, “Gallery of Industry and Enterprise: No. 4. Hon. John T. Winter, of Georgia,” *De Bow’s Review* 10 (June 1851): 582—86; J.D.B. De Bow, “Home Manufactures,” *De Bow’s Review* 7 (November 1849): 454.

Virginia. The reader reported that the James River and Kanawha Railroad Company and the Virginia and Tennessee Railroad Company saved more than half of their annual labor costs after buying slaves. De Bow reminded readers that these savings would be passed down to shareholders.⁸

De Bow's economic agenda inevitably was complicated by political questions. The discovery of gold in California and subsequent debate over the territory's admission into the Union agitated sectional divisions between the North and South. De Bow viewed the sectional debate in economic terms, estimating that western markets could produce \$350 million annually. In October 1849 he attended a railroad convention in Memphis to discuss the impending transcontinental railroad. Convention delegates supported a railroad between Memphis and San Diego, California, as the most logical and efficient route. Although De Bow supported this route, he worried that sectional interests among northerners and southerners might delay construction and allow European competitors to gain control of western markets. When the debate over California's admission into the Union occurred in Congress, De Bow supported Henry Clay's compromise bill. He was disappointed when it was defeated. Although De Bow claimed to abhor extremism on both sides, he attended the Nashville Convention in June 1850 at which delegates from nine southern states discussed responses to limits on the western expansion of slavery. De Bow found the convention to be tiresome and unproductive. He admitted, however, that

⁸ J.D.B. De Bow, "Saluda Factory, S.C.—Negro Labor," *De Bow's Review* 9 (October 1850): 432—33; J.D.B. De Bow, "Excessive Slave Population—The Remedy," *De Bow's Review* 12 (February 1852): 182—85; R.G. Morris, "Slave Labor upon Public Works at the South," *De Bow's Review* 17 (July 1854): 76—82; Starobin, *Industrial Slavery in the Old South*, 221—23.

the exhibition of southern unity stirred sectional pride within him. De Bow continued to hope that a peaceful solution could be reached.⁹

In the midst of a national debate in the summer of 1850, De Bow escaped New Orleans to explore new areas and gain personal insight into southern society. He visited various towns along the Gulf Coast and evaluated their commercial potential and natural beauty. De Bow enjoyed his time at a resort in beautiful, tranquil Point Clear, Alabama. At Mississippi Springs, Mississippi, De Bow spoke about railroad development with N. D. Coleman, a *Review* reader and railroad president. Despite maintaining a heavy work load while traveling, De Bow managed to enjoy time with “hopeful maidens and gay widows.” He played pool, drank, and smoked cigars with prominent planters also relaxing at the resort.¹⁰

The passage of Stephen Douglas’s compromise bills in September 1850 created hope in De Bow that an amicable solution had been reached in the sectional crisis. De Bow applauded the Fugitive Slave Law as essential to southern property rights. He accepted popular sovereignty as a way for new territories to decide their place in the Union. De Bow expressed relief to his readers, hoping “that God grant that the verdict be *peace*, and that some measure shall be devised for the preservation of this glorious Union, in a manner that many cause no section of it to blush.” Although relieved by the terms of

⁹ Van Deusen, *The Ante-Bellum Southern Commercial Conventions*, 27—30; J.D.B. De Bow, “The Memphis Convention,” *De Bow’s Review* 8 (March 1850): 217—32; J.D.B. De Bow, “Pacific Railroad,” *De Bow’s Review* 9 (December 1850): 601—14; Potter, *The Impending Crisis*, 465—66; James M. McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1988), 64—77; David M. Potter, *The Impending Crisis, 1848—1861*, (New York: Harper Colophon, 1976), 13, 16—17; J.D.B. De Bow, “The Wilmot Provisos Exclusion,” *De Bow’s Review* 4 (December 1847): 557—58; Thelma Jennings, *The Nashville Convention: Southern Movement for Unity, 1848—1851* (Memphis: Memphis State University Press, 1980), 3—12; Potter, *The Impending Crisis*, 123—30.

¹⁰ J.D.B. De Bow, “Summer Ramblings,” *De Bow’s Review* 9 (September 1850): 347—50.

the political compromise, he remained concerned about the growing influence of abolitionism among northern moderates.¹¹

De Bow continued to support southern economic development within the national context. He encouraged his readers to use the North as an economic model for their own progress. Southern entrepreneurs could emulate the success of northern factories, mills, cities, and railroads, De Bow reasoned, and become direct competitors in national and international markets. He hoped that economic progress would stabilize the political relationship between the North and South. In a speech at the Fair of the American Institute in New York City, De Bow admitted to his northern audience that “in my own region I would imitate very much what belongs to your character and career.” He noted that the South had much to offer the nation and that “a great revolution is in progress.” De Bow stressed that southerners had embraced agricultural reform, urban development, industrialization, and commercial growth. His reassuring words and moderate tone invoked images of a great southern revolution that would benefit the entire nation.¹²

The editorial tone of the *Review* remained balanced during the sectional crisis. De Bow hoped to attract a broad audience and wanted to appeal to moderate southerners while appearing strong on regional topics. Frustrated by the lack of support among southern nationalists, De Bow simultaneously criticized South Carolina’s press for

¹¹ J.D.B. De Bow, “California, the New El Dorado,” *De Bow’s Review* 8 (June 1850): 538—541; Potter, *The Impending Crisis*, 13, 16—17; J.D.B. De Bow, “The Wilmot Provisos Exclusion,” *De Bow’s Review* 4 (December 1847): 557—58; “Slavery in the New Territories,” *De Bow’s Review* 7 (July 1849): 62—73; J.D.B. De Bow, “The Cause of the South,” *De Bow’s Review* 9 (July 1850): 121; J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial Notes,” *De Bow’s Review* 9 (September 1850): 352; J.D.B. De Bow, “Fugitive Slaves,” *De Bow’s Review* 9 (November 1850): 567—68.

¹² J.D.B. De Bow, “The South and the Union,” *De Bow’s Review* 10 (February 1851): 151—62; Paul Gaston, *The New South Creed: A Study in Southern Mythmaking* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1970), 42—47, 223—24; Robert Darden Little, “The Ideology of the New South: A Study in the Development of Ideas, 1865—1910 (Ph.D. diss. The University of Chicago, 1950), 14—18.

framing “an argument for disunion at all hazards, even were the slavery question closed up and amicably settled . . . this course is suicidal to the southern cause.” In another editorial, he condemned his personal friend and college classmate, William H. Trescott, for suggesting that free labor and slavery had made the North and South socially and economically incompatible. De Bow countered Trescott’s assumption by suggesting that free labor and slave labor worked toward common goals.¹³

On the other hand, De Bow recognized the influence of condemnations of southern slavery. He took particular note of non-southerners who supported slavery. The British editor William Chambers was an opponent of slavery when he arrived in the South, but during an extended trip through the region he came to accept the social and economic benefits of slave labor. De Bow seized upon the similar transformation of Solon Robinson, a noted northern agriculturalist, who also toured the South. Robinson admitted that he had ambivalent feelings about slavery until he witnessed its effectiveness. De Bow appreciated the importance to national public opinion of outsiders’ approval of the South’s peculiar institution.¹⁴

The rapid growth of northern and European factories and railroads made De Bow suspicious of the motives of those who attacked slavery. Great Britain became a favorite target of southerners who saw hypocrisy in British attitudes toward slavery. Although De Bow understood the role of cotton in the relationship between England and the South, he

¹³ J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial and Literary Department,” *De Bow’s Review* 10 (February 1851): 242; J.D.B. De Bow, “The Position and Course of the South,” *De Bow’s Review* 10 (February 1851): 231—32.

¹⁴ J.D.B. De Bow, “William Chambers on Slavery,” *De Bow’s Review* 18 (April 1855): 448—54; J.D.B. De Bow, “The South and Her Remedies,” *De Bow’s Review* 10 (March 1851): 265—268; Solon Robinson, “Negro Slavery at the South,” Pts. 1 and 2 *De Bow’s Review* 7 (September 1849): 206—25; (November 1849): 379—89; Herbert A. Kellar, ed., *Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturalist, Volume 2* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1936), 253—54; Robinson, “Negro Slavery at the South,” 206.

criticized slave emancipation in the British West Indies as an attempt to undercut slave labor. He attacked British abolitionists and wondered if the South's biggest buyer of cotton used abolitionism as an economic tool to reduce southern productivity. John Forsyth, the editor of the *Mobile Register*, concurred with De Bow and argued that slavery had also been the foundation of northern industrial progress. Forsyth reminded apathetic southerners that "slavery, so far from being the cause of our retardation, is the nursing mother of the prosperity of the North."¹⁵

De Bow continued to promote a regional railroad network. He explained to readers how railroads needed to follow the agricultural and commercial patterns of the South. Frost lines, harvest patterns, mineral deposits, and towns and cities had to be accounted for when railroads were built. De Bow understood the importance of shipping goods along a North-South axis as well as in an East-West direction. He traveled to meetings and legislative sessions to promote his vision of railroad development. In October 1851 he addressed the Tennessee Legislature on "the crowning achievements of the . . . railroad . . . in elevating and perfecting our civilization and our progress." De Bow stressed that railroads created a sense of community and cohesiveness. He urged lawmakers to fund railroad construction immediately or risk becoming marginalized by northern progress.¹⁶

¹⁵ J.D.B. De Bow, "Improved Sugar Process," *De Bow's Review* 9 (December 1850): 665—69; John Forsyth, "The North and the South," *De Bow's Review* 17 (October 1854): 361—78; I.T. Danson, "Connection between American Slavery and the British Cotton Manufacture," *De Bow's Review* 22 (March 1857): 265—88.

¹⁶ M. Butt Hewson, "Thoughts on a Rail-Road System for New Orleans," *De Bow's Review* 11 (October/November 1851): 471—74; Marshall S. Legan, "Railroad Sentiment in Northern Louisiana in the 1850s," *Louisiana History* 17 (1976): 125—41; J.D.B. De Bow, "Rail-road Prospects and Progress," *De Bow's Review* 12 (May 1852): 492—507; Potter, *The Impending Crisis*, 146—47.

The proposed route of the new transcontinental railroad continued to worry De Bow. He supported a southern route and aligned himself with a group of Louisiana merchants and politicians led by Pierre Soulé and Judah Benjamin. These two had invested heavily in the Tehuantepec Railroad Company and hoped to connect New Orleans with the Pacific Coast. Their plan included purchasing a right-of-way through Mexican territory and building an interoceanic railroad that would guarantee the inclusion of southern ports. Stephen Douglas's simultaneous attempt to secure a northern railroad route through Chicago intensified De Bow's efforts. Douglas had organized political support and purchased public land for the Illinois Central Railroad in anticipation of securing a northern route through the Nebraska territory. De Bow understood Douglas's motives and increased his editorial campaign to secure a southern route. Dissatisfied at the South's response to this threat, De Bow called out to his supporters: "Up, up ye men of capital, ye men of influence and enterprise, for it is not common danger that menaces. The hour is now."¹⁷

The 1852 commercial convention in New Orleans offered De Bow and many of his supporters a public forum to discuss railroad development. On January 5, 1852, Maunsel White opened the New Orleans convention amid the growing excitement of a regional railroad boom. James Robb, a local businessman and railroad promoter, called

¹⁷ J.D.B. De Bow, "Tehuantepec Railroad, Movement in New Orleans," *De Bow's Review* 10 (January 1851): 94—96; J.D.B. De Bow, "Internal Improvements," *De Bow's Review* 9 (August 1850): 218—22; "How Can the Union Be Preserved—Views of Mr. Calhoun, in the Senate Debate on the Compromise of 1850," *De Bow's Review* 21 (September 1856): 232; Potter, *The Impending Crisis*, 146—49; J.D.B. De Bow, "Presidential Candidates and Aspirants," *De Bow's Review* 29 (July 1860): 97—98; G.R. Fairbanks, "Communication between New York, New Orleans, and San Francisco," *De Bow's Review* 8 (January 1850): 30—32; William Cronon, *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1991), 68—70; Holman Hamilton, *Prologue to Conflict: The Crisis and Compromise of 1850* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1964), 119—21, 182—84; J.D.B. De Bow, "Thoughts on a Rail-Road System For New Orleans," *De Bow's Review* 10 (February 1851): 175.

for increased governmental funding and the use of public land to encourage railroad development in the South. Robb believed that more southern railroads and factories would attract immigrants who wanted to live in the South. Like De Bow, Robb saw railroad construction as “a civilizing and conquering power . . . the greatest of all missions.” Judah Benjamin reaffirmed Robb’s suggestions in a separate speech and explained how railroads fostered a sense of community and protected the basic tenets of republicanism.¹⁸

On the second day of the convention, De Bow presented his comprehensive plan to improve and diversify the southern economy. Invoking memories of an “Old South” that had supplied many of the nation’s most prominent politicians, he reminded delegates that southern entrepreneurship had produced the first transatlantic steamship and the longest railroad in the world by the 1830s. He admitted, however, that those days had passed and that northern advances had overtaken southern political and economic dominance. De Bow blamed southerners for this decline, specifically pointing to their overdependence on agricultural production that limited industrial and commercial development. He proposed a specific plan that linked the interests of planters, merchants, and industrialists. Railroads would open new territory, foster innovation, and expand the commercial network of the South. Factories would stimulate the extraction of raw materials, create new urban centers, and increase the South’s global economic status. These changes, De Bow promised, would lead to greater profits for all southerners. He challenged southerners to become more like their northern counterparts and “build up

¹⁸ J.D.B. De Bow, “Southern and Western Railroad Convention,” *De Bow’s Review* 12 (March 1852): 305—32; Johnson, *The Men and the Vision of the Southern Commercial Conventions*, 106; Van Deusen, *Ante-Bellum Southern Commercial Conventions*, 32—39. J.D.B. De Bow, “Department of Internal Improvements,” *De Bow’s Review* 12 (May 1852), 563—65.

rail-roads, erect factories, hold conventions, but you cannot redeem the commercial apathy of the South unless you are content to adopt the same expedients.” Despite the rising sectional tension between the North and South, De Bow saw value in northern economic progress in early 1852—it provided a model for southern growth and crystallized a regional agenda.¹⁹

Examples of southern progress became important in the commercial convention movement and essential to De Bow’s plan. Another convention was scheduled in Baltimore. Although De Bow missed the convention, he used the *Review* to highlight Baltimore’s connection to the South. He applauded the city’s support of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad and Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. De Bow suggested that these improvements made Baltimore the city “nearest the North, nearest the South, nearest the West; so central, in fact, as to be nearest to all.” In fact, the Baltimore convention exposed growing intraregional differences among southerners about how to achieve economic growth. The façade of a solid South had been elusive for John C. Calhoun in the 1830s, and it continued to be a challenge in 1852.²⁰

De Bow’s interest in history shaped how he saw the South’s future. He had helped start the Louisiana Historical Society and was an honorary member of the Wisconsin Historical Society. He believed that progress built upon itself and that future generations needed primary historical sources to record past successes and failures. Charles Gayarre had the greatest influence on De Bow’s understanding of history. De Bow had befriended

¹⁹ J.D.B. De Bow, “Importance of an Industrial Revolution in the South,” *De Bow’s Review* 12 (April 1852): 554—62.

²⁰ J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial and Literary Department,” *De Bow’s Review* 13 (October 1852): 427; J.D.B. De Bow, “The Baltimore Southern Commercial Convention,” *De Bow’s Review* 14 (April 1853): 373—79; Van Deusen, *Ante-Bellum Southern Commercial Conventions*, 39—41.

Gayarre, a well-respected historian and politician, early in his editorial career in New Orleans. By 1847 Gayarre had written *Histoire de la Louisiane* and *Romance of the History of Louisiana* using primary sources from Europe and America. He concluded the under French and Spanish rule, Louisiana remained trapped by overly romantic, unproductive planters. These early planters constrained regional growth until the American takeover of the territory in 1803. Gayarre argued that southerners had transformed Louisiana and New Orleans into models of commercial efficiency, noting that “Louisiana hardly halted in her march to wealth and power, notwithstanding these temporary calamities . . . which were soon forgotten, and hardly left any traces of their passage under the luxuriant development of her unbounded resources.”²¹

De Bow’s growing national reputation as an authority on the economy led to new personal and professional opportunities outside of the South. Organizers of the 1853 World’s Fair in New York City asked De Bow, Maunsel White, and James Robb to serve as committeemen to represent the South in planning the event. The committee wrote a public letter that supported the theme of the fair—global industrialization and progress—and encouraged southerners to “unite with our fellow-citizens of the North in this great enterprise . . . [and] strengthen the bonds of amity and concord—realize indeed that we

²¹ J.D.B. De Bow, “Progress of the Great West in Population, Agriculture, Arts, and Commerce,” *De Bow’s Review* 4 (September 1847): 40–42; Charles Gayarre, “Influence of the Mechanical Arts on the Human Race,” *De Bow’s Review* 17 (September 1854): 229–44; J.D.B. De Bow, “General Literature,” *De Bow’s Review* 3 (April 1847), 353. J.S.W., “Histoire de Louisiane,” *Southern Quarterly Review* 9 (April 1846): 361–71. A similar construction of an historical “Old South” during the antebellum period occurred in Middle Florida according to Edward E. Baptist in *Creating an Old South: Middle Florida’s Plantation Frontier Before the Civil War*, (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002), 254–57, 283. Baptist attributes social and racial chaos in Middle Florida during the early nineteenth century to the primary reason that planters in the 1850s recreated an idolized version of their past. They used Virginia history and Sir Walter Scott’s *Ivanhoe* as historical markers, and Baptist concludes that by erasing earlier regional crises from public memory, local planters instilled a sense of long-term stability and harmony within their communities. Charles Gayarre, *History of Louisiana* (New York: William J. Widdleton, 1867), 632—33.

are one people, with one hope and one inheritance, one faith and one destiny.” The World’s Fair appealed to De Bow’s global curiosity, and in a December 1852 editorial he challenged Americans to commingle with other cultures and reduce local and regional prejudices. He ended his commentary with a plea to southerners to take advantage of the opportunity, reminding his readers that “we are Americans yet, taking pride in the achievements of the great republic . . . from the rising to the setting sun.” De Bow’s willingness to participate in events outside of the South highlighted his commitment to southern economic development within the larger national context. But it also showed his fear of the South being marginalized and left out of America’s growing progress.²²

In April 1853 De Bow accepted an appointment to serve as the superintendent of the 1850 federal census. His interest and use of statistics had become a defining editorial trait of the *Review*. In 1848 De Bow had served as superintendent of Louisiana’s Bureau of Statistics and helped standardize the census for the state. He viewed accurate records as essential to economic and social development. In September 1849 De Bow wrote a series of articles for the *New Orleans Daily Picayune* that criticized Joseph Kennedy, the current superintendent of the 1850 federal census. Articles in the *Review* offered general advice and direction on the collection of statistics. Although De Bow claimed to have little interest in Kennedy’s position, in November 1852 he traveled to Washington, D.C., to secure a federal position in Franklin Pierce’s new presidential administration. On April 6, 1853, De Bow agreed, after a subtle campaign and some coaxing, to replace Kennedy as the head of the census. De Bow announced that he would relocate to the nation’s

²² J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial Miscellany,” *De Bow’s Review* 14 (March 1853): 300; John R. Gold and Margaret M. Gold, *Cities of Culture: Staging International Festivals and the Urban Agenda, 1851—2000* (Hampshire, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2005), 89—90; J.D.B. De Bow, “The American Crystal Palace,” *De Bow’s Review* 13 (December 1852): 637—40.

capital and reassured readers that the *Review* would continue to be published. Excited by the new opportunity and national exposure created by his public position, De Bow announced that he hoped to “enlarge and diversify the interests of the *Review*; and whilst its distinctive character as a southern work is preserved, I will make it, in many senses, a national one.”²³

De Bow used his new fame to republish many of the *Review*’s most popular articles in a three-volume set entitled *The Industrial Resources, Etc., of the Southern and Western States: Embracing a View of their Commerce, Agriculture, Manufactures, Internal Improvements, Slave and Free Labor, Slave Institutions, Products, Etc., of the South*. Later shortened to *De Bow’s Industrial Resources*, the 1,800-page set received high praise from newspapers and magazines around the nation. The *Boston Post* and *New York Times* applauded his statistical analysis and insight, and a reviewer at *Harper’s Magazine* noted that “it is still more important in a national point of view, making the different parts of the Union better acquainted with each other, and increasing the attachment of all to the general interests of their common country.” Although De Bow had few northern readers, he hoped that the *Review* would become popular in the North. He reasoned that sectional misunderstandings could be reduced if northern readers better understood southern issues.²⁴

²³ Skipper, *J. D. B. De Bow, Magazinish of the Old South*, 69—80; Carroll D. Wright and William C. Hunt, *History and Growth of the United States Census, 1790—1890* (Washington, D.C., 1900), 38—39, 45; *Daily Picayune* (New Orleans), September 27, October 4—13, November 10, 1849; J.D.B. De Bow, “Populaton,” *De Bow’s Review* 8 (March 1850): 207—16; J.D.B. De Bow, “Statistical Bureaus in the States, Etc.,” *De Bow’s Review* 8 (May 1850): 422-44; J.D.B. De Bow, “Census of 1850,” *De Bow’s Review* 9 (August 1850): 249; J.D.B. De Bow, “Our Future,” *De Bow’s Review* 14 (May 1853): 524; J.D.B. De Bow, “Our Future,” *De Bow’s Review* 14 (June 1853): 632; J.D.B. De Bow, “A Work for Every Library,” *De Bow’s Review* 14 (June 1853): 631—32.

²⁴ J.D.B. De Bow, “De Bow’s Industrial Resources,” *De Bow’s Review* 14 (June 1853): 633.

After being elected to the United States Agricultural Society in June 1851, De Bow became increasingly interested in agricultural topics. De Bow's plan was simple—he hoped to transform southern plantations into efficient businesses by publishing articles that highlighted successful practices and techniques. He also encouraged southerners to meet and share ideas at conventions and local societies. His focus on agricultural reform came at a time when many Americans read and subscribed to journals that emphasized modern farming techniques. In 1853 there were forty-three agricultural journals in the United States, and although most would fail, they, like the *Review*, provided a steady flow of information and opinions to rural Americans.²⁵

Much of the agricultural content in the *Review* focused on improving specific practices on large cotton and sugar plantations. Aside from monthly updates and brief letters from individual contributors, De Bow published between 1850 and 1854 twenty full-length articles about cotton production, eight on sugar manufacturing, and individual pieces on grapes, rice, corn, tobacco, livestock, poultry, and the use of guano. Many of his contributors provided detailed information on soil and climate conditions and how these variables influenced production. Enough readers regularly submitted articles on rural topics to make the “Agricultural Department” a standard part of the *Review* by 1853. De Bow used the *Review* to applaud those who embraced change. Noting the progress of the sugar cane industry in Louisiana, he congratulated planters on their spirit of enterprise to improve the manufacture of sugar. Although large planters had pushed

²⁵ Lyman Carrier, “The United States Agricultural Society,” *Agricultural History* 11 (1937): 278—88; J.D.B. De Bow, “National Agricultural Society,” *De Bow's Review* 13 (August 1852), 207—09; Sarah T. Phillips, “Antebellum Agricultural Reform, Republican Ideology, and Sectional Tension,” *Agricultural History* 74 (Autumn 2000): 799—822; Avery Craven, “The Agricultural Reforms of the Antebellum South,” *The American Historical Review* 33 (January 1928): 302—14; Phillips, *Life and Labor in the Old South*, 196—205; Lewis C. Gray, *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860, Vol. II* (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution of Washington, Publication 430, 2 vols., 1933), 788—89.

many yeoman farmers out of business in Louisiana, sugar production had grown from 186,000 hogsheads in 1845 to 449,324 hogsheads in 1853. The successful growth of the sugar industry reinforced De Bow's message of industrialization.²⁶

The *Review* also became a popular forum for planters to discuss slave management techniques. De Bow published letters and articles by southerners who studied slave behavior and offered advice on minute details to maximize potential profits for planters. Many articles focused on daily and seasonal work routines, food rationing, slave housing and clothing, and the general welfare of slaves. A contributor prescribed strict rules that relied on clock management and the use of bells to regulate the day. Aware of the importance of good morale, De Bow encouraged planters to think about slave happiness as a way to increase the productivity of their workforce. His attitudes about slavery stemmed more from the desire to create a profitable institution than from concern for slaves' well-being.²⁷

²⁶ For examples of typical agricultural contributions see: A Mississippi Planter, "Production and Manufacture of Cotton," *De Bow's Review* 8 (February 1850): 99—101; M.H. McGehee, "Cotton: Disease of Plant and Remedies," *De Bow's Review* 11 (July 1851): 7—12; Sidney Weller, "Southern Vines and Vineyards," *De Bow's Review* 12 (May 1852): 470—75; Leonard Wray, "Culture and Manufacture of Sugar," *De Bow's Review* 12 (June 1852): 646—55; Edmund Ruffin, "Southern Agricultural Exhaustion and Its Remedy," *De Bow's Review* 14 (January 1853): 34—46; Albert W. Ely, "Domestic Poultry," *De Bow's Review* 15 (November 1853): 496—509; R.F.W. Allston, "Sea-Coast Crops of the South," *De Bow's Review* 16 (June 1854): 589—615; J.D.B. De Bow, "Remarks on Dr. Cartwright's Paper—'Extension of the Sugar Region,'" *De Bow's Review* 15 (December 1853): 647—48; Richard Follett, *The Sugar Masters: Planters and Slaves in Louisiana's Cane World, 1820—1860* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005), 17—23.

²⁷ J.D.B. De Bow, "Rules for the Management of Negroes," *De Bow's Review* 14 (February 1853): 176—78; John A. Calhoun, "Management of Slaves," *De Bow's Review* 18 (June 1855): 714; Eugene D. Genovese, *The Political Economy of Slavery: Studies in the Economy and Society of the Slave South* (New York: Pantheon, 1965), 26—31; Eugene Genovese, *Roll, Jordon, Roll: The World the Slaves Made* (New York: Vintage Books, 1976), 4, 297—308; James Oakes, "Whom Have I Oppressed?: The Pursuit of Happiness and the Happy Slave," in *The Revolution of 1800: Democracy, Race, and the New Republic*, ed. James Horn, Jan E. Lewis, and Peter S. Onuf (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2002), 220—39; James O. Breeden, *Advice Among Masters: The Ideal in Slave Management in the Old South* (Westport: Greenwood Press, 1980), 291; Robert Collins, "Essay on the Management of Slaves," *De Bow's Review* 17 (October 1854): 421—26.

De Bow understood the importance of the overseer in improving agricultural productivity on large plantations. He believed that the overseer served as the middle manager between the planter and his slaves. De Bow's theory on slave happiness rested primarily on the relationship between management and labor. He expected overseers to attend to the well-being and comfort of slaves in return for their loyalty and discipline. De Bow stressed that "humanity, on the part of the overseer, and unqualified obedience on the part of the negroes, are, under all circumstances, indispensable." Likewise, De Bow argued, the overseer owed his devotion to the planter, and the planter assumed active oversight of his plantation and supported his overseer and workforce. In De Bow's mind, a paternalistic planter, a capable overseer, and happy slaves would increase the profitability and efficiency of a plantation.²⁸

De Bow used planters' fairs and conventions to promote his ideas about southern agricultural reform. In December 1853 he attended a six-day planters' convention in Columbia, South Carolina. The vibrancy and variety of speeches excited De Bow and provided him with ideas that later emerged in the *Review*. He delivered a speech on the agricultural, commercial, and political importance of cotton to the South and participated in discussions to create a regional agricultural college for the benefit of young

²⁸ J.D.B. De Bow, "Rules and Regulations for the Government of a Southern Plantation," *De Bow's Review* 10 (June 1851): 625—27; Thomas Affleck, "The Duties of An Overseer," *De Bow's Review* 18 (March 1855): 339—45; Genovese, *Roll, Jordon, Roll*, 4—5, 54; Philip D. Morgan, *Slave Counterpoint* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998), 284—87; Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998), 96—98. Historians have debated the existence of paternalism in the antebellum South. Genovese believes that paternalistic behavior increased after the ban on the international slave trade in 1808. Philip Morgan contends that the Revolutionary War forced planters to become more paternalistic toward slaves to maintain their loyalty. Ira Berlin notes an early attachment to paternalism while stressing the continued importance of violence and degradation in the master-slave relationship.

southerners. Delegates hoped to raise money to start the school and then petition individual states to maintain the college.²⁹

The Columbia Convention brought De Bow into contact with other southern agricultural reformers. He met and spoke with Edmund Ruffin and solicited a promise from the Virginian to write for the *Review*. Ruffin had established himself as the South's most prominent agronomist after publishing books on calcareous manure and fertilizer and from his agricultural survey of South Carolina in 1843. De Bow had published an earlier profile of Ruffin and admired his work. De Bow and Ruffin agreed on the need to improve southern agricultural practices, but in 1853 disagreed on the reasons. De Bow hoped to improve the southern economy and therefore establish the South as an equal partner with the North. Ruffin feared that any sign of southern weakness might lead to new attacks on slavery. He spent years advocating agricultural reform but by 1853 had primarily become a proslavery ideologist and secessionist. De Bow initially asked Ruffin for agricultural articles but later published his political writing. Although De Bow and Ruffin maintained a long working relationship, Ruffin strongly disliked De Bow, referring to him as a "crafty & mean Yankee in conduct & principle, though a southerner by birth & residence, & in political philosophy."³⁰

De Bow also became acquainted with the convention's recording secretary, the noted Alabama agriculturalist Noah Cloud. Born in Edgefield District, South Carolina, in 1809, Cloud attended medical school in Philadelphia before moving to Alabama and

²⁹ J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorials, Book Notices, Etc.," *De Bow's Review* 16 (March 1854), 331—32; Carrier, "The United States Agricultural Society," *Agricultural History* 11 (1937): 341—42.

³⁰ Eric H. Walther, *The Fire-Eaters*, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1992), 232—34; Phillips, *Life and Labor in the Old South*, 131—32; William M. Mathew, *Edmund Ruffin and the Crisis of Slavery in the Old South: The Failure of Agricultural Reform* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989); McCardell, *The Idea of a Southern Nation*, 110—11; William Kauffman Scarborough, *The Diary of Edmund Ruffin, Volume I* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1972), 443.

becoming a cotton planter. He became involved with the Alabama State Fair and the state agricultural society and used his notoriety to start the *American Cotton Planter* in 1853. Cloud used original articles borrowed from journals like *De Bow's Review* to promote scientific farming and other agricultural innovations. He understood the importance of integrating agriculture and industry, reminding his readers that “manufactures—yes, this is the true policy for the American cotton planter . . . we should foster and encourage the introduction of cotton manufacturing in the midst of our fields.” Daniel Pratt supported Cloud’s decision to promote economic diversification and used himself as an example: “I am not a cotton planter, notwithstanding I am deeply interested in its cultivation. It is from this plant that I have been enabled to support myself and family, and to give employment to a good number of persons . . . the most important step towards it [industrialization] is to encourage agricultural improvements.” Although it is impossible to gauge the influence of Cloud’s editorial efforts on southern readers, Alabama planters and farmers increased the state’s improved acreage by two million acres from 1850 to 1860 and raised the total value of all farms by \$46 million during the same period.³¹

Much of the positive momentum and publicity generated by De Bow became obscured by Stephen Douglas’s Kansas-Nebraska Bill in early 1854. Douglas had garnered enough political support to reintroduce his plan to organize the territory immediately west of Iowa and hoped to organize the land to secure a northern route for an impending transcontinental railroad. On January 4, 1854, Douglas proposed that residents of Kansas and Nebraska use popular sovereignty to choose whether they wanted

³¹ Weymouth T. Jordon, “Noah B. Cloud and the American Cotton Planter,” *Agricultural History* 31 (October 1957), 44—49; Noah B. Cloud, “The American Cotton Planter,” *American Cotton Planter* 1 (January 1853), 20, 27; Walter Lynwood Fleming, *The South in the Building of the Nation, A History of the Southern States, Volume V* (Richmond: The Southern Historical Publication Society, 1909), 587—92.

to be admitted to the Union as free states or slave states. By dismissing the political boundary that had been set by the Missouri Compromise in 1820 and supporting the concept of popular sovereignty, Douglas reignited the national dispute over the western expansion of slavery, especially among northern abolitionists.³²

In April 1854 the Charleston Commercial Convention offered De Bow a public forum to express his disdain for the North's reaction to the Kansas-Nebraska Act. Although De Bow was unable to attend the convention, he sent an open letter that was read and published into the official record. Unlike past articles and speeches, De Bow's speech took a more sectional tone, and he wondered if the South might prosper outside the Union. He argued that breaking free of northern factories and merchants would allow the southern economy to develop more fully and permit southerners to provide for themselves. He reminded delegates of the importance of building railroads, improving river navigation, and developing a manufacturing sector to compete with northern businessmen. In a more conciliatory tone, De Bow encouraged southerners to "calmly, yet boldly . . . advance in this great work of regeneration . . . without the spirit of recrimination—without sectional bitterness or enmities." De Bow's overall tone, however, reflected his growing dissatisfaction. Delegates at the convention fixated on the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, transcontinental railroad, and the growing power of the abolitionist movement. Albert Pike, a *Review* subscriber and prominent southwestern lawyer, accused northerners of seeding the West with sympathetic immigrants. The tenor

³² Potter, *The Impending Crisis*, 146—76.

of the Charleston meeting reflected a far more combative sectional character than any earlier commercial convention.³³

In the midst of the heightening sectional debate, De Bow maintained a busy social life. He took long summer vacations to mountain resorts in Maryland and Virginia and traveled to New York City for business and pleasure. He became personal friends with many well-connected politicians such as Jefferson Davis of Mississippi, John Bell of Tennessee, and Robert Hunter of Massachusetts. De Bow enjoyed living in Washington, D. C., and began courting the daughter of a local merchant, and in August 1854 he married Caroline Poe, second cousin to Edgar Allan Poe.³⁴

But by the end of 1854, rising sectionalism had forced De Bow to reevaluate the editorial content of the *Review*. The steady rise of northern antislavery sentiment in conjunction with the political events of the 1850s left him frustrated and bitter about real and perceived sectional slights. He became alarmed as northern politicians, writers, and common citizens amplified the tone and frequency of their attacks on slavery. De Bow had been exposed to slavery from his earliest childhood to adulthood and formulated feelings about the institution before becoming a prominent editor. He defended slavery as a social and economic necessity and saw little reason to debate its existence. By modernizing agricultural techniques, improving slave management, and expanding the use of slave labor into the industrial sector, De Bow believed slavery could be fully compatible with a modern industrial economy in the South. Northern attacks on slavery

³³ Van Deusen, *Ante-Bellum Southern Commercial Conventions*, 44—49; J.D.B. De Bow, “The Great Southern Convention in Charleston, No. II,” *De Bow’s Review* 17 (July 1854): 95—97.

³⁴ James A. Harrison, *Life and Letters of Edgar Allan Poe, Volume II* (New York: Thomas P. Crowell & Co., 1903), 14—15, 25, 425—29. Charles Gayarre, “James Dunwoody Brownson De Bow,” *De Bow’s Review* 3 (June 1867): 505; Ottis Skipper, “J.D.B. De Bow, The Man,” *Journal of Southern History* 10 (November 1944): 414.

caused De Bow to change his view of the Union. These assaults overwhelmed his sense of American nationalism and awakened sectional feelings that had been secondary in De Bow's mind and in the pages of the *Review*.³⁵

³⁵ Follett, *The Sugar Masters*, 40—45. Follett examines the individual and collective efforts of Louisiana sugar planters to modernize and industrialize the antebellum cane industry. He determines that planters rarely cooperated with each other. This lack of cooperation hindered economic development in Louisiana.

Chapter Six: The Radicalization of De Bow, 1855—1860

De Bow's perception that northerners were attacking the South increasingly agitated him after 1854. He understood that his interest in western expansion and the transcontinental railroad placed him at odds with northerners who intended to expand their economic influence or stop the spread of slavery. The violence of "Bleeding Kansas" left De Bow pessimistic about the future, changed his view of the Union, and altered the editorial tone of the *Review*. He took antislavery attacks on slavery as assaults on southern property and constitutional rights. De Bow became defensive about any criticism of the South. He became more a sectional apologist than a critical observer of the South's economic development, less willing to criticize regional shortcomings and more apt to over-promote any modicum of southern success. His sense of enthusiasm about national prosperity faded as new feelings about southern independence emerged. Although the *Review* had always promoted southern issues, De Bow had maintained a balanced editorial tone and kept most articles free of political commentary. The Kansas-Nebraska Act and subsequent violence in Kansas, however, provoked him to engage northern opponents. The *Review* became his weapon.¹

The 1855 New Orleans Commercial Convention gave southerners an opportunity to express their grievances about Stephen Douglas's attempt to secure a northern route for a transcontinental railroad. There Albert Pike, a prominent southwestern lawyer and railroad promoter, insisted that southerners build their own railroad between New Orleans

¹ For the historiographical debate over the motivation behind the Kansas-Nebraska Act see: George Fort Milton, *The Eve of Conflict: Stephen A. Douglas and the Needless War* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934); P. Orman Ray, *The Repeal of the Missouri Compromise* (Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1909); James A. Rawley, *Race and Politics: "Bleeding Kansas" and the Coming of the Civil War* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1969); Nicole Etcheson, *Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004).

and the Pacific Ocean. De Bow agreed with Pike that Douglas had robbed the South of an opportunity to expand its economic sphere. De Bow encouraged southerners to forgo government funding and build a regional railroad system on their own. He warned delegates of the “difficulties of effecting great revolutions.” Although satisfied with the general development of southern railroads, De Bow sometimes worried about the lack of cooperation among southerners.²

The surging sectional feeling among convention delegates manifested itself in debates over education. C. K. Marshall, a *Review* reader and resident of Vicksburg, opposed northern instructors teaching and influencing southern students. He encouraged southern colleges and universities to produce more teachers to protect young minds from abolitionist propaganda and attacks on slavery. De Bow added that southern publishers needed to produce acceptable textbooks for students. He suggested a commission to monitor partisan northern textbooks. He created a “Department of Education” in the *Review* to discuss teaching practices used in the North and Europe, explore curriculum changes, and promote the construction of new schools. A broader worldview, De Bow reasoned, also created a sense of awareness and regional identity among southern children.³

² Van Deusen, *Ante-Bellum Southern Commercial Conventions*, 50—52; J.D.B. De Bow, “Southern Commercial Convention at New Orleans,” *De Bow’s Review* 18 (March 1855): 353—55; J.D.B. De Bow, “The Southern Commercial Convention,” *De Bow’s Review* 18 (February 1855): 240; Jere W. Roberson, “The South and the Pacific Railroad, 1845—1855,” *The Western Historical Society* 5 (April 1974), 177; Potter, *The Impending Crisis*, 162—64. Potter contends that the Kansas-Nebraska debate started as a railroad question but because of sectional attacks and personal bitterness became a question about the expansion of slavery.

³ C.K. Marshall, “Home Education at the South,” *De Bow’s Review* 18 (March 1855): 430—32; Van Deusen, *Ante-Bellum Southern Commercial Conventions*, 41—44; J.D.B. De Bow, “Our Department of Education,” *De Bow’s Review* 18 (January 1855): 144. Lorri Glover, *Southern Sons: Becoming Men in the New Nation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007), 51—54; J.D.B. De Bow, “Education in Missouri, Boston, Washington, South Carolina, Arkansas, Germany,” *De Bow’s Review* 18 (February 1855): 285—88; J.D.B. De Bow, “Relation of Education to the Prevention of Crime,” *De Bow’s Review* 18

As violence in Kansas between slavery and anti-slavery factions escalated, De Bow supported emigration societies that supplied southern sympathizers with money, supplies, and arms. In early 1856 he joined the executive board of New Orleans's Kansas Society. De Bow published speeches and articles that encouraged southerners to support their right to live and work in western territories. Other emigration groups used the *Review* as a clearinghouse for information and strategies. Like many southerners, De Bow viewed Kansas as a constitutional test over property rights and civil liberties. But the closure of new western territories to slavery also would limit southern access to new markets. He supported violence as a means to solve sectional differences. In a speech in New Orleans, De Bow called for vengeance against the "irreconcilable enemies of the southern states." He reprinted articles and speeches of prominent southerners equally upset about the sectional conflict. One reader called on De Bow to "urge us forward; urge us with all of your might; recollect our apathy and aversion to change."⁴

As he accepted that the sectional conflict was irreconcilable, De Bow began to think about the comparative advantages of the North. The larger population in the North concerned De Bow as he contemplated the potential imbalance of workers and soldiers. De Bow encouraged southerners to accept European immigrants into their communities. He rejected the xenophobic position of the Know-Nothing Party and anti-immigrant sentiments shared by many southerners. Aware that many northerners also opposed

(March 1855): 409—21; Archibald Roane, "Common Schools and Universities North and South," *De Bow's Review* 18 (April 1855): 520—28.

⁴ J.D.B. De Bow, "The War Against the South," *De Bow's Review* 21 (September 1856): 271—77; J.D.B. De Bow, "Kansas, A Slave State," *De Bow's Review* 20 (June 1856): 741—44; J.D.B. De Bow, "Kansas Matters—Appeal to the South," *De Bow's Review* 20 (May 1856): 635—37; J.D.B. De Bow, "Letter to Kansas Association," *De Bow's Review* 20 (May 1856): 637—39; J.D.B. De Bow, "Kansas Meeting in New Orleans," *De Bow's Review* 20 (May 1856): 639—40; J.D.B. De Bow, "Sentiments of the South," *De Bow's Review* 21 (October 1856): 438—40; J.D.B. De Bow, "Reorganization of Southern Society," *De Bow's Review* 21 (August 1856): 207—09.

immigration, he told readers that “northern folly, bigotry, and intolerance drive the foreign emigrant, the naturalized citizen, and the Roman Catholic from amongst them [and] it is the true policy of the South to receive them.”⁵

Although slavery had been a common subject in the *Review* prior to 1854, the violence in Kansas intensified De Bow’s proslavery commitments. He included inflammatory articles that had not appeared in earlier years. In January 1856 he republished what many southerners considered to be the original proslavery treatise—Thomas R. Dew’s *Review of the Debate in the Virginia Legislature of 1831—2*. Dew, a professor at William and Mary College, argued that God had created all natural institutions and that sudden changes would disrupt the natural order of society. Using world history to prove that human bondage was an organic institution, he concluded that slavery had become a positive economic and social force in Virginia’s history. He rejected slave emancipation or colonization as being unrealistic and contrary to the interests of slaveholders and non-slaveholders. Slave emancipation, Dew argued, would lead to higher taxes, increased crime, economic ruin, and social equality among the races. His claims clarified a distinct proslavery position that incorporated religion, history, social development, and economic growth.⁶

⁵ J.D.B. De Bow, “The True Policy of the South,” *De Bow’s Review* 20 (January 1856): 55—60.

⁶ Thomas R. Dew, “Slavery in the Virginia Legislature of 1831—2, Pts. 1 and 2” *De Bow’s Review* 20 (January 1856): 118—40, (February 1856): 175—89; Drew G. Faust, *The Ideology of Slavery: Proslavery Thought in the Antebellum South, 1830—1860*, (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981), 8—9; Kenneth Stampp, “An Analysis of T. R. Dew’s *Review of the Debates in the Virginia Legislatures*,” *The Journal of Negro History* 27 (October 1942): 380—387; David Donald, “The Proslavery Argument Reconsidered,” *Journal of Southern History* 37 (February 1971): 3—18. Donald suggests that proslavery ideologists felt alienated by the modern world and retreated into historical precedent. He notes that De Bow, more than most antebellum southerners, urged southerners to look toward the future to create “the paradigm of the perfect society.”

De Bow published the provocative proslavery arguments of other prominent southerners. He reprinted a series of letters from James Henry Hammond, a prominent planter and politician in South Carolina, to Thomas Clarkson, an English abolitionist. Hammond's letters defended slavery as a cornerstone of southern society. Hammond used biblical, historical, and scientific evidence to defend slavery and its importance to the South. Later famous for his reference to King Cotton and his "mudsill speech," Hammond explained that slaves earned what they needed through hard work and loyalty to their masters. In return, good masters cared for and satisfied the needs of their naturally subordinate slaves. De Bow reprinted the 1837 speech of William Harper, a noted South Carolina jurist and politician, who defended slavery with Biblical and legal arguments. God had created slavery, Harper said, and the legal system assured that blacks remained in their proper place. Harper rejected the universal ideals of liberty and equality. He believed that blacks lacked the necessary intellectual skills to understand the self-evident truths of the American Revolution. De Bow later used Harper's arguments to insist that education and moral virtue separated whites and blacks. De Bow and Harper reasoned that unproductive and uneducated slaves had no right to the benefits of the Declaration of Independence or the United States Constitution.⁷

De Bow prescribed to the theories of prominent ethnologists and physicians who created scientific theories that attempted to prove black inferiority. Samuel A.

⁷ Thomas R. Dew, "Professor Dew's Essays on Slavery, Pts. 1 and 2 *De Bow's Review* 10 (June 1851): 658; Carol Bleser, ed. *Secret and Sacred: The Diary of James H. Hammond, A Southern Slaveholder* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), vii—xvi; Drew G. Faust, *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982), 2—3, 258, 278—81, 380—81; James H. Hammond, "Negro Slavery at the South," Pts. 1-3 *De Bow's Review* 7 (October 1849): 289—97, (December 1849): 490—501, (February 1850): 122—33; Chancellor Harper, "Memoir on Slavery," Pts. 1 and 2 *De Bow's Review* 8 (March 1850): 232—43, (April 1850): 339—47; Faust, *The Ideology of Slavery*, 78—79; Carl L. Becker, *The Declaration of Independence: A Study in the History of Political Ideas* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1922), 247—49.

Cartwright, a physician who treated slaves in New Orleans, wrote many *Review* articles that justified slavery as a natural law of science. He believed that blacks were incapable of further development and warned southerners about their inherent laziness and lack of virtue. Cartwright hoped to improve slave productivity by offering cures for drapetomania, the slave's ability to avoid responsibility, and dysaesthesia, the slave's natural lack of a work ethic. In both cases Cartwright prescribed frequent whippings and strict oversight as potential cures. Although De Bow rejected brutality as a way of dealing with slaves, his own interest in science made Cartwright's research plausible.⁸

Josiah C. Nott used a mixture of anthropology, medical knowledge, and ethnology to establish the inferiority and separate origins of the black race. Nott, a southern physician and surgeon, used cranial and body measurements to argue that blacks and whites came from separate species. De Bow invited Nott to speak at a public lecture on his research and later published the talk as *Two Lectures on the Connection between the Biblical and Physical History of Man*. Nott's conclusions elicited strong feelings among readers who disapproved of his rejection of creationism. Although De Bow personally disagreed with Nott's polygenist conclusions, he felt that Nott's scientific arguments lent legitimacy to the proslavery position.⁹

De Bow's most prolific contributor on black inferiority was George Fitzhugh, who published ninety-nine articles in the *Review* between 1855 and the start of the Civil

⁸ Samuel A. Cartwright, "How to Save the Republic, and the Position of the South in the Union," *De Bow's Review* 10 (August 1851): 184—97; Paul Finkelman, *Defending Slavery: Proslavery Thought in the Old South, A Brief History with Documents* (Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003), 157.

⁹ Faust, *The Ideology of Slavery*, 206—07; J.D.B. De Bow, "Nott on the Physical History of Man," *De Bow's Review* 7 (October 1849): 377; J.D.B. De Bow "Physical Character of the Negro," *De Bow's Review* 9 (August 1850): 231—44; Reginald Horsman, *Josiah Nott of Mobile: Southerner, Physician, and Racial Theorist* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987); Josiah C. Nott, "Nature and Destiny of the Negro," *De Bow's Review* 10 (March 1851): 332.

War. The eccentric Virginian had shocked northern readers by attacking free society in *Sociology for the South; or the Failure of Free Society* and *Cannibals All! or Slaves without Masters*. Unlike other proslavery ideologists who only defended slavery, Fitzhugh attacked the basic tenets of free society as being inferior to slave society. He rejected the North's adherence to capitalism and competitive commercialism. Fitzhugh claimed that slavery eliminated unemployment and the exploitation of workers in the South. Southern masters provided better standards of living for their workers because free-market competition stripped society of humanity and morality. Fitzhugh used genealogical research to argue that white southerners had engaged in selective reproduction to create a natural "master race." This southern race of natural leaders would eventually dominate northern competition in politics and on the battlefield. Although De Bow often disagreed with Fitzhugh's conclusions, he valued the reaction these arguments got in the northern press. William Lloyd Garrison, the abolitionist editor of *The Liberator*, railed against Fitzhugh's contributions to the slavery debate and likened his work to that of Satan.¹⁰

Aside from defending the South's peculiar institution and attacking northern abolitionists, De Bow understood the importance of romanticizing slavery and softening the image of the planter. Abolitionists had used slave abuse as a tool to sway moderate northerners and non-slaveholding southerners away from the interests of slaveholders. De Bow hoped to create a positive public image of slavery by re-publishing short stories that

¹⁰ George Fitzhugh, "Southern Thought, Pts. 1 and 2," *De Bow's Review* 23 (October 1857): 338—50, (November 1857): 449—62; J.D.B. De Bow, "Cannibals All! or, Slaves Without Masters," *De Bow's Review* 22 (May 1857): 543—49; C. G. Grammer, "Failure of Free Society," *De Bow's Review* 19 (July 1855): 29—38; Eric Foner, *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970), 66—67; George Fitzhugh, "Family History and the Philosophy of Names," *De Bow's Review* 29 (September 1860): 257—69; *The Liberator*, November 23, 1855.

romanticized the relationship between the master and slave. William S. White's *The African Preacher: An Authentic Narrative* exemplified the type of story that highlighted the supposed fidelity and affection of the master-slave relationship. In the short story, a fictional northern visitor witnessed a slave funeral and the raw emotions of the white master. Noting the tenderness of the moment, the northern witness confessed that "it was not the haughty planter, the lordly tyrant, talking of his dead slave as of his dead horse, but the kind-hearted gentleman, lamenting his loss and eulogizing the virtues of his good old friend." The visitor promised that "I shall return to my northern home, deeply impressed with the belief that, dispensing with the name of freedom, that Negroes of the south are the happiest and most contented people on the face of the earth."¹¹

De Bow often used history to legitimize the course of southern society. His interest in history transformed how he saw the South. He believed that future generations needed to understand the past so as not to fear the future. He wanted to promote a mythical regional history that highlighted the harmoniousness and cohesiveness of a genteel southern society. De Bow aided Albert J. Pickett, a historian and planter from Alabama, to write his state's history. Pickett focused on the formation of social and cultural institutions unique to the Southwest. He explained how early settlements and communities grew and, although proud of Alabama's accomplishments, lamented the disruption of nature by "vast fields of cotton, noisy steamers, huge rafts of lumber, towns reared for business, disagreeable corporation laws, harassing courts of justice, mills, factories, and everything else that is calculated to destroy the beauty of a country, and to rob man of his quiet and native independence." Although Pickett's distress about modern

¹¹ William S. White, "The Night Funeral of a Slave," *De Bow's Review* 20 (February 1856): 218—21.

economic forces countered De Bow's feelings about future growth, De Bow understood the necessity of confronting regional fears about unseen market forces. He had dedicated the *Review* to instilling a sense of progress and wanted to assure readers that factories and cities were the natural products of a modern society.¹²

The Savannah Commercial Convention in December 1856 reaffirmed the South's growing commitment to sectional and economic independence. The recent defeat of the Republican Party in the presidential election reenergized talk of southern independence. Convention delegates discussed direct trade with Europe, railroad construction, and urban development. A growing element of southern nationalism crept into the convention's agenda, however, and, aware of this ideological shift, many moderate delegates feared attending the convention. Talk of secession became more open. De Bow encouraged delegates to discuss southern independence. James Lyons, a *Review* reader and lawyer from Richmond, typified the shift that had occurred in the commercial convention movement. Earlier in his career, Lyons had attended conventions that supported railroad development and Henry Clay's American System. As an economic nationalist, Lyons hosted Clay and Daniel Webster at his Richmond home. Lyons served as chairman of the Richmond and Ohio Railroad and the Richmond and Danville Railroad. He helped organize the Virginia Central Agricultural Society. Despite his interest in linking Richmond to the national economy, northern attacks on southern institutions created personal animosity in Lyons. He attended the Nashville Convention, and in 1850 helped

¹² J.D.B. De Bow, "General Literature," *De Bow's Review* 3 (April 1847): 353—54; Nathaniel Beverly Tucker, "The Path of Disunion—To The North and The South" *De Bow's Review* 31 (July 1861): 59; J.D.B. De Bow, "The State of Alabama," *De Bow's Review* 12 (January 1852): 66; Thornton, *Politics and Power in a Slave Society*, 291—92, 308—11. Pickett's fear of modernity concurs with Thornton's conclusions about how antebellum Alabamians reacted toward urbanization and industrialization.

start the Central Southern Rights Association of Richmond. In December 1856 Lyons served as president of the Savannah convention, the first commercial convention that openly discussed secession. Lyons oversaw De Bow's nomination as president of the next convention in Knoxville, Tennessee.¹³

On August 10, 1857, De Bow publicly embraced secession and southern nationalism in a speech at the Knoxville Commercial Convention. Much had changed in the commercial convention movement since the Memphis convention in 1845. Appeals for internal improvements and commercial development had given way to proslavery diatribes and disunionist speeches. The vitriolic speeches of William Lowndes Yancey and Leonidus W. Spratt muted the voices of moderate delegates. De Bow's gradual transition from American nationalist to southern fire-eater had been a public one, and the Knoxville convention served as reaffirmation of his ideological shift. In his opening presidential remarks, addressed only to southerners, he called for continued economic development to ensure independence. He felt that autonomy would force Europeans to recognize the economic power of the South. De Bow reminded delegates that to secure freedom from the North they had to support regional growth "by stimulating agriculture, by promoting commerce, by steamships, and by steam-mills, and . . . by a system of home education, which shall save our children from the poison which infects the springs from which they have hitherto been in the habit of drinking."¹⁴

¹³ William A. Christian, *Richmond: Her Past and Present* (Spartanburg: The Reprint Company, 1912), 140—97. Frank Towers, *The Urban South and the Coming of the Civil War* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2004), 20—21; Central Southern Rights Association of Virginia Records, 1850—1860, Virginia Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia.

¹⁴ Van Deusen, *The Ante-Bellum Southern Commercial Convention*, 58; Wender, *Southern Commercial Conventions*, 17—21; Johnson, *The Men and the Vision of the Southern Commercial Conventions*, 95—99, 146—62; J.D.B. De Bow, "The Rights, Duties, and Remedies of the South," *De Bow's Review* 23 (September 1857): 233, 235.

De Bow had rarely shown an editorial interest in banks or financial institutions early in his career, but the Panic of 1857 provided him an opportunity to discuss northern mismanagement of the nation's wealth. He blamed the panic on the recent failure of several northern railroads, low crop prices, over-speculation by northern investors, and the lack of fluid capital in New York. Southern merchants and planters suffered financially because northern bankers and investors failed to follow good practices, according to De Bow. The panic offered him substantive proof that regional economic independence would provide more financial security for southerners. He hoped that the free-trade policies that had been discussed at many commercial conventions would become the true policy of the South. De Bow beckoned northerners to "let us alone" and allow the South to develop away from the "the unwise and selfish course pursued by the banks of the North." Eager to reassure southern readers about their financial institutions, De Bow provided statistics to highlight the soundness of regional banks and specie reserves. His interest in banking quickly subsided after cotton prices increased.¹⁵

De Bow's *Review* became an outlet for fanatical secessionists. Edmund Ruffin traced northern political aggression back to the Missouri Compromise and concluded that northerners had always dedicated themselves to stealing southern rights. He welcomed open warfare between the North and South, believing that abolitionists had infiltrated the federal government. Ruffin reasoned that independence would end the tyrannical rule of northerners who lacked empathy or understanding of southern society. Boasting of southern manhood, he hoped that the two sides could meet on a battlefield and settle their differences. George Fitzhugh escalated his attacks on northern society. Critical of

¹⁵ J.D.B. De Bow, "The Times Are Out of Joint," *De Bow's Review* 23 (December 1857): 652—58.

progress measured by materialism and greed, he concluded that northern capitalism had made “the poor poorer, the ignorant more ignorant, the vicious and criminal more vile and debased.” Fitzhugh criticized the negative influence of urban development, commercial greed, and free trade. These economic forces, he argued, corrupted lives and tainted communities by placing unrestrained greed above all else. De Bow had difficulty accepting Fitzhugh’s condemnation of progress and modernity. He had spent the last thirteen years supporting what Fitzhugh wanted to tear down. But his hostility to the North led him to nevertheless publish Fitzhugh’s articles.¹⁶

De Bow’s readers noticed the editorial shift of the *Review*. Southerners liked it. A subscriber from Columbus, Georgia, reacted positively to De Bow’s secessionist rhetoric, noting that “I am highly pleased with the strong Southern stand you have taken, and for one, am willing to go with you any length in that direction.” De Bow’s ideological shift stunned northern observers. The editor of the *Philadelphia Inquirer* concluded that “Mr. De Bow is one of the most accomplished men of the South . . . to suppose such a man . . . would become a disunionist is, we repeat, almost incredible, and we can only indulge a hope that the accomplished statistician has been misunderstood or misreported.”¹⁷

At the same time he was becoming more involved in the southern nationalist movement, De Bow’s family life became more complicated. He and Caroline now had two children, James and Mary. They lived in Washington, D.C., where De Bow socialized with prominent politicians and enjoyed his public status. The family took

¹⁶ Edmund Ruffin, “Consequences of Abolition Agitation, Part I-V,” *De Bow’s Review* 22 (June 1857), 583-93; (September 1857), 266-72; (October 1857), 385-90; (November 1857), 546-52; (December 1857), 596-607; George Fitzhugh, “Uniform Postage, Railroads, Telegraphs, Fashions, Etc.,” *De Bow’s Review* 26 (June 1859): 657—664.

¹⁷ J.D.B. De Bow, “A Vision of a Studious Man,” *De Bow’s Review* 23 (November 1857):522; J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial, Book Notices, Etc.,” *De Bow’s Review* 23 (October 1857): 446.

frequent trips to the Virginia highlands. Like many wealthy southerners in the late 1850s, De Bow escaped hot weather and disease by visiting mountain resorts. Although De Bow traveled extensively and enjoyed New York, Boston, and New England, he warned his readers against traveling in the North. He encouraged them to support southern resorts and vacation destinations.¹⁸

De Bow's domestic life turned to tragedy when successive epidemics of cholera took Caroline and James in late 1857 and early 1858, respectively. Devastated, De Bow and Mary left the city for a resort in Berkeley Springs, Virginia. To memorialize his wife, De Bow changed Mary Emma's name to Caroline Mary. His in-laws offered to raise her, but De Bow insisted that she remain with him. He arranged for a private nurse and tutor.¹⁹

Grief hardly diverted De Bow from his intensifying southern defensiveness, especially about northern writers. De Bow assailed Frederick Law Olmsted, correspondent for the *New York Daily Times*, for his critique of southern society and slavery, which was first published as a book in 1857. De Bow said Olmsted's books were "abounding in bitterness and prejudices of every sort." He thought Olmsted had misrepresented himself to southerners who had shown him hospitality and even portrayed him as a Yankee plunderer stealing from his southern hosts. Hinton Rowan Helper's *The Impending Crisis of the South*, also appearing in 1857, further provoked De Bow. A native of North Carolina, Helper focused on the negative influence slavery had on free

¹⁸ J.D.B. De Bow, "Southern Travel and Travelers," *De Bow's Review* 21 (September 1856), 323—29; Charlene M. Boyer-Lewis, *Ladies and Gentlemen on Display: Planter Society at the Virginia Springs, 1790—1860* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001), 3—4, 7.

¹⁹ J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial Miscellany," *De Bow's Review* 25 (September 1858): 371; Skipper, *J.D.B. De Bow, Magazinish of the Old South*, 108—09; Skipper, "J.D.B. De Bow, The Man," *Journal of Southern History* 10 (November 1944): 414—15.

labor and the lives of non-slaveholding whites. Horace Greeley, the editor of the *New York Tribune*, published Helper's critical assessment as proof that an ideological division existed between planters and non-slaveholders. Much to De Bow's chagrin, Helper had used census statistics and material from *De Bow's Review* to support his contentions. De Bow insisted that Helper misrepresented facts and suggested that Greeley's financial generosity may have influenced Helper's anti-southern point of view. About Olmsted and Helper, De Bow warned readers that "the enemy is sleepless and indefatigable in his nefarious work, and bringing up his cohorts to our very doors!"²⁰

De Bow became sensitive to British abolitionist criticism of the South. He suggested that English abolitionists were using slave emancipation as a tool to reduce southern productivity and lessen their nation's dependence on southern imports. At the same time, De Bow knew the huge importance of the relationship between southern planters and British industrialists. He celebrated their commercial relationship and expressed hope that both groups would continue to prosper from slave labor.²¹

The sectional crisis made De Bow even more convinced of the importance of economic diversification and industrial development in the South. Despite steady industrial growth during the 1850s, the South still lagged far behind the North's industrial

²⁰ J.D.B. De Bow, "Southern Slavery and its Assailants," *De Bow's Review* 15 (November 1853): 486—96; J.D.B. De Bow, "Texas," *De Bow's Review* 23 (August 1857): 113—14, 117. Frederick Law Olmsted, *A Journey in the Back Country* (New York: Mason Brothers, 1860), 300—02; 399—407; Frederick Law Olmsted, *The Cotton Kingdom: A Traveler's Observations on Cotton and Slavery in the American Slave States* (New York: Mason Brothers, 1862), 17, 25; David Brown, *Southern Outcast: Hinton Rowan Helper and The Impending Crisis of the South* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006), 91—98; Hinton R. Helper, *The Impending Crisis of the South: How to Meet It* (New York: Burdick Brothers, 1857), 30; J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial Miscellany," *De Bow's Review* 26 (May 1859): 607.

²¹ J.D.B. De Bow, "Improved Sugar Process," *De Bow's Review* 9 (December 1850): 665—69; I.T. Danson, "Connection between American Slavery and the British Cotton Manufacture," *De Bow's Review* 22 (March 1857): 265—88.

progress. In 1858 he reported that only 27,725 of the nation's 131,657 factories were located in the South. Southern foundries produced just a quarter of the nation's pig-iron; and less than a third of the tanneries were in slave states. The South accounted for only 202 of the nation's 1,094 cotton mills. James Martin, a cotton mill owner from Florence, Alabama, wrote an article in the *Review* that challenged southerners to support a wide variety of industries. Martin believed that an educated and trained workforce, employing poor whites instead of slaves, would help the South create a domestic market and generate new consumers of finished products. De Bow agreed with Martin's assessment and provided examples of successful factories in southern cities and towns. Memphis's business sector had built eighteen steam-powered factories and twelve water-powered mills that produced cotton goods, iron products, carriages, cotton gins, and steam boilers. De Bow failed to notice, however, that these factories were linked to cotton production. Few factories in the South produced the other industrial goods needed by an independent nation.²²

Many southerners became critical of the South's effort to industrialize. C. K. Marshall urged southerners to reduce cotton production, plant more food crops, raise more livestock, and invest in factories. Marshall wondered why cotton factories could produce raw cloth and yarn but not clothes. Production of finished goods would be essential for southern independence. He hoped that readers still had time "to correct these evils, and stop these blood-suckers from preying upon our vitals." A *Review* contributor questioned why, despite the South's abundance of lumber, naval stores, and cotton to

²² J.D.B. De Bow, "Southern Manufactures," *De Bow's Review* 24 (June 1850): 555—59; James Martin, "The Field for Southern Manufactures," *De Bow's Review* 24 (May 1858): 382—86; George Stueckrath, "Memphis, Tennessee," *De Bow's Review* 27 (August 1859): 235—39.

transport, more southern shipbuilders had failed to materialize. A disenchanted reader noted that delegates to the Vicksburg Commercial Convention had traveled on northern-built railroad cars that rode on iron rails produced in northern foundries. Once they arrived at the convention, delegates used chairs and desks that had been assembled by northern workers and after a long day retired to “lie down to dream of southern independence in a Yankee bed.”²³

In response, De Bow promoted new industries that had been neglected in past issues of the *Review*. He saw the opportunity to enlarge the timber industry in the yellow pine forests of Georgia and Florida and in the isolated hardwood tracts of eastern Tennessee and western North Carolina. De Bow published an extract of an agricultural survey from Mississippi that noted high levels of porcelain clay and silica. He suggested that these natural resources could support a glassware factory. De Bow highlighted industrial growth in Mobile and the construction of a resin oil plant and saw mills. City records indicated that these new factories and mills produced 1,798 spars and masts, 2,968 tons of hewn wood, and thousands of barrels of naval stores in 1857. But no shipbuilding industry had emerged in Mobile. The South’s manufacturing sector produced semi-finished goods, which created the illusion of a diversified economy, but in fact the regional industrial economy remained very limited. Despite De Bow’s pleas and the efforts of some southern entrepreneurs, the South still lacked the ability to supply many of its own needs.²⁴

²³ C.K. Marshall, “We Must Diversify Our Industry,” *De Bow’s Review* 24 (March 1858): 261; Unknown, “Who Profits By Our Commerce?,” *De Bow’s Review* 24 (May 1858): 449—50; J.D.B. De Bow, “Sensible Hints to the South,” *De Bow’s Review* 24 (June 1858): 573.

²⁴ J.D.B. De Bow, “The Yellow Pine Forest of the South,” *De Bow’s Review* 23 (November 1857): 536—37; J.D.B. De Bow, “Agricultural Survey of Mississippi,” *De Bow’s Review* 23 (December 1857):

De Bow mainly saw southerners as producers and exporters and only later came to an understanding of how crucial consumption was to his economic ambitions for the South. His insufficient and inconsistent emphasis on consumption reflected the larger regional failure to understand the limits of the South's economic potential. Southern consumers bought finished goods like clothing from the North at the same time that southern factories were producing yarn and cloth that could have been finished at home, but in fact were shipped to northern factories for final assembly or fabrication. De Bow lamented that "the presumption is, so far as our efforts are concerned, the South has nothing to sell!" Late in the antebellum years, De Bow was prompted to see how the South's industrial sector suffered from the lack of consumer support. William Gregg, the *Review's* most experienced industrial contributor, verified these concerns, noting that "the absence of patronage to home industry is an evil that cannot be overcome by political agitation or conventional platforms, but must be worked out by the people themselves."²⁵

He did understand that the shortage of banks and credit made it difficult to capitalize factories or transportation projects, but he did not succeed in re-orienting southern investment significantly. Planters relied on cotton merchants who extended them long-term credit based on their cotton crop. They too often borrowed to buy more land and slaves and then had too little capital available for other investments. In 1860 De Bow reprinted an article claiming that industrial investments often yielded 16 percent

644-50; J.D.B. De Bow, "Commercial Movements of Mobile," *De Bow's Review* 23 (November 1857): 485—88.

²⁵ J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial Miscellanies, Book Notices, Etc.," *De Bow's Review* 22 (May 1857): 555—56. James Montgomery, "Why Southern Factories Fail," *De Bow's Review* 26 (January 1859): 95—96; William Gregg, "Southern Patronage to Southern Imports and Domestic Industry," *De Bow's Review* 29 (July 1860): 79. J.D.B. De Bow, "Development of Southern Industry," *De Bow's Review* 19 (July 1855): 1—22.

annually while land and slaves produced 3 percent yearly. Joseph E. Segar, a lawyer and politician from Virginia, wrote in the *Review* blaming a “half century of apathy and thralldom” on planters who did not support manufacturing enterprises. Segar concluded that southerners “are anti-commercial in spirit—their turn is decidedly agricultural—they incline, accordingly, to invest rather in lands and slaves than in ships and freight; to dig from the soil an ample living rather than to amass princely fortunes by the course of trade.” In a brief editorial aside to a larger article in 1860, De Bow wrote that “we have neglected to avail ourselves of the means we have at hand in abundance, to attain the desirable condition of independence.”²⁶

The prospect of secession prompted De Bow to campaign for more direct southern trade with foreign nations. One Mississippi writer in the *Review* called for his state to build a port along the Gulf of Mexico so as “to place our State in a position in which she will be able, at least, to exert some influence on her own destiny.” Virginians urged their state government and individual investors to develop commercial networks to international markets. Ambrose D. Mann helped charter the Atlantic Steam Ferry Company, which he said would secure “the future commercial independence of the slaveholding states.” Mann and other investors hoped that their steamship line could link southern cotton growers to European ports. William M. Burwell, a Virginia legislator and railroad promoter, planned a railroad system that would funnel southern goods to the

²⁶ Woodman, *King Cotton & His Retainers*, 98—100, 136—42; Bateman and Weiss, *A Deplorable Scarcity*, 158—60; Joseph Segar, “Letters from Lieutenant M.F. Maury and Joseph Segar, On a Line of Steamers from the Chesapeake to Europe,” *De Bow’s Review* 22 (May 1857): 516—17; Edwin Heriott, “Wants of the South,” *De Bow’s Review* 29 (August 1860): 215.

South's easternmost deepwater port at Norfolk. Henry A. Wise, the governor of Virginia, supported direct trade with South America and the West Indies.²⁷

In the early summer of 1859, De Bow traveled around the South to gauge the progress of southern cities and railroads. He commented on the energy of Mobile's businessmen. Local railroad development had helped boost the city's cotton exports from 102,684 bales in 1830 to 503,177 bales in 1857. De Bow took the Mobile and Ohio Railroad from Mobile to Columbus, Mississippi. The growth of Columbus pleased him, and he noted its broad commercial connection to other regions. He left Columbus, traveled to Montgomery, and took the Montgomery and West Point Railroad and other smaller lines to Atlanta, Augusta, and Charleston. After spending time in Charleston, De Bow took a forty-two hour trip from Charleston to Memphis aboard the Memphis and Charleston and the Western and Atlantic railroads. He noted that the railroads had become an "admirable structure, under the most excellent management." On his way to Memphis, De Bow stopped in Chattanooga, Tennessee, and Huntsville, Alabama, cities he found orderly and handsome. He admired Memphis's progress before leaving for Vicksburg.²⁸

The Vicksburg Commercial Convention provided De Bow with a public forum to discuss the reopening of the international slave trade. He argued that the importation of Africans would reduce the cost of slaves, making them more affordable for poorer whites. In response to De Bow's interest, delegates elected him to serve as president of

²⁷ J. D. B. De Bow, "Mississippi Seeking a Gulf Outlet," *De Bow's Review* 25 (August 1858): 230; A. Dudley Mann, "Southern Direct Trade with Europe," *De Bow's Review* 24 (May 1858): 352; William M. Burwell, "Overland and Ocean Routes Between the Southwest and Europe," *De Bow's Review* 26 (January 1859): 1—23; Henry A. Wise, "Southern Trade with South America and the West Indies," *De Bow's Review* 26 (January 1859): 73—76.

²⁸ J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial Miscellany," *De Bow's Review* 27 (July 1859): 112—15.

the African Labor Supply Association. He worried about the consolidation of the slave population onto large plantations. De Bow also hoped that the inflammatory topic would incite northern protests and intensify sectional feelings between the North and South.²⁹

Although he continued to publish articles on economic development, De Bow focused more on topics that provoked sectional hostility. He supported reopening the international slave trade despite his earlier warnings about the dangers of slave overpopulation. De Bow's stance shocked some of the most committed southern nationalists. Edmund Ruffin and Robert Barnwell Rhett rejected De Bow's position as untenable and overly divisive within southern society. They believed that questions about the slave trade would frighten moderate southerners away from secession. Ruffin proposed slave colonization as an alternative to reopening the slave trade. Undeterred, De Bow published articles that both supported and rejected his plan, noting "it is but fair to allow a full discussion of all topics important to the South."³⁰

John Brown's raid on the federal arsenal at Harper's Ferry in October 1859 further fueled De Bow's secessionist impulse, and he printed more alarmist opinion. Joseph A. Turner of Georgia, a frequent contributor to the *Review*, cautioned southerners to be wary of northerners and pointed to recent arson attacks in Georgia and Brown's raid as proof that a larger abolitionist plot existed. Another contributor linked the "Black

²⁹ Johnson, *The Men and Vision of the Southern Commercial Conventions*, 32, 103, 164; Harvey Wish "The Revival of the African Slave Trade in the United States, 1856—1860," *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 27 (March 1941): 569—88; Barton J. Bernstein, "Southern Politics and Attempts to Reopen the African Slave Trade," *Journal of Negro History* 51 (January 1966): 16—35; J.D.B. De Bow, "African Labor Supply Association," *De Bow's Review* 27 (August 1859): 233.

³⁰ J.D.B. De Bow, "Excessive Slave Population—The Remedy," *De Bow's Review* 12 (February 1852): 182—85; Edmund Ruffin, "African Colonization Unveiled," *De Bow's Review* 29 (November 1860): 638—49; J.J. Pettigrew, "Protest Against a Renewal of the Slave Trade," *De Bow's Review* 25 (August 1858): 166—85; Thomas Walton, "Further Views of the Advocates of the Slave Trade," *De Bow's Review* 26 (January 1859): 51.

Republicans,” political agenda to Brown’s actions, noting that “his course is the natural result of their teachings.” George Fitzhugh argued that “disunion within the Union” would reestablish political balance between the North and South. Fitzhugh’s alternative to secession struck De Bow as a weak response and suggested that “we better like disunion out of it [the Union], when the issue comes.”³¹

The rise of the Republican Party offered De Bow the opportunity to rally southern readers against a common foe. He accused abolitionists of building the party on “one single, controlling idea of hostility to negro slavery.” Fearful that abolitionists had already taken control of the federal government and that Abraham Lincoln might win the presidential election in 1860, De Bow warned southerners about northern fanaticism. He predicted that abolitionists would disband the federal government within five years and steal the South’s constitutional rights. They would do this, De Bow argued, by falsifying the nation’s history and declaring that slavery had always been illegal. He implored southerners to defend their property rights from Lincoln and the Republican Party.³²

The presidential election of 1860 was a pivotal point for De Bow, as it was for many Americans. In July 1860 De Bow dismissed the overall quality of the presidential candidate pool. He characterized Salmon P. Chase as being “eminent for his labors in behalf of the negro stealers and fugitive slaves.” De Bow was suspicious of John C. Fremont, a southern-born Republican, and questioned the ability of Andrew Johnson. He

³¹ J.A. Turner, “What Are We To Do?,” *De Bow’s Review* 29 (July 1860): 70—71; Lawrence Huff, “Joseph Addison Turner: Southern Editor During the Civil War,” *Journal of Southern History* 29 (November 1963): 469—85. Joseph A. Turner hired Joel Chandler Harris as a typesetter for *The Countryman* in 1862. Harris became one of the postwar South’s most popular dialectic writers who romanticized black folktales and stories about plantation life in the Old South. J.W. Morgan, “The Conservative Men, and the Union Meetings of the North,” *De Bow’s Review* 28 (November 1860): 519; George Fitzhugh, “Disunion Within the Union,” *De Bow’s Review* 28 (January 1860): 1—7.

³² J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial Miscellany,” *De Bow’s Review* 29 (December 1860): 797; J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial Miscellany,” *De Bow’s Review* 29 (October 1860): 534.

warned that William H. Seward qualified as the “most dangerous, and . . . by far the ablest of the Republicans, or what is much the same thing, abolition leaders.” De Bow’s disdain for Lincoln made it “too contemptible to entitle him to a place in the gallery of presidential candidates.” Lincoln’s election would, however, have the benefit of forcing southerners to “break the ignoble shackles, and proclaim themselves free.” He praised John Bell of Tennessee as a man of character and applauded Jefferson Davis for his unconditional support of southern rights. About the Democratic Party, De Bow lamented that “we have a party, hitherto national, but now divided and distracted, and endeavoring to meet the dangers which are upon the country by temporizing expedients, rather than by a bold and intrepid assertion of right, and a manful breasting of the storm.”³³

In the midst of the 1860 election, De Bow married Martha E. Johns, the daughter of a wealthy Tennessee planter, and moved to Nashville to be closer to her family. Within a month of moving, however, De Bow left for a long tour of the South to promote secession. While he was away, Martha reported that secessionists in Nashville had burned an effigy of Andrew Johnson.³⁴

On December 5, 1860, De Bow gave a speech at a meeting in Nashville that appealed for non-slaveholders to support secession. *The Interest in Slavery of the Southern Non-Slaveholder: The Right of Peaceful Secession* gained national attention. He acknowledged that most southerners, himself among them, had never owned a slave. Slavery yielded profit for all white southerners, he explained, because it protected them from racial equality, economic collapse, and social stagnation. He appealed to their work

³³ J.D.B. De Bow, “Presidential Candidates and Aspirants,” *De Bow’s Review* 29 (July 1860): 92—103.

³⁴ Skipper, “J.D.B. De Bow, The Man,” 416; Letter from Martha E. De Bow to J.D.B. De Bow, December 30, 1860, De Bow Papers, Perkins Library, Duke University.

ethic and place in society, reminding southerners that “the non-slaveholder of the South preserves the status of the white man, and is not regarded as an inferior or a dependent.” De Bow suggested that most non-slaveholders supported slavery and aspired to be masters. Without slavery, he warned, the South’s white population would become consumed by class conflict, wage-slavery, and racial upheaval. He declared that “God never intended us to exchange places with our slaves.”³⁵

Some of De Bow’s readers rejected his promotion of secession. The *Review* had ceased being a journal dedicated only to the economic diversification and development of the South. It had become entirely a partisan defender of slavery and related southern institutions. De Bow’s personal feelings influenced his editorial style. Harsh commentary and intentionally inflammatory articles about the North became common in the *Review*. Upset by these changes, an Alabama reader warned that dire consequences would follow from secession: “Please stop my *Review*,” he added. A Memphis subscriber voiced similar concerns, noting that he had been a reader for fifteen years but intended to discontinue his subscription because of De Bow’s secessionist position. De Bow assured himself and his readers that “when the storm is over and our liberties and honor safe, our friend will come back.”³⁶

J. D. B. De Bow embodied how the sectional crisis took over the minds and behavior of most southerners in the late 1850s. His transformation was stark. He went

³⁵ J.D.B. De Bow, *The Interest in Slavery of the Southern Non-Slaveholder: The Right of Peaceful Secession* (Charleston: Evans & Goodwell, 1860), 3—12; Charles Edward Cauthon, *South Carolina Goes to War, 1860—1865* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2005), 41—42; Jon L. Wakelyn, *Southern Pamphlets on Secession: November 1860—April 1861* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996), 78; Stephanie McCurry, *Masters of Small Worlds: Yeoman Households, Gender Relations, and the Political Culture of the Antebellum South Carolina Low Country* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 287—88; Brown, *Southern Outcast*, 174—75; J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial Miscellany,” *De Bow’s Review* 29 (December 1860): 797.

³⁶ J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial Notes and Miscellany,” *De Bow’s Review* 30 (January 1861): 128.

from being an American nationalist with a particular concern for southern economic influence in the Republic to a rabid secessionist. De Bow's economic ambitions shifted away from bringing the South in line with national developments and toward economic self-sufficiency in preparation for a split from—and perhaps a war with—the United States. He enabled the secessionists' usurpation of the commercial convention movement. His commitment to the improvement of education was turned into a paranoid preoccupation with abolitionists' alleged infiltration of schools and textbooks. He closed himself off from northern literary influences. De Bow had initially said little about slavery, but by the mid-1850s he had become a primary source of proslavery rhetoric. The rise of the Republican Party intensified De Bow's reaction to perceived threats to the South. He demonized and vilified the North by linking all events to abolitionism and northern greed. With the election of Abraham Lincoln, he warned that for Republicans abolition was a religion, "the Negro their God . . . its preachers are the Swards and Garrisons, [and] Sumners." Convinced that war was inevitable, De Bow dedicated himself to the new southern nation that would protect the social and economic character of the past.³⁷

³⁷ J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial Miscellany," *De Bow's Review* 29 (December 1860): 797.

Chapter Seven: The Reformulation of De Bow's South, 1861-1867

De Bow applauded South Carolina's decision to leave the Union in December 1860. He believed that other states would follow the Palmetto State. In early 1861, De Bow campaigned for economic diversification as a crucial component of southern independence. He hoped to consolidate public opinion for secession and project the image of a unified region. He campaigned for secession in the Upper South. He found contributors who understood the concerns of moderate readers still unsure of disunion. Robert M. T. Hunter, an ex-senator from Virginia, warned southerners that they would become part of an inferior minority if their state remained in the Union. Henry A. Wise, the ex-governor of Virginia, listed twenty-eight separate "outrages and aggressions of the North against the South." Wise reminded Marylanders that the Underground Railroad had cost them millions of dollars in lost personal property. He recalled that John Brown had traveled to Virginia to "shed the blood of our citizens on her own soil."¹

De Bow used the fear of racial equality and slave emancipation to woo uncommitted southerners to support secession. In a short story that envisioned a war between the North and South, Edmund Ruffin described armies of northern abolitionists that descended upon helpless southern families. He described how northern soldiers

¹ Robert R. Russel, *Economic Aspects of Southern Sectionalism, 1840—1861* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1924), 249; Emory Thomas, *The Confederacy as a Revolutionary Experience* (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1971), 25—29. Thomas notes that fire-eaters such as De Bow used sectional rhetoric to create excitement and support for secession among moderate southerners. R. M. T. Hunter, "Department of Miscellany," *De Bow's Review* 30 (January 1861): 114—16; William H. Chase, "The Secession of the Cotton States: Its Status, Its Advantages, and Its Power," *De Bow's Review* 30 (January 1861): 93—101; J.D.B. De Bow, "The Non-Slaveholders of the South: Their Interest in the Present Sectional Controversy Identical with that of the Slaveholders," *De Bow's Review* 30 (January 1861): 67—77; William W. Freehling, *The South vs. The South: How Anti-Confederate Southerners Shaped the Course of the Civil War* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001); Henry A. Wise, "Overt Acts of Northern Aggression," *De Bow's Review* 30 (January 1861): 116—18.

enslaved poor whites and unleashed vengeful devastation on the countryside. Ruffin depicted loyal slaves fighting for their masters and refusing to leave their plantations. Another contributor warned that abolitionists wanted to subjugate southerners by “elevating the negro slave to an equality with the white man.” He concluded that northerners hoped to emancipate blacks and degenerate whites. De Bow hoped such dire warnings would persuade readers to seek protection within the new southern confederation. In defiance of abundant contrary evidence of persistent unionism the reluctant secessionists in the South, De Bow declared that “never was the South so nearly united as at present, and the day of her deliverance from an insolent and vexatious sectional tyranny is evidently at hand.”²

De Bow attended the secession conventions in South Carolina, Mississippi, and Louisiana. Eager to create a sense of historical importance and regional unity, De Bow presented South Carolina state flags to the secession conventions in Mississippi and Louisiana. After presenting Louisiana’s delegation with a flag, he urged them to create a “new confederation, which shall bring us in safety and honor from the crumbling materials of the old one.” Although secession conventions in many southern states faced substantial opposition from unionists, De Bow believed that the pageantry and success of the three conventions he attended would stimulate excitement in the Upper South.³

In February 1861 delegates from seven southern states met in Montgomery to create a new national government and constitution. De Bow approved of the moderate

² Edmund Ruffin, “Fidelity of Slaves to Their Masters,” *De Bow’s Review* 30 (January 1861): 118—20; John Townsend, “The Non-Slaveholders of the South,” *De Bow’s Review* 30 (January 1861): 123—24; J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial Miscellany,” *De Bow’s Review* 30 (January 1861): 124; Charles B. Dew, *Apostles of Disunion: Southern Secession Commissioners and the Causes of the Civil War* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001), 11—13, 74—83.

³ *Charleston Mercury*, December 15—17, 1860; J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial Notes and Miscellany,” *De Bow’s Review* 30 (February 1861): 251.

choices made by the convention. Jefferson Davis, the new president of the Confederate States of America, had been a causal acquaintance of De Bow while serving in Franklin Pierce's administration. Alexander Stephens, the vice-president of the Confederacy, had been De Bow's first paying subscriber in 1846. Both men had been strong states' rights supporters but opposed secession until their respective states left the Union. De Bow confided to readers that "President Davis is endowed by nature with many heroic qualities which fit him for the great position now assigned to him by history as the second Father of his Country." De Bow also approved of the Confederacy's new constitution, applauding its fairness and its protection of slavery. Inspired by the preservation of old traditions and the advent of new ones, he published the lyrics of "Old King Cotton" and the "Ballad for the Young South" as symbolic of the South's past and future greatness.⁴

The outbreak of war in April 1861 caused De Bow to reevaluate the South's industrial capacity, commercial growth, and agricultural production. He highlighted the region's economic successes since 1846. Southern cotton factories could produce 400,000 yards of cloth per day. When southerners applauded Virginia's decision to join the Confederacy in April 1861, De Bow paid more attention to the inclusion of that state's well-developed industrial resources. The region's railroad mileage had increased from 2,004 miles in 1850 to 8,946 miles in 1860. De Bow was confident that the existing transportation network could support the Confederacy. He assumed that the \$100 million southerners annually paid to northern factories could be reinvested in regional industries. Still, cotton would be the underpinning of the southern economy and even the basis of

⁴ J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial Miscellany," *De Bow's Review* 30 (March 1861): 378—381; William C. Davis, *Look Away!: A History of the Confederate States of America* (New York: The Free Press, 2002), 59—64; J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial," *De Bow's Review* 31 (July 1861): 102.

political independence. Like many other southerners, De Bow assumed that cotton would produce diplomatic recognition for the Confederacy by Great Britain and France. He mocked Abraham Lincoln's expressed doubts that Europeans would support a pro-slavery regime, wondered how "there [is] any man, or is any Black Republican insane enough to suppose Great Britain will tolerate such a prohibition for a moment."⁵

De Bow felt confident that the South's economy would continue to grow after independence. He believed that the region had the natural resources and spirit of enterprise to meet civilian and military needs. He looked forward to the time when southerners would grow and manufacture the bulk of the region's cotton textiles. He hoped that independence would allow southern planters and merchants to enjoy all of the profits generated by the South's economy. William Gregg proved to be more pragmatic and questioned if southerners were ready for economic independence. He asked *Review* readers to support diversified industrialization and buy southern goods. De Bow confidently wrote that a quick war would produce little change in the southern economy and that "old channels of trade would revive, agents of northern manufactures would infest our cities . . . and forever prostrate those incipient manufacturers which are now

⁵ Chad Morgan, *Planters' Progress: Modernizing Confederate Georgia* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2005), 5—6; J.D.B. De Bow, "Southern Patronage to Southern Imports and Domestic Industry," *De Bow's Review* 30 (February 1861): 216—23; Russel, *Economic Aspects of Southern Sectionalism*, 225; Phillips, *A History of Transportation in the Eastern Cotton Belt*, 19—20; H. David Stone, Jr., *Vital Rails: The Charleston & Savannah Railroad and the Civil War in Coastal South Carolina* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2008); William F. Burwell, "The Commercial Future of the South," *De Bow's Review* 30 (February 1861): 129—56; Frank Owsley, *King Cotton Diplomacy: Foreign Relations of the Confederate States of America* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931), 15—20; David G. Surdam, "King Cotton: Monarch or Pretender? The State of the Market for Raw Cotton on the Eve of the American Civil War," *The Economic History Review* 51 (February 1998): 113—32; J.D.B. De Bow, "Department of Commerce," *De Bow's Review* 30 (April 1861): 493.

under the impulse of patriotism and the public want, springing up in every part of the South.”⁶

De Bow believed that the South’s superior leadership and fighting skills would overcome the North’s numerical superiority in men and material. He saw early military victories in Kentucky, Missouri, and Virginia as evidence of southern supremacy. De Bow promised that despite advantages in manpower and materiel, northern armies would “again and again be scattered as chaff before the wind!” He pointed to internal stresses in northern society and wondered if moderate northerners would support Lincoln’s war. De Bow hoped to create a sense of excitement and enthusiasm about the future. He urged readers to embrace patriotic duty and let their unselfish acts become “the war cry for the whole of the Confederacy.”⁷

De Bow moved to Richmond in August 1861 and accepted a position with the Produce Loan Office. The office had been created after the Confederate Congress failed to pass a direct tax bill to fund the war. Christopher G. Memminger, the Confederate secretary of treasury, predicted that \$150 million could be raised by issuing government bonds based on future cotton crops. He hoped to entice southern planters to loan their cotton in exchange for bonds that paid 8 percent annually. Memminger hoped that loan agents could then sell the cotton to European buyers. De Bow supported the plan and used the *Review* to endorse it. Rampant inflation and resistant planters doomed the project, however, and in November 1861, *The Times* of London reported that “as to the

⁶ J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial Notes and Miscellany,” *De Bow’s Review* 30 (February 1861): 252; J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial,” *De Bow’s Review* 32 (January/February 1862): 163; William Gregg, “Southern Patronage to Southern Imports and Domestic Industry,” *De Bow’s Review* 29 (July 1860): 77—83; J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial,” *De Bow’s Review* 32 (March/April 1862): 334—40.

⁷ George Fitzhugh, “Conduct of the War,” *De Bow’s Review* 32 (January/February 1862): 139—40; J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial,” *De Bow’s Review* 31 (November/December 1861): 465; J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial,” *De Bow’s Review* 32 (March/April 1862): 334.

produce loan, we suppose every man in the Confederacy, except the Secretary of the Treasury and Mr. De Bow, is conscious of its utter failure.” Frustrated by the lack of public support and dwindling resources, De Bow watched northern armies capture immense amounts of cotton, and desperate planters try to smuggle their harvest out of the South, regardless of how it influenced the war effort. He later admitted that he spent more time burning cotton than selling it during the war.⁸

His service to the Confederacy came at considerable personal cost. He failed to publish some monthly issues of the *Review*. Martha De Bow worried about her husband’s health. In November 1861, Robert Norton, De Bow’s uncle in Robertsville, South Carolina, expressed similar concerns about his nephew’s health and urged him to go back to Nashville. De Bow did return to Nashville in early 1862 as northern troops approached the city. The capture of nearby Fort Donelson had thrown the city into pandemonium. De Bow decided to move his family to New Orleans as Nashville braced for northern occupation. But within two months of arriving in the Crescent City, the De Bows had to leave again as northern troops took New Orleans.⁹

De Bow’s Review was an early casualty of the war. Many readers had stopped paying their subscriptions. He published two bimonthly editions in early 1862 but the

⁸ J.D.B. De Bow, “Journal of the War,” *De Bow’s Review* 2 (September 1866): 328—30; Emory M. Thomas, *The Confederate Nation, 1861—1865* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1979): 137—38; Douglas B. Ball, *Financial Failure and Confederate Defeat* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 80—91; Ramsdell, *Behind the Lines in the Southern Confederacy*, 8—12, 80—82.

⁹ J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial,” *De Bow’s Review* 31 (August 1861): 208; Letters from Martha De Bow to J.D.B. De Bow, September 10, 1861, September 12, 1861, December 28, 1861, Letter from Robert Norton to J.D.B. De Bow, November 27, 1861, De Bow Papers MSS, Perkins Library, Duke University; Stephen V. Ash, *When the Yankees Came: Conflict and Chaos in the Occupied South, 1861—1865* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 16—17.

wartime inflation of paper and ink costs made production too expensive to continue. In April 1862 De Bow closed his editorial office.¹⁰

The weakness of the industrial sector and the incomplete transportation system initially made it difficult for the Confederate government to meet military and civilian demand. The region's industrial capacity had grown substantially since 1840 but still was far behind the North's. In 1840 the South accounted for 20 percent of the capital invested in the American industrial sector; by 1860 that number had dropped to below 16 percent. By the start of the Civil War, southern factories could only produce 233 of 631 known items fabricated by American factories. Although thousands of miles of railroad track had been laid in the 1850s, the South's share of the nation's overall mileage had shrunk from 44 percent in 1844 to 35 percent in 1860. Individual state governments had liberalized incorporation laws to encourage railroad development but rarely provided funding to private companies. Southern lawmakers usually did not support projects across state lines. The result was a fractured, disconnected railroad system without long intraregional trunk lines. Despite these limitations, however, Josiah Gorgas, head of the Confederate Ordnance Bureau, managed to gain control of regional factories and railroads. He streamlined production and standardized processes that helped supply the military with munitions, uniforms, and equipment. De Bow's earlier vision of regional cities that supported factories and mills was realized to some extent in Gorgas's decision to

¹⁰ J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial, *De Bow's Review* 32 (January/February 1862): 168; J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial," *De Bow's Review* 32 (March/April 1862): 338—39.

centralize southern industrial production in places like Columbus, Atlanta, Macon, and Selma.¹¹

The South's failure to diversify agricultural production during the 1850s contributed to food shortages in the Confederacy. Many planters had clung to cotton, especially as the commodity price rose through most of the decade. During the intensifying sectional crisis, De Bow focused on the importance of cotton cultivation as the basis for potential southern geo-political power. He mostly stopped publishing items about agriculture beyond cotton production. The South's production of grain, pasture grasses, fruit, and garden vegetables had stayed relatively low compared to its potential—and need during wartime. By 1860 southern farms produced only 29 percent of the nation's wheat and 10 percent of its hay. Planters in the Lower South had become reliant on commercial farms in the Upper South, the border states, and the Northwest for their food supply. Acute food shortages became a problem for most soldiers and citizens of the Confederacy.¹²

De Bow failed to anticipate changes in the European cotton market and the influence of the North's naval blockade of the South. Good harvests in the late 1850s had allowed foreign factory owners to stockpile substantial cotton reserves. They also began

¹¹ Stanley L. Engerman, "Myths and Realities," in *Global Perspectives on Industrial Transformation in the American South* ed. Susanna Delfino and Michele Gillespie (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2005), 18—19; Richard E. Beringer, Herman Hattaway, Archer Jones, and William N. Stills, Jr., *Why the South Lost the Civil War* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986), 215—17; Russel, *Economic Aspects of Southern Sectionalism*, 227; J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial," *De Bow's Review* 32 (January/February 1862): 169; McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 94—95; Downey, *Planting a Capitalist South*, 101—03; Black III, *The Railroads of the Confederacy*, 1—11; James A. Ward, "A New Look at Antebellum Southern Railroad Development," *Journal of Southern History* 39 (August 1973): 409—20.

¹² Gray, *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860, Volume II*, 811—30; Roger L. Ransom, *The Confederate States of America* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2005), 188; Charles W. Ramsdell, *Behind the Lines in the Southern Confederacy* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1944), 34—35; J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial," *De Bow's Review* 31 (August 1861): 203—04; William Hume, "The Grape—Its Culture and Manufacture at the South," *De Bow's Review* 30 (March 1861): 335—51; Mary E. Massey, *Ersatz in the Confederacy* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1952), 55—77.

to buy cotton from India. Winfield Scott, a Virginian and the Union's general-in-chief in 1861, devised the "Anaconda Plan" to block all major seaboard and river ports in the South. The blockage limited southern exports, and cotton's diplomatic and economic importance dwindled as bales sat in warehouses or were burned by northern armies. De Bow later reflected on the failure of cotton to produce political recognition, noting that "our cotton was not indispensably necessary to [foreign] nations, and it did not confer on us the power to dictate relations and policy."¹³

De Bow attempted to bolster the morale of his readers with reports of military and economic successes. He provided detailed lists of new railroads, factories, and natural resources that could be harnessed for military use. He applauded the creation of new industries that supported the war effort. He assured readers that Confederate finances had improved and that the war had overextended the North. The invading northern armies, he promised, would be stopped even if women had to be armed. De Bow's commitment to the Confederacy rivaled his earlier interests in economic reform and southern nationalism. Unable or unwilling to see the declining fortunes of the Confederacy, De Bow chose to highlight the gallantry of southern soldiers and the sacrifice of civilians rather than military defeat or supply shortages.¹⁴

As the war wore on, De Bow's southern chauvinism turned to bitter criticism about regional economic failure. He condemned state governments that had failed to

¹³ McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom*, 334—36; Herman Hattaway and Archer Jones, *How the North Won the War: A Military History of the Civil War* (Champlain: University of Illinois Press, 1991), 82, 288; Owsley, *King Cotton Diplomacy*, 73. Owsley argues that many southerners favored a northern blockade as a means of forcing Great Britain to recognize the Confederacy and increase cotton prices. J.D.B. De Bow, "Manufacturers: The South's True Remedy," *De Bow's Review* 3 (February 1867): 174.

¹⁴ J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial Notes and Miscellany," *De Bow's Review* 30 (February 1861): 252—53; R.R. Welford, "The Loyalty of the Border States," *De Bow's Review* 32 (January/February 1862): 87; J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial Miscellany," *De Bow's Review* 30 (March 1861): 380.

develop their own economies. De Bow criticized Charleston's business elite for not expanding the city's commercial and industrial realm. He realized that too much emphasis had been placed on cotton production and manufacturing. Aware that the Confederate government had to establish new factories and mills in the midst of fighting, De Bow later confessed that if the Confederacy had had an "established diversified industry . . . the contest would have been brief and our independence would have been achieved." He blamed this deficiency on southerners "who have croaked against Southern enterprise, and manufacturing at the South, who are constantly setting forth the idea that our young men will not make merchants . . . or try to become business men—we repeat, let us beg that class of men to cease their croaking." De Bow did not, however, own up to how much his own sectionalist croaking in the late antebellum years had diverted him from promoting a diversified, modern economy.¹⁵

De Bow spent the rest of the war working for the Produce Loan Office and avoiding northern armies. The De Bow family moved from New Orleans to Jackson, Mississippi, and then to Selma, Mobile, and Uniontown, Alabama, and finally to Columbus, Mississippi. A wealthy planter provided De Bow with a comfortable home in Columbus. Approaching northern troops in 1864, however, forced the family to move to Winnsboro, South Carolina, where they lived until April 1865. De Bow later admitted feeling isolated and unproductive during these years. He kept a daily journal of the war and hoped to publish a history about the Confederacy.¹⁶

¹⁵ J.D.B. De Bow, "Manufacturers: The South's True Remedy," *De Bow's Review* 3 (February 1867): 174; J.D.B. De Bow, "Southern Patronage to Southern Imports and Domestic Industry," *De Bow's Review* 30 (February 1861): 218.

¹⁶ J.D.B. De Bow, "Journal of the War—Entered Up Dailey in the Confederacy," *De Bow's Review* 1 (June 1866): 646; Skipper, *J.D.B. De Bow, Magazinish of the Old South*, 170—72.

By the beginning of 1865, De Bow recognized that the bid for southern independence had failed. He also understood that his vision of economic development had been partially flawed. De Bow had focused too narrowly on cotton manufacturing, large commercial ports, and wealthy planters. He knew that this mistake would have to be rectified if the *Review* was to resume and regain its status as the South's most prominent economic journal.¹⁷

Like many other southerners in April 1865, De Bow had to reconcile his feelings about southern defeat with his future in the United States. Burned-out cities, wrecked railroads, untended fields, and freed slaves left De Bow and other white southerners melancholy and unsure of the future. He remained silent about the assassination of Abraham Lincoln but reacted favorably to Andrew Johnson's lenient proclamation of amnesty. Eager to restart his life, De Bow took an oath of allegiance to the United States on July 15, 1865, and filed for a presidential pardon two days later. He believed that Johnson's generous terms would restore order in the South and reap "golden fruits of industry, enterprise, prosperity, and cheerful allegiance." On August 29, 1865, President Johnson granted De Bow a full pardon despite objections from those who considered him a traitor. The editor of the *Washington Standard* hoped that De Bow might be handed over to ex-slaves so they could "hang up 'de fiddle' . . . at the same time 'hang up De Bow.'"¹⁸

¹⁷ R. Thomassy, "The New Sea Salt Manufacture of the Confederate States," *De Bow's Review* 31 (October/November 1861): 442.

¹⁸ See J.DB. De Bow File in *Case Files of Applications from Former Confederates for Presidential Pardons ("Amnesty Papers"), 1865-67*. Records of the Adjutant General's Office, 1780's-1917, Record Group 94, Publication M1003; National Archives, Washington, D.C.; *Washington Standard* (Olympia), November 15, 1865.

In late 1865 De Bow toured the South to gauge the level of destruction caused by the war and to see how southerners responded to northern occupation. He noted a sense of progress amid the torched buildings of Richmond. He felt that Baltimore had stagnated and become complacent during the war, and that Washington, D.C., had grown to accommodate the northern war effort. De Bow witnessed widespread suffering in Charleston but noted that all classes of white citizens were in the streets attempting to rebuild the city. He saw little reason for military occupation in light of such dutiful work directed at restoring the South. De Bow welcomed northern aid but bristled at the attitude of the occupiers. In a trip to northern Alabama, he encountered a group of northern investors looking for inexpensive land. Their enthusiasm and ready money excited De Bow, but he objected to what he perceived as their overconfident manner and rude behavior.¹⁹

De Bow spent the rest of 1865 preparing to reopen the *Review*. He hoped to reintroduce his basic economic tenets—industrialization, urbanization, commercial development, and agricultural reform—but in a way that resonated among readers in the postwar South. He now hoped to lead the South back into the Union. De Bow collected past payments that were due him and reestablished old connections with contributors and readers. He hoped that his “After the War Series” would reinsert his ideas into the minds of southerners. The national press responded favorably to De Bow’s return. The *Rochester Republican* remembered his unmatched devotion to economic development. The *New York Times* believed he could offer leadership and hoped that De Bow might

¹⁹ J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial Notes and Miscellany,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (February 1866): 217—20; J.D.B. De Bow, “Profits of Cotton-Growing,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (February 1866): 197; J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial Notes and Miscellany,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (February 1866): 219.

constitute “a very favorable token of the progress of sound opinion and right purpose in the South.” The editor of the *Canton Daily Mail* thought that he could rekindle feelings of progress among southerners. This public support made De Bow eager to restart the *Review*. He opened his editorial office in Nashville and began to work.²⁰

In January 1866 De Bow published the first postwar issue of the *Review*. In the “Future of the United States,” he conceded the South’s complete defeat and rejected the doctrine of secession. The strength of the Union had been tested and survived. He encouraged southerners to look forward and “put their shoulder to the wheel, intellectually and physically, to redeem—such is the vastness of our resources and the flexibility of our institutions—what has been lost, and remove all traces of the recent calamitous times.” Sensing the growing political power of the Radical Republicans in Congress, De Bow pled for sectional harmony and a moderate plan of reconstruction. He reminded southern readers that slavery’s destruction had been complete and hoped that “the people of the South, universally, are willing to give a fair and honest trial to the experiment of Negro emancipation, which has been forced upon them.” He believed that southerners, more than any other American, had “intimate knowledge of negro character, and that sympathy with him and his fortunes, which is but the natural result of long and close association.”²¹

De Bow went so far as to reject his secessionist past as a political misunderstanding. He claimed that “the political teachers of his youth and early manhood

²⁰ *Rochester Republican* (Rochester, New York), December 21, 1865; *New York Times*, September 1, 1865; *Canton Daily Mail* (Canton, Mississippi), December 28, 1865.

²¹ J.D.B. De Bow, “Future of the United States,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (January 1866): 3—5; *Philadelphia Inquirer*, September 2, 1865; J.D.B. De Bow, “The Future of the South,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (January 1866): 6—16.

. . . Jefferson, Calhoun, Madison, and McDuffie” had taught him to support states’ rights as a logical defense against federal abuses. De Bow explained that states’ rights and secession had been used as a threat to create “new understandings and new compacts, in which the rights of all sections would be observed and respected.” He denied ever wanting war with the North and saw the conflict as a spontaneous act of political aggression. De Bow’s reversal shocked many readers who remembered him as a prominent agitator for war.²²

The postwar emigration of prominent southerners to Europe and South America concerned De Bow. Judah Benjamin had escaped to England, and Matthew F. Maury moved to Brazil rather than live under northern occupation. De Bow felt that these men, and others like them, could help lead the South after the war. De Bow reminded readers “that it is the duty of her sons to remain in the country, and abide by its fortunes for weal or for woe, we have discouraged all schemes of emigration.” Robert E. Lee noted De Bow’s willingness to remain in the South and sent a letter of support to the *Review*.²³

In May 1866 the Joint Committee on Reconstruction summoned De Bow to testify on the condition of the postwar South. He used the public forum to create an image of a peaceful and remorseful region. According to De Bow, southerners rejected secession and accepted northern victory and had become tired of political strife. He questioned the need for military occupation and reassured listeners that secessionists held little animosity toward ex-slaves or unionists. Concerned congressmen queried De Bow

²² J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial and Miscellanies,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (March 1866): 331—32; Potter, *The Impending Crisis*, 482—83.

²³ J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial Notes and Miscellany,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (January 1866): 108; J.D.B. De Bow, “Shall Southerners Emigrate to Brazil?,” *De Bow’s Review* 2 (July 1866): 30—38; J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial and Miscellanies,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (March 1866): 331.

about violence in Louisiana and wondered what could be done to improve the situation. De Bow explained that violence had been rare and that most southerners welcomed new opportunities created by northern investments. He hoped that the Freedmen's Bureau would be dissolved and that local communities would be put in charge of education for ex-slaves. De Bow opposed granting citizenship to blacks who could not read or write. Ex-slaves could earn their citizenship through education and proper vocational training and then be granted the right to vote, he argued. De Bow questioned the motives of Republicans who hoped to punish the South and overthrow Andrew Johnson's administration.²⁴

De Bow accommodated himself to the realities of the postwar South. He renounced his secessionist past and regained his citizenship into the United States. He encouraged readers to embrace reconciliation and new ideas as ways of speeding up economic recovery. His reverence for the past became secondary to the immediate needs of the region. De Bow assumed that his readers, the prewar economic and political elite in many southern communities, would help lead southern recovery efforts. He understood that resistance to northern occupation and violence against blacks would only provoke northerners to impose harsher conditions on the South. He counseled readers to forget about past defeats and accept that "brave and true men never waste time over the inevitable and the irretrievable." De Bow confidently predicted that southerners would "perform all the duties [of citizenship] . . . quietly, soberly, orderly, without ostentation or

²⁴ J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial and Miscellanies," *De Bow's Review* 1 (May 1866): 555—60; Benjamin B. Kendrick, *The Journal of the Joint Committee of Fifteen on Reconstruction* (New York: 1914); *Report of the Joint Committee on Reconstruction at the First Session of the Thirty-Ninth Congress* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1866), 132—36; Eric L. McKittrick, *Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960), 209—10.

parade, and if the Federal authorities and the people of the North will act with a liberal and enlarged spirit, and with the generosity which the conqueror can well afford, the South may yet be restored and a great future open upon it.”²⁵

Although his belief in black racial inferiority remained unchanged, De Bow reminded readers that “the ties of sympathy between the Negro and the white man, his former master, are not dissolved because slavery has ceased.” The sudden migration of thousands of ex-slaves in search of new homes and family members, however, concerned De Bow. He worried about the productivity of free labor and the relationship between ex-masters and ex-slaves, and he thought blacks had no real choice but to go back to work. They could either become productive members of society, or they could leave the United States, or “like the Indians submit to annihilation.”²⁶

The Freedmen’s Bureau became a popular topic in the postwar *Review*. The sudden emancipation of 4 million slaves concerned De Bow. He worried that unproductive freed blacks would become burdensome. Noting the unruly behavior of free blacks in Jamaica and the West Indies, he worried that American ex-slaves would become lazy and insolent. William H. Trescott confirmed De Bow’s fears after reporting that the Freedmen’s Bureau in South Carolina’s Sea Islands harbored criminals and vagrants. De Bow believed that Bureau fostered “the poison of discontent, and the feelings of envy, of jealousy, of insubordination and of turbulence” among ex-slaves toward their old masters. De Bow published a brief poem modeled after Edgar Allan

²⁵ J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial Notes and Miscellanies,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (January 1866): 217, 220.

²⁶ J.D.B. De Bow, “A Talk with Radical Leaders,” *De Bow’s Review* 2 (October 1866): 334; J.D.B. De Bow, “The Future of the Negro Population,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (January 1866): 58;

Poe's poem, "The Raven." In the poem, the unknown writer wondered: "On your honor, as a Negro, will you labor as before? Quoth the Negro: 'Nevermore.'"²⁷

De Bow promoted northern and European investment in the postwar South. Early in his editorial career he had encouraged northern investors to build cotton factories and railroads in the South. He had borrowed ideas about factory construction and investment strategies from Charles T. James, a prominent Rhode Island entrepreneur, and published them for the general benefit of his readers. Later, after the *Review* became more sectional in the mid-1850s, De Bow rejected northern investment as a hindrance to the profit-minded businessmen who were emerging in the South. In mid-1857 he published two articles that warned readers about Yankees in Virginia and the "Yankee colonization of the South." But after the war that view disappeared, and De Bow openly courted outside investors. With nearly all native southern capital destroyed in the war, he welcomed all outside investment. He applauded a French consortium for purchasing coal fields and large tracts of land in Virginia. He encouraged northerners to become cotton planters. The *Review* published extensive listings of plantations for sale and promoted investment companies such as the American Land Company in New York City. He helped William T. Withers, a real estate broker from Jackson, Mississippi, list eighty-one plantations in Mississippi and noted that "northern capitalists may feel safe in his hands." De Bow

²⁷ J.D.B. De Bow, "The Future of South Carolina—Her Inviting Resources," *De Bow's Review* 2 (July 1866): 41; J.D.B. De Bow, "Justice to the Negro," *De Bow's Review* 2 (July 1866): 91—92; William H. Trescott, "The Freedmen on the Sea Islands of South Carolina," *De Bow's Review* 1 (April 1866): 440—41; J.D.B. De Bow, "Atrocities of the Freedmen's Bureau," *De Bow's Review* 2 (July 1866): 92—94. J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial Notes, Etc.," *De Bow's Review* 2 (July 1866): 111.

hoped that northerners might create new opportunities for southerners who in time could regain control of the land.²⁸

De Bow resurrected his call for crop diversification and scientific farming. Contributors offered advice on new farming techniques and machinery. De Bow explored the benefits of sugar beets, Indian corn, and grain cultivation as alternative crops. Still, he promoted cotton production as the fastest way to attain needed capital for recovery. He published three to five articles each month on different aspects of cotton production. Whereas most prewar articles in the *Review* had focused on large-scale agricultural production, De Bow now broadened his postwar editorial scope to include anyone interested in growing cotton.²⁹

De Bow recognized that his prewar focus on cotton factories had been a mistake and asked postwar readers to invest in a more diversified industrial sector. He now republished newspaper articles, essays, and reports that offered practical advice on manufacturing. He hoped to create regional momentum and build “new furnaces, mills, factories, tanneries; new mines of iron, coal, copper, lead, and zinc; new railroads, countless oil wells; in the multiplication of machinery and the establishment of new

²⁸ Eric Foner, *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863--1877* (New York: Perennial Classics, 1988), 214—15; J.D.B. De Bow, “French Enterprise in Virginia,” *De Bow's Review* 1 (May 1866): 554; J.D.B. De Bow, “The Cotton Crop of the South, and What it Costs to Produce Cotton, and how Great a Field is Opened to Enterprise and Capital,” *De Bow's Review* 1 (May 1866): 542—47; F. A. Conkling, “Production and Consumption of Cotton in the World,” *De Bow's Review* 1 (April 1866): 378—95; Edward Atkinson, “The Cotton Resources of the South, Present and Future,” *De Bow's Review* 2 (August 1866): 132—44; J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorials, Book Notices, Etc.,” *De Bow's Review* 2 (December 1866): 667.

²⁹ J.D.B. De Bow, “Sugar Beet and Beet Sugar, No. 1,” *De Bow's Review* 1 (February 1866): 194—96; J.D.B. De Bow, “The Grain Products of the United States,” *De Bow's Review* 2 (July 1866): 79—80; J.D.B. De Bow, “Crops in the Prairie Lands of Mississippi,” *De Bow's Review* 2 (November 1866): 532; J.D.B. De Bow, “Agricultural Machinery,” *De Bow's Review* 1 (April 1866): 432—33; J.D.B. De Bow, “Estimate for Cultivating 500 acres of Cotton Land,” *De Bow's Review* 2 (July 1866): 74—75; J.D.B. De Bow, “Cost of Growing Cotton by Free Labor,” *De Bow's Review* 2 (September 1866): 300-01; J.D.B. De Bow, “The Cotton Supply for 1866,” *De Bow's Review* 2 (September 1866): 302; J.D.B. De Bow, “Sources of the British Cotton Supply,” *De Bow's Review* 2 (July 1866): 81—82.

industries.” The timber industry, which he had neglected before the war, became a special focus. De Bow noted the large timber stands and sawmills in western North Carolina, eastern Tennessee, western Georgia, northern Florida, and parts of Louisiana. His interest in timber brought his attention to the upcountry and mountainous areas of the South that he had virtually ignored before the war. A lumber boom in Georgia and Florida resulted in dozens of new sawmills in Augusta immediately after the war. An influx of Alabama timber revitalized Mobile and made it a successful lumber port. De Bow encouraged southerners to harvest southern forests and supply domestic and national markets with needed lumber. Existing towns and railroads could be converted to accommodate the South’s lumber industry while continuing to meet the needs of local farmers. He envisioned new sawmills, furniture factories, paper mills, turpentine stores, and railroads being built to help support the lumber industry.³⁰

De Bow imagined the benefits of building a southern petroleum industry. The wartime development of northern petroleum fields surprised many southerners who had been isolated by the war. Northern production had increased from 600,000 barrels in 1860 to 2.3 million barrels in 1865. Still unsure of the uses and value of oil, De Bow reprinted northern articles that explained the new industry. The presence of large coal deposits in the South’s mountainous areas led to hope that large oil reserves also existed.

³⁰ J.D.B. De Bow, “Manufactures: The South’s True Remedy,” *De Bow’s Review* 3 (February 1867): 174; J.D.B. De Bow, “The Future of South Carolina—Her Inviting Resources,” *De Bow’s Review* 2 (July 1866): 41—49; J.D.B. De Bow, “The Lumber Business of the South,” *De Bow’s Review* 2 (August 1866): 201—02; Starobin, *Industrial Slavery in the Old South*, 24—25; Victor S. Clark, *History of Manufactures in the United States, Volume II, 1860—1893* (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1929), 126—27; Woodward, *Origins of the New South*, 116—17.

He urged southerners to invest in oil extraction and develop new oilfields. De Bow compared the excitement of the petroleum industry to the California Gold Rush.³¹

Articles about mining and mineral extraction became more common in the postwar *Review*. De Bow explored different mining enterprises and concluded that enough mineral resources existed to supply new southern iron foundries and factories. Contributors wrote about coal, iron, and gold reserves that could benefit the South's economy. Aware of northern Alabama's coal and iron fields before the war, De Bow hoped that these deposits could expand the postwar South's industrial capacity. Albert Stein, a long-time contributor from Mobile, urged his city to extend its commercial resources to industrialists and miners in northern Alabama before regional competition isolated the port city. De Bow agreed with Stein's assessment and reminded readers of the importance of linking commerce and industry to create a more diversified economy.³²

De Bow encouraged the use of immigrants to supplement the South's work force. In the 1840s and 1850s, many southern factories and railroad companies had converted from free labor to slave labor. Emancipation created doubt among white southerners about the productivity of ex-slaves. De Bow suggested that European immigrants and Chinese laborers might become a dependable workforce. Agencies in northern cities recruited immigrants to travel South and work in factories or on farms. De Bow highlighted the economic and social benefits that new immigrants brought to the South. A *Review* contributor suggested that southern promotional material be printed in foreign

³¹ J.D.B. De Bow, "Editorial Notes and Miscellany," *De Bow's Review* 1 (January 1866): 106; W.A. Van Benthuyzen, "Petroleum," *De Bow's Review* 1 (February 1866): 173—78; J.D.B. De Bow, "Petroleum as an Element of National Wealth," *De Bow's Review* 2 (August 1866): 203.

³² Sean P. Adams, *Old Dominion, Industrial Commonwealth, Coal, Politics, and Economy in Antebellum America* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004), 1—6; J.D.B. De Bow, "The Iron and Coal of Alabama," *De Bow's Review* 1 (January 1866): 84; Albert Stein, "Alabama and Her Resources," *De Bow's Review* 2 (October 1866): 362—72.

languages. Another reader studied the cultural habits of Chinese coolies and concluded that they worked hard and usually returned to China within five years. Few *Review* contributors mentioned the availability of ex-slaves as an effective labor force. One subscriber warned readers that he had hired ex-slaves to work but watched them descend into drunken stupors.³³

De Bow promoted the economic potential of southern cities. He celebrated the commercial revival of New Orleans and Memphis as river traffic increased after the war. After a trip to Virginia, De Bow noted the industrial and commercial reemergence of Richmond and the continued potential of Norfolk as an international port. He lauded Nashville's fortuitous commercial proximity to Memphis, St. Louis, Cincinnati, and Knoxville. With minimal wartime damage and good commercial connections to the North, Nashville stood poised to assume a new level of economic importance. De Bow asked southern newspaper editors to publish favorable articles about the South.³⁴

De Bow encouraged city governments to create statistical reports that added legitimacy to his claims of progress. Monthly and annual reports from Memphis, Savannah, New Orleans, and Mobile became regular parts of the *Review*. These statistical overviews had been common before the war but became important postwar indicators of

³³ Starobin, *Industrial Slavery in the Old South*, 116—28; J.D.B. De Bow, "Profits of Cotton Growing," *De Bow's Review* 1 (February 1866): 197—98; E.C. Cabell, "White Immigration to the South," *De Bow's Review* 1 (January 1866): 91—94; C.L. Fleishman, "Opening of New Fields to Immigration," *De Bow's Review* 1 (January 1866): 87—91; J.D.B. De Bow, "Coolies as a Substitute for Negroes," *De Bow's Review* 2 (August 1866): 215—17; Foner, *Reconstruction*, 214—15; J.D.B. De Bow, "The Freedmen of North Carolina," *De Bow's Review* 1 (March 1866): 328.

³⁴ J.D.B. De Bow, "The Future of South Carolina—Her Inviting Resources," *De Bow's Review* 2 (July 1866): 38—49; J.B. Robinson, "The Vast Resources of Louisiana," *De Bow's Review* 2 (September 1866): 274—85; J.D.B. De Bow, "Virginia—Her Spirit and Development," *De Bow's Review* 2 (July 1866): 53—56; Dan H. Doyle, *New Men, New Cities, New South: Atlanta, Nashville, Charleston, Mobile, 1860—1910* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990), 27—31; J.D.B. De Bow, "Nashville and its Projected Railroad Improvements," *De Bow's Review* 2 (July 1866): 97—100.

regional recovery. De Bow assumed that export levels indicated broader activity among planters, manufacturers, and merchants. Although Charleston had incomplete numbers in early 1866, De Bow used projections of warehoused cotton to forecast “the revival of a commerce, which we confidently anticipate will increase and multiply until Charleston shall rank first among the cities of the South.”³⁵

In June 1866 De Bow gave a speech in Cincinnati on the importance of regional harmony and railroad development. He hoped to create a sense of sectional reconciliation that would link the commercial future of Cincinnati to the resources of the South. De Bow noted that the North had the capital to fix the South’s railroad system and that the South had the natural resources to fuel northern economic growth. Still proud of southern achievements, De Bow noted that “the South sleeps; she is not dead.” He reassured his audience that southerners wanted to end sectional hostility and promote national economic recovery. After De Bow finished his speech, James W. Sloss, the president of the Nashville and Decatur Railroad, reaffirmed his friend’s appeal for northern capital and intersectional cooperation. He believed that a direct railroad connection between Nashville and Cincinnati would create new agricultural and industrial opportunities for southerners and benefit northern merchants. Sloss later joined Daniel Pratt and other pre-war Alabama railroad promoters in developing the state’s iron industry in what would

³⁵ For examples of postwar statistical reports see: J.D.B. De Bow, “Commerce of Mobile,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (February 1866): 199—200; J.D.B. De Bow, “Trade of Memphis,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (April 1866): 425—26; J.D.B. De Bow, “The City of Nashville,” *De Bow’s Review* 2 (October 1866): 427—28; J.D.B. De Bow, “Sources of the British Cotton Supply,” *De Bow’s Review* 2 (July 1866): 82; J.D.B. De Bow, “Commerce of Charleston, S.C.,” *De Bow’s Review* 1 (February 1866): 199. Despite De Bow’s positive prediction for complete economic recovery, the city of Charleston languished in ruin for decades after the Civil War. The city remained a symbol of the destruction and loss of an older South. Woodward, *Origins of the New South*, 107.

become Birmingham in 1871. With the aid of northern capital, Sloss's furnaces produced pig iron for factories in Cincinnati, Cleveland, and Chicago.³⁶

In October 1866 De Bow became president of the Tennessee Central and Pacific Railroad Company. The state of Tennessee had chartered the new railroad in March 1866, and investors hoped that it would provide better access to eastern Tennessee and the Cumberland Plateau. De Bow first mentioned the railroad in August 1866 and believed that it could link Knoxville and Nashville to Jackson, Mississippi, which served as a hub for larger western railroads. After accepting the presidency of the new railroad, De Bow addressed a letter to the people of Tennessee in the *Review*. He reminded readers of his long commitment to internal improvement projects, noting that railroads had created "a system which has built up our cities and developed our interior; adding indefinitely to the value of our lands and to our physical, moral, and other comforts," but he added that "we are but in the middle, and not at the end of our laborers." The Tennessee Central became the tangible outcome of De Bow's personal crusade for railroad development. His knowledge of railroad matters and what had worked and failed became the basis of his presidency. Unfortunately for De Bow and Tennessee investors, financial problems delayed construction until 1869. In 1877 the Nashville, Chattanooga, and St. Louis Railroad consolidated the debt-plagued Tennessee Central, assuming

³⁶ J.D.B. De Bow, "Nashville and Its Projected Railroad Improvements," *De Bow's Review* 2 (July 1866): 97—100; Henry M. McKiven, Jr., *Iron and Steel: Class, Race, and Community in Birmingham, Alabama, 1875—1920* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1995), 8—12; Philip A. Bruce, *The History of North America: The Rise of the New South, Volume XVII* (Philadelphia: George Barrie & Sons, 1905), 213—14. Woodward, *Origins of the New South*, 292.

control of twenty-nine miles of track and a northern-built steam engine named the “J. D. B. De Bow.”³⁷

In January 1867 De Bow wrote an article that condemned his prewar vision of industrialization and over-reliance on cotton factories. He promised readers that diversified industrialization would erase the errors of the past that had been shown to be a delusion by the war. De Bow urged southerners to act upon his words and his advice on “how to begin the Reformation.” The *Review* had always given ample space to articles on factories and manufacturing, De Bow noted, but he promised now to provide articles and sketches of machinery, factories, and tools that would be useful for entrepreneurs interested in starting new enterprises. Believing that he understood his reader’s needs, De Bow prepared to print the first installment of this new industrial section in the February 1867 issue of the *Review*.³⁸

That issue proved to be his last and it is not clear that he saw it in print. In early February 1867 De Bow traveled to Elizabeth, New Jersey, to attend to his sick brother. On arrival at Benjamin De Bow’s side, James complained of feeling ill himself. De Bow’s symptoms became worse and on February 27, 1867, he died of acute peritonitis. Unsure of what to do with the body, local residents put his corpse on a southbound train without a clear destination. De Bow’s remains never reached Nashville or any other

³⁷ J.D.B. De Bow, “Tennessee Pacific Railroad for Knoxville to Memphis,” *De Bow’s Review* 2 (September 1866): 318—19; *New York Times*, October 19, 1866; J.D.B. De Bow, “Railroad History and Results,” *De Bow’s Review* 2 (December 1866): 609—39; John F. Stover, *The Railroads of the South, 1865—1900: A Study of Finance and Control* (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1955), 27; J.D.B. De Bow, “Editorial Notes, Etc.,” *De Bow’s Review* 3 (January 1867): 109—12; Richard Prince, *Nashville, Chattanooga, and St. Louis Railway: History and Steam Locomotives* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001), 28.

³⁸ J.D.B. De Bow, “Manufactures: The South’s True Remedy,” *De Bow’s Review* 3 (February 1867): 172—73, 177.

known burial spot. His family failed to erect a headstone or monument in his memory. It was an ignominious end to a long, high-profile public life.³⁹

Newspapers around the nation noticed De Bow's death. The *Boston Daily Advertiser* recalled that he had "warmly espoused the cause of secession . . . but since the war his personal views on politics and slavery were considerably modified." The editor of the *North American and United States Gazette* recalled that De Bow had "constantly kept in the public eye for a number of years, sometimes by his merits, sometimes by his faults." The southern press mourned De Bow's passing. One southern obituary writer noted that De Bow's contributions to the South had been unmatched and that he would be memorialized in death by the articles, statistics, and opinions of the *Review*.⁴⁰

In the period after the war, De Bow had transformed the *Review* to match the needs of the postwar South. He created a sense of regional progress, both real and imagined, that encouraged reinvestment in the South and avoided sectional animosity. He focused on regional betterment and community development by embracing national unity when it benefited the South. De Bow suggested that southerners remove themselves from political debates and focus on economic development. For his vision of recovery to work, a sense of progress and excitement had to outweigh reports of violence and strife. De Bow recognized his mistakes, attempted to correct them, and reintroduced them to southern readers as a way of attaining economic salvation. He had started his editorial career as an American nationalist, had become an ardent southern secessionist, and then had returned to his original faith in national progress within the span of twenty years.

³⁹ Skipper, *J.D.B. De Bow, Magazinish of the Old South*, 223—24.

⁴⁰ *Boston Daily Advertiser*, March 2, 1867; *North American and United States Gazette*, March 1, 1867; Charles Gayarre, "James Dunwoody Brownson De Bow," *De Bow's Review* 3 (June 1867): 497—506.

This fluidity of thought arose in a mind that understood most modern economic principles and how they shaped society. Yet De Bow's inability to see past race, slavery, and sectionalism minimized his national reputation and historical legacy. His reputation as a militant southern sectionalist overrode his views on economic development and modernization.

De Bow's successes lay in his ability to recognize practical ideas and bring them together into a coherent economic plan. The past mattered to him because it provided structure and precedent for the future. He had promoted the idea of an industrialized economy in the antebellum South, and the notion would later be popularized by other promoters of economic diversification. These men would claim that their vision of the South's future was unique. Long before Edward Atkinson lauded the importance of southern industry, Richard H. Edmonds dazzled readers with weekly statistical reports of progress in the *Manufacturers' Record*, Daniel H. Hill promoted agricultural reform in *The Land We Live In*, and Francis W. Dawson, Henry Watterson, and Henry W. Grady used their newspapers as regional pulpits to preach about a New South. De Bow had brought forth the same argument. He was, of course, responsible in part for his not receiving credit for his prescience: His descent into fire-eating sectionalism and bellicose secessionism after 1854 overrode his earlier vision of economic modernism.⁴¹

In the month before his death, De Bow took an extended trip through the North and South. He visited factories and stores in Louisville, Cincinnati, and New York. He complained about the safety of railroads and hoped that state governments would regulate

⁴¹ Susanna Delfino, "Southern Economic Backwardness: A Comparative View," in *Global Perspectives on Industrial Transformation in the American South* eds. Susanna Delfino and Michele Gillespie (Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2005), 107—08.

construction to ensure the well-being of passengers. He noted the level of progress and reconstruction in towns and cities between Washington, D.C. and Charleston. Yet when De Bow arrived in Charleston he became melancholy. His final visit to “dear old Charleston” reminded him of the work that still needed to be done in the postwar South. Burned homes, destroyed businesses, and grass-filled streets evoked sad childhood memories of the city he had grown up in. Instead of dwelling on the past, however, De Bow saw economic potential amid the rubble. He foresaw a new era of commercial greatness in his old city. Writing directly to the merchants of Charleston in his last article before his death, De Bow implored them: “Never say FAIL—brothers in this hour of common disaster, Awake! Awake! There is a future before us, perhaps more brilliant than the past, if we are to be true to that past.”⁴²

⁴² J.D.B. De Bow “Editorial Notes, Etc.” *De Bow’s Review* 3 (February 1867): 213—217.

Bibliography

Manuscript Collections

- Duke University Special Collections, Durham, North Carolina
James Dunwoody Brownson De Bow Papers
- Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill
Nathaniel Henry Rhodes Dawson Papers
Maunsel White Papers
- Washington and Lee University Special Collections, Lexington, Virginia
Franklin Subscription Library Collection
- Harvard Business School, Baker Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts
R.G. Dun & Co. Historical Collection
- W.S. Hoole Special Collections Library, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, Alabama
Daniel C. Smyly Papers
Robert Jemison Papers
Montgomery Tax Records
Northeast and Southwest Railroad Company Records
- Birmingham Public Library, Birmingham, Alabama
Elyton Land Company Business Records
- Alabama State Archives, Montgomery Alabama
Bolling Hall Papers
George Goldthwaite Papers
Charles T. Pollard Papers
- James D. Hoskins Library, Special Collections, University of Tennessee
The Land We Love
- Virginia State Historical Society, Richmond, Virginia
Proceedings of the First Annual Meeting of the Stockholders of the Richmond and
Danville Railroad Company, President's Report, Chief Engineers Report,
Financial Statement and By-Laws.
Central Southern Rights Association of Virginia, Records, 1850-1860
George Barksdale Scrapbook
Bolling Walker Haxall, Account Book, 1851-1883
Cabell Family Papers
Crump Family Papers
- Tennessee State Archives, Nashville, Tennessee
Martha Casey De Bow Papers

Primary Sources

- Acts of Alabama, 1830—1860.* Catawba: Allen & Brickell.
- Acts of Tennessee, Index to Names, 1831-1850,*
<http://www.tennessee.gov/tsla/history/state/actsintro.htm>.
- Case Files of Applications from Former Confederates for Presidential Pardons*
("Amnesty Papers"), 1865-67. Records of the Adjutant General's Office, 1780's-
1917, Record Group 94, Publication M1003; National Archives, Washington,
D.C.

- De Bow, J.D.B. *The Interest in Slavery of the Southern Non-Slaveholder: The Right of Peaceful Secession*. Charleston: Evans & Goodwell, 1860.
- De Bow, J.D.B. *The Industrial Resources, Etc., of the Southern and Western States: Embracing a View of Their Commerce, Agriculture, Manufactures, Internal Improvements, Slave and Free Labor, Slavery Institutions, Products, Etc., of the South : Together with Historical and Statistical Sketches of the Different States and Cities of the Union : Statistics of the United States Commerce and Manufactures, from the Earliest Periods, Compared with Other Leading Powers : The Results of the Different Census Returns since 1790, and Returns of the Census of 1850, on Population, Agriculture and General Industry, Etc. : With an Appendix*. 3 vols. New Orleans: The Office of De Bow's Review, 1852.
- Gayarre, Charles. *History of Louisiana*. New York: William J. Widdleton, 1867.
- Helper, Hinton R. *The Impending Crisis of the South: How to Meet It*. New York: Burdick Brothers, 1857.
- Journal of the Proceedings of the South-Western Convention, Began and Held at the City of Memphis, on the 12th November, 1845*. Memphis: 1845.
- Mills, Robert Mills. *Statistics of South Carolina: A View of the Natural, Civil, and Military History, General and Particular*. Charleston: Hurlbut and Lloyd, 1826.
- Norman, Benjamin M. *Norman's New Orleans and Environs: Containing a Brief Historical Sketch of the Territory and State of Louisiana and the City of New Orleans*. New Orleans: B.M. Norman, 1845.
- Olmsted, Frederick Law. *A Journey in the Back Country*. New York: Mason Brothers, 1860.
- Olmsted, Frederick Law. *Journey in the Seaboard Slave States: With Remarks on their Economy*. New York: Mason Brothers, 1861.
- Olmsted, Frederick Law. *The Cotton Kingdom: A Traveler's Observations on Cotton and Slavery in the American Slave States*. New York: Mason Brothers, 1862.
- Report of the Joint Committee on Reconstruction at the First Session of the Thirty-Ninth Congress*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1866.
- United States Census Office, *Fourth Census of the United States, 1820* Washington, D.C., 1850
- White, George. *Statistics of the State of Georgia: Including an Account of its Natural, Civil, and Ecclesiastical History: Together with a Particular Description of Each County*. Savannah: W. Thorne Williams, 1849.

Newspapers & Periodicals

American Cotton Planter
Boston Daily Advertiser
Canton Times (Canton, Mississippi)
Charleston Courier
Charleston Mercury
Cincinnati Weekly Herald & Philanthropist
Daily Picayune (New Orleans, Louisiana)
De Bow's Review

Greenville Republican (Greenville, South Carolina)
Jonesborough Whig and Independent Journal (Jonesborough, Tennessee)
New York Times
Newport Mercury
North American and United States Gazette
Philadelphia Inquirer
Rochester Republican (Rochester, New York)
Semi-Weekly Natchez Courier (Natchez, Mississippi)
Southern Patriot (Charleston, South Carolina)
Southern Quarterly Review
Tri-Weekly Memphis Enquirer
Washington Post
Washington (Olympia) Standard (Olympia, Washington)
Young American Magazine

Secondary Sources

- Adams, Sean P. *Old Dominion, Industrial Commonwealth, Coal, Politics, and Economy in Antebellum America*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2004.
- Aiken, Charles S. *The Cotton Plantation South: Since the Civil War*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Ash, Stephen V. *When the Yankees Came: Conflict and Chaos in the Occupied South, 1861—1865*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
- Ball, Douglas B. *Financial Failure and Confederate Defeat*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1991.
- Baptist, Edward E. *Creating an Old South: Middle Florida's Plantation Frontier Before the Civil War*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2002.
- Bateman, Fred, and Thomas Joseph Weiss. *A Deplorable Scarcity: The Failure of Industrialization in the Slave Economy*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981.
- Beard, Charles A. and Mary R. *The Rise of American Civilization, Volume II*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.
- Becker, Carl L. *The Declaration of Independence: A Study in the History of Political Ideas*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1922.
- Beringer, Richard E. Herman Hattaway, Archer Jones, and William N. Stills, Jr., *Why the South Lost the Civil War*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1986.
- Berlin, Ira. *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998.
- Black, Robert C. III. *The Railroads of the Confederacy*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1952.
- Bleser, Carol. ed. *Secret and Sacred: The Diary of James H. Hammond, A Southern Slaveholder*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Bosher, Marshall. *Chesterfield County, Virginia: A Collection of Notes Peculiar to its Early History*. Chesterfield Historical Society, 1989.
- Boyer-Lewis, Charlene M. *Ladies and Gentlemen on Display: Planter Society at the*

- Virginia Springs, 1790—1860*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001.
- Breeden, James O. *Advice Among Masters: The Ideal in Slave Management in the Old South*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1980.
- Brown, David. *Southern Outcast: Hinton Rowan Helper and The Impending Crisis of the South*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006.
- Brownell, Blaine A. and David R. Goldfield, ed. *The City in Southern History: The Growth of Urban Civilization in the South*. Port Washington, N.Y.: Kennikat Press, 1977.
- Bruce, Philip A. *The History of North America: The Rise of the New South, Volume XVII*. Philadelphia: George Barrie & Sons, 1905.
- Buck, Paul. *The Road to Reunion: 1865—1900*. New York: Vintage Books, 1937.
- Bushman, Richard. *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities*. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.
- Byrne, Frank J. *Becoming Bourgeois: Merchant Culture in the South. 1820—1865*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2006.
- Capers, Gerald M. *John C. Calhoun-Opportunist: A Reappraisal*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1960.
- Cauthon, Charles E. *South Carolina Goes to War, 1860—1865*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2005.
- Christian, William A. *Richmond: Her Past and Present*. Spartanburg: The Reprint Company, 1912.
- Clark, Victor S. *History of Manufactures in the United States, Volume II, 1860—1893*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution of Washington, 1929.
- Conrad, Glenn R. Ed. *A Dictionary of Louisiana Biography, Volume 1*. New Orleans: Louisiana Historical Association, 1988.
- Cooper, William, Jr. *The South and the Power of Slavery, 1828—1856*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1978.
- Cronon, William. *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1991.
- Curry, Leonard P. Curry. *The Free Black in Urban America, 1800—1850*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Cyclopedia of Eminent and Representative Men of the Carolinas of the Nineteenth Century*. Madison: Brant and Fuller, 1892.
- Davis, William C. *Look Away!: A History of the Confederate States of America*. New York: The Free Press, 2002.
- Delfino, Susanna, and Michele Gillespie, eds. *Global Perspectives on Industrial Transformation in the American South*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2005.
- Derrick, Samuel M. *Centennial History of South Carolina Railroad*. Columbia: The State Company, 1930.
- Dew, Charles B. *Apostles of Disunion: Southern Secession Commissioners and the Causes of the Civil War*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2001.
- Dew, Charles. *Bond of Iron: Master and Slave at Buffalo Forge*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1994.
- Dodd, William E. *Statesmen of the Old South: From Radicalism to Conservative Revolt*.

- New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.
- Downey, Tom. *Planting a Capitalist South: Masters, Merchants, and Manufacturers in the Southern Interior, 1790—1860*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2006.
- Doyle, Don Harrison. *New Men, New Cities, New South*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1990.
- Dupre, Daniel S. *Transforming the Cotton Frontier: Madison County, Alabama, 1800-1840*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1997.
- Easterby, J.H. *A History of the College of Charleston*. New York: The Scribner Press, 1935.
- Eaton, Clement. *A History of the Old South*. New York: Macmillan, 1949.
- Eaton, Clement. *The Mind of the Old South*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1964.
- Ellis, John H. *Yellow Fever and Public Health in the New South*. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1992.
- Etcheson, Nicole. *Bleeding Kansas: Contested Liberty in the Civil War Era*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2004.
- Evans, Curtis J. *The Conquest of Labor: Daniel Pratt and Southern Industrialization*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2001.
- Faust, Drew G. ed. *The Ideology of Slavery: Proslavery Thought in the Antebellum South, 1830—1860*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1981.
- Faust, Drew G. *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982.
- Finkelman, Paul. *Defending Slavery: Proslavery Thought in the Old South, A Brief History with Documents*. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2003.
- Ford, Lacy K., Jr. *Origins of Southern Radicalism: The South Carolina Upcountry, 1800—1860*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Fischer, David Hackett and James C. Kelly. *Bound Away: Virginia and the Westward Movement*. Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2000.
- Fleming, Walter L. *The South in the Building of the Nation, A History of the Southern States, Volume V*. Richmond: The Southern Historical Publication Society, 1909.
- Follet, Richard. *The Sugar Masters: Planters and Slaves in Louisiana's Cane World, 1820—1860*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 2005.
- Foner, Eric. *Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men: The Ideology of the Republican Party Before the Civil War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Foner, Eric. *Reconstruction: America's Unfinished Revolution, 1863—1877*. New York: Perennial Classics, 1988.
- Fraser, Walter J. *Charleston, Charleston: The History of a Southern City*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1989.
- Freehling, William W. *Prelude to Civil War: The Nullification Controversy in South Carolina, 1816—1836*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1968.
- Freehling, William W. *The South vs. The South: How Anti-Confederate Southerners Shaped the Course of the Civil War*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Garrett, William. *Reminiscences of Public Men in Alabama*. Spartanburg: The Reprint Company, Publishers, 1872.

- Gaston, Paul, *The New South Creed: A Study in Southern Mythmaking*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1970.
- Genovese, Eugene D. *The Political Economy of Slavery: Studies in the Economy & Society of the Slave South*. 2nd ed. Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1989.
- Genovese, Eugene. *Roll, Jordon, Roll: The World the Slaves Made*. New York: Vintage Books, 1976.
- Genovese, Eugene D. *The Southern Front: History and Politics in the Cultural War*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1995.
- Glover, Lorri. *Southern Sons: Becoming Men in the New Nation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.
- Grant, Susan-Mary. *North Over South : Northern Nationalism and American Identity in the Antebellum Era*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000.
- Gray, Lewis C. *History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860, Vol. II*. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Institution of Washington, Publication 430, 1933.
- Green, Fletcher M. *Constitutional Development in the South Atlantic States, 1776—1860*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1930.
- Green, Fletcher M. *The Role of the Yankee in the Old South*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1972.
- Gold, John R. and Margaret M. Gold. *Cities of Culture: Staging International Festivals and the Urban Agenda, 1851—2000*. Hampshire, England: Ashgate Publishing, 2005.
- Goldfield, David R. *Cotton Fields and Skyscrapers: Southern City and Region*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982.
- Goldfield, David R. *Urban Growth in the Age of Sectionalism, 1847—1861*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977.
- Hahn, Steven. *The Roots of Southern Populism: Yeoman Farmers and the Transformation of the Georgia Upcountry, 1850—1880*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1983.
- Hamilton, Holman. *Prologue to Conflict: The Crisis and Compromise of 1850*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1964.
- Harrison, James A. *Life and Letters of Edgar Allan Poe, Volume II*. New York: Thomas P. Crowell & Co., 1903.
- Hattaway, Herman and Archer Jones. *How the North Won the War: A Military History of the Civil War*. Champlain: University of Illinois Press, 1991.
- Holt, Michael F. *The Rise and Fall of the American Whig Party*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Horn, James, Jan E. Lewis, and Peter S. Onuf. *The Revolution of 1800: Democracy, Race, and the New Republic*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2002.
- Horsman, Reginald. *Josiah Nott of Mobile: Southerner, Physician, and Racial Theorist*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987.
- Howe, Daniel Walker. *The Political Culture of the American Whigs*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Jennings, Thelma. *The Nashville Convention: Southern Movement for Unity, 1848—1851*. Memphis: Memphis State University Press, 1980.

- Johnson, Vicki Vaughn. *The Men and the Vision of the Southern Commercial Conventions: 1845–1871*. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 1992.
- Joyner, Charles. *Down by the Riverside: A South Carolina Slave Community*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984.
- Kellar, Herbert A. ed. *Solon Robinson, Pioneer and Agriculturalist, Volume 2*. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1936.
- Kendrick, Benjamin B. *The Journal of the Joint Committee of Fifteen on Reconstruction*. New York: 1914.
- Knight, Edgar K. *Public Education in the South*. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1922.
- Lander, Ernest M. *Reluctant Imperialists: Calhoun, the South Carolinians, and the Mexican War*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1979.
- Larson, John L. *Internal Improvements: National Public Works and the Promise of Popular Government in the Early United States*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2001.
- Larson, Lawrence H. *The Rise of the Urban South*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1985.
- Larsen, Lawrence H. *The Urban South: A History*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 1990.
- Lewis, Ronald. *Coal, Iron, and Slaves: Industrial Slavery in Maryland and Virginia, 1715—1865*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1979.
- Little, Robert D. “The Ideology of the New South: A Study in the Development of Ideas, 1865—1910.” Ph.D. diss. The University of Chicago, 1950.
- Massey, Mary E. *Ersatz in the Confederacy*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1952.
- Mathew, William M. *Edmund Ruffin and the Crisis of Slavery in the Old South: The Failure of Agricultural Reform*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1989.
- McCardell, John. *The Idea of a Southern Nation: Southern Nationalists and Southern Nationalism, 1830-1860*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1979.
- McCurry, Stephanie. *Masters of Small Worlds: Yeoman Households, Gender Relations, and the Political Culture of the Antebellum South Carolina Low Country*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- McIlwaine, Shields. *Memphis, Down in Dixie*. New York: E.P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1948.
- McInnis, Maurie D. *The Politics of Taste in Antebellum Charleston*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005.
- McKenzie, Robert T. *One South or Many?: Plantation Belt and Upcountry in the Civil War-Era*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- McKittrick, Erik L. *Andrew Johnson and Reconstruction*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1960.
- McKiven, Henry M., Jr. *Iron and Steel: Class, Race, and Community in Birmingham, Alabama, 1875—1920*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1995.
- McPherson, James M. *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era*. New York: Ballantine Books, 1988.
- Miller, John David. *South By Southwest: Planters Emigration and Identity in the Slave*

- South*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2002.
- Miller, Randall M. *The Cotton Mill Movement in Antebellum Alabama*. New York: Arno Press, 1978.
- Milton, George F. *The Eve of Conflict: Stephen A. Douglas and the Needless War*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1934.
- Mitchell, Broadus. *The Rise of Cotton Mills in the South*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1921.
- Mitchell, Broadus and George S. Mitchell. *The Industrial Revolution in the South*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1930.
- Moore, Glover. *The Missouri Controversy, 1819—1821*. Lexington: University of Kentucky, 1953.
- Morgan, Chad. *Planters' Progress: Modernizing Confederate Georgia*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 2005.
- Morgan, Philip D. *Slave Counterpoint*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1998.
- Noe, Kenneth W. *Southwest Virginia's Railroad: Modernization and the Sectional Crisis in the Civil War Era*. Tuscaloosa: The University of Alabama Press, 2003.
- Oakes, James. *The Ruling Race: A History of American Slaveholders*. New York: Alfred K. Knopf, Inc., 1982.
- O'Brien, Michael. *Conjectures of Order: Intellectual Life and the American South, 1810-1860*, 2 vols. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- O'Brien, Michael and David Moltke-Hansen, eds. *Intellectual Life in Antebellum Charleston*. Knoxville: The University of Tennessee Press, 1986.
- O'Neill, John Belton. *The Annals of Newberry in Two Parts*. Newberry: Aull & Houseal, 1892.
- Owen, Thomas M. *History of Alabama and Directory of Alabama Biography*. 4 vols. Chicago: S.J. Clark Publishing Company, 1921.
- Owsley, Frank. *King Cotton Diplomacy: Foreign Relations of the Confederate States of America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1931.
- Owsley, Frank. *Plain Folk of the Old South*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1949.
- Parrington, Vernon L. *Main Currents in American Thought: The Romantic Revolution in America*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc., 1927.
- Paskoff, Paul F. and Daniel J. Wilson, eds. *The Cause of the South: Selections from De Bow's Review, 1846—1867*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1982.
- Phillips, Ulrich B. *A History of Transportation in the Eastern Cotton Belt to 1860*. New York: The Columbia University Press, 1908.
- Phillips, Ulrich B. *Life and Labor in the Old South*. New York: Little, Brown and Company, 1929.
- Potter, David M. *The Impending Crisis, 1848-1861*. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.
- Powell, Lawrence N. *New Masters: Northern Planters During the Civil War and Reconstruction*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.
- Prince, Richard. *Nashville, Chattanooga, and St. Louis Railway: History and Steam Locomotives*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001.

- Ramsdell, Charles W. *Behind the Lines in the Southern Confederacy*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1944.
- Ransom, Roger L. *The Confederate States of America*. New York: W.W. Norton, 2005.
- Ransom, Roger L. Ransom and Richard Sutch. *One Kind of Freedom: The Economic Consequences of Emancipation*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Rawley, James A. *Race and Politics: "Bleeding Kansas" and the Coming of the Civil War*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1969.
- Ray, P. Orman. *The Repeal of the Missouri Compromise*. Cleveland: The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1909.
- Rogers, George. *Charleston in the Age of the Pinckneys*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1969.
- Rogers, William W. *Confederate Home Front: Montgomery During the Civil War*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1999.
- Roper, James. *The Founding of Memphis, 1818-1820*. Memphis: The Memphis Sesquicentennial, Inc., 1970.
- Rothbard, Murray N. *The Panic of 1819: Reactions and Policies*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1962.
- Russel, Robert R. *Economic Aspects of Southern Sectionalism, 1840—1861*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1924.
- Russell, James M. *Atlanta, 1847—1890: City Building in the Old South and the New*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1988.
- Sellers, Charles. *The Market Revolution: Jacksonian America, 1815—1846*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Scarborough, William K. *The Diary of Edmund Ruffin, Volume I*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1972.
- Shugg, Roger W. *Origins of Class Struggle in Louisiana: A Social History of White Farmers and Laborers during Slavery and After, 1840-1875*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1966.
- Sigafoos, Robert A. *Cotton Row to Beale Street: A Business History of Memphis*. Memphis: Memphis State University Press, 1979.
- Skipper, Ottis C. *J.D.B. De Bow: Magaziniest of the Old South*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1958.
- Smith, Alfred G., Jr. *Economic Readjustment of an Old Cotton State: South Carolina, 1820—1860*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1958.
- Starobin, Robert S. *Industrial Slavery in the Old South*. Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Stone, H. David, Jr. *Vital Rails: The Charleston & Savannah Railroad and the Civil War in Coastal South Carolina*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2008.
- Stover, John F. Stover. *The Railroads of the South, 1865—1900: A Study of Finance and Control*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1955.
- Sydnor, Charles S. *The Development of Southern Sectionalism, 1819—1848*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1948.
- Taylor, William R. *Cavalier & Yankee: The Old South and American National Character*. New York, George Braziller, Inc., 1957.
- Thomas, Emory. *The Confederacy as a Revolutionary Experience*. Englewood Cliffs:

- Prentice-Hall, 1971.
- Thomas, Emory M. *The Confederate Nation, 1861—1865*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1979.
- Thompson, Holland. *From the Cotton Field to the Cotton Mill: A Study of the Industrial Transition in North Carolina*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1906.
- Thornton, J. Mills, III. *Politics and Power in a Slave Society: Alabama, 1800—1860*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1878.
- Towers, Frank. *The Urban South and the Coming of the Civil War*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2004.
- Tregle, Joseph G. *Louisiana in the Age of Jackson: A Clash of Cultures and Personalities*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1999.
- Van Deusen, John G. *The Ante-Bellum Southern Commercial Conventions*. Durham: Duke University Press, 1926.
- Vedder, O.F. *History of the City of Memphis, Vol. II*. Syracuse: D. Mason & Company, 1888.
- Wade, Richard C. Wade. *Slavery in the Cities: The South, 1820—1860*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Wakelyn, Jon L. *Southern Pamphlets on Secession: November 1860—April 1861*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1996.
- Wallenstein, Peter. *From Slave South to New South: Public Policy in Nineteenth-Century Georgia*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1987.
- Walther, Eric H. *The Fire-Eaters*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1992.
- Weatherford, Willis D. *James Dunwoody Brownson De Bow*. Charlottesville, Va.: The Historical Publishing Co., Inc., 1935.
- Wells, Jonathan D. *The Origins of the Southern Middle Class, 1800—1861*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2004.
- Wender, Herbert. *Southern Commercial Conventions*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1930.
- Wilson, Clyde N. *The Papers of John C. Calhoun, Volume XXII*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1995.
- Wilson, Clyde N. and Shirley Bright Cook, eds. *The Papers of John C. Calhoun, Volume XXIII, 1846*. Columbia: The University of South Carolina Press, 1996.
- Wiltse, Charles M. *John C. Calhoun: Nationalist, 1782-1828*. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1944.
- Woodward, C. Vann. *Origins of the New South, 1877-1913*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1951.
- Wright, Carroll D. and William C. Hunt. *History and Growth of the United States Census, 1790—1890*. Washington, D.C., 1900.
- Wright, Gavin. *Old South, New South: Revolutions in the Southern Economy since the Civil War*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1996.
- Wright, Gavin. *The Political Economy of the Cotton South: Households, Markets, and Wealth in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Norton, 1978.
- Young, J.P. *Standard History of Memphis, Tennessee: From a Study of the Original Sources*. Knoxville: H.W. Crew & Co., 1912.

Articles

- Adams, William H. "The Louisiana Whigs." *Louisiana History* 15 (Summer 1974): 213—28.
- Atherton, Lewis E. "Mercantile Education in the Ante-Bellum South." *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 39 (1953): 623—64.
- Beale, Mildred. "Charles Teed Pollard, Industrialist." *Alabama Historical Quarterly* (Spring 1940): 72—85; (Summer 1940): 189—202.
- Bernstein, Barton J. "Southern Politics and Attempts to Reopen the African Slave Trade." *Journal of Negro History* 51 (January 1966): 16—35.
- Blackson, Robert M. "Pennsylvania Banks and the Panic of 1819: A Reinterpretation." *Journal of the Early Republic* 9 (Autumn 1989): 335—358.
- Bond, Horace M. "Social and Economic Forces in Alabama Reconstruction." *The Journal of Negro History* 23 (July 1938): 363—77.
- Burt, Jesse C., Jr. "The Nashville and Chattanooga Railroad, 1854—1872: The Era of Transition." *East Tennessee Historical Society Publications* 23 (1951): 58—76.
- Carrier, Lyman. "The United States Agricultural Society." *Agricultural History* 11 (1937): 278—88.
- Cathy, C.O. "Sidney Weller: Ante-Bellum Promoter of Agricultural Reform." *The North Carolina Historical Review* 31 (1954): 1—17.
- Chandler, Walter. "The Memphis Navy Yard: An Adventure in Internal Improvement." *The Western Tennessee Historical Society Papers* 1 (1947): 68—72.
- Coclanis, Peter. "The Sociology of Architecture in Colonial Charleston: Pattern and Process in an Eighteenth-Century Southern City." *Journal of Social History* 18 (Summer 1985): 607—23.
- Collins, Herbert. "The Southern Industrial Gospel Before 1860." *Journal of Southern History* 12 (August 1946): 386—402.
- Cotterill, R.S. "Southern Railroads, 1850—1860." *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 10 (March 1924): 396—405.
- Craven, Avery. "The Agricultural Reforms of the Ante-Bellum South." *The American Historical Review* 33 (January 1928): 302—14.
- Donald, David. "The Proslavery Argument Reconsidered." *Journal of Southern History* 37 (February 1971): 3—18.
- Doster, James F. "The Shelby Iron Works Collection in the University of Alabama Library." *Bulletin of the Business Historical Society* 26 (December 1952): 214—17.
- Downey, Tom. "Riparian Rights and Manufacturing in Antebellum South Carolina: William Gregg and the Origins of the 'Industrial Mind.'" *Journal of Southern History* 69 (February 1999): 77—108.
- Egerton, Douglas R. "Markets Without a Market Revolution: Southern Planters and Capitalism." *Journal of the Early Republic* 16 (Summer 1996): 207—21.
- Griffin, Richard W. "An Origin of the New South: The South Carolina Homespun Company, 1808—1815." *The Business History Review* 35 (Autumn 1961): 402—14.
- Hill, Henry B. and Larry Gara. "A French Traveler's View of Ante-Bellum New

- Orleans." *Louisiana History* 1 (Fall 1960): 336—38.
- Huff, Lawrence. "Joseph Addison Turner: Southern Editor During the Civil War." *Journal of Southern History* 29 (November 1963): 469—85.
- Johnson, Kenneth R. "Urban Boosterism and Higher Education in the New South: A Case Study." *The Alabama Historical Quarterly* 42 (Spring and Summer 1980): 40—58.
- Jordan, Weymouth T. "Cotton Planters' Conventions in the Old South." *Journal of Southern History* 19 (August 1953): 321—45.
- Jordon, Weymouth T. "Noah B. Cloud and the American Cotton Planter." *Agricultural History* 31 (October 1957): 553—69.
- Lander, Ernest M., Jr. "Charleston: Manufacturing Center of the Old South." *The Journal of Southern History* 26 (August 1960): 330—51.
- Laws, Forrest. "The Railroad Comes To Tennessee: The Building of the LaGrange and Memphis." *The West Tennessee Historical Society Papers* 30 (1976): 24—42.
- Legan, Marshall S. "Railroad Sentiment in Northern Louisiana in the 1850s." *Louisiana History* 17 (1976): 125—42.
- Marmor, Theodore R. "Anti-Industrialism and the Old South: The Agrarian Perspective of John C. Calhoun." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 9 (July 1967): 377—406.
- Morrow, Ralph E. "The Proslavery Argument Revisited." *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 47 (June 1961): 79—94.
- Phillips, Sarah T. "Antebellum Agricultural Reform, Republican Ideology, and Sectional Tension." *Agricultural History* 74 (Autumn 2000): 799—822.
- Pittman, Caryolyn. "Memphis in the Mid-1840s: Memphis Before the Mexican War." *The Western Tennessee Historical Society Papers* 23 (1969): 30—44.
- Reinders, Robert C. "The Free Negro in the New Orleans Economy: 1850—1860." *Louisiana History* 6 (Summer 1965): 273—85.
- Roberson, Jere W. "The South and the Pacific Railroad, 1845—1855." *The Western Historical Quarterly* 5 (April 1974): 163—86.
- Roper, James E. "Marcus B. Winchester, First Mayor of Memphis: His Later Years." *The Western Tennessee Historical Society Papers* 8 (1959): 5—38.
- Sellers, Charles. "Who Were the Southern Whigs?." *American Historical Review* 59 (1954): 335—46.
- Skipper, Ottis C. "J.D.B. De Bow, The Man." *Journal of Southern History* 10 (November 1944): 404—23.
- Stampf, Kenneth. "An Analysis of T. R. Dew's *Review of the Debates in the Virginia Legislatures*." *The Journal of Negro History* 27 (October 1942): 380—387.
- Surdam, David G. "King Cotton: Monarch or Pretender? The State of the Market for Raw Cotton on the Eve of the American Civil War." *The Economic History Review* 51 (February 1998): 113—32.
- Thompson, Holland. "The Civil War and Social and Economic Changes." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 154 (January 1931) 11—20.
- Ward, James A. "A New Look at Antebellum Southern Railroad Development." *Journal of Southern History* 39 (August 1973): 409—20.
- Wish, Harvey. "The Revival of the African Slave Trade in the United States, 1856—

1860.” *The Mississippi Valley Historical Review* 27 (March 1941): 569—88.
Wriston, Barbara. “Who Was the Architect of the Indiana Cotton Mill, 1849—1850.” *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 24 (May 1965): 171—73.

Appendices

De Bow's Review Readership¹

¹ Data used to reconstruct De Bow's known readership came from the 1860 federal census. I used the census to collect full name, residence, occupation, real estate value, and personal estate value for each identified reader. United States Census Office, *Eighth Census of the United States, 1860* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1862).

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Costley	Warrenton		AL	Physician	\$2,700	\$10,000
Borman	Alfred	Autauga	AL	Brick Maker	\$250	
Edwards	Charles A.	Autauga	AL	Physician	\$1,500	\$6,000
Goodwyn	Albert G.	Autauga	AL	Physician	\$25,000	\$40,000
Hall	Bolling, Jr.	Autauga	AL	Lawyer	\$54,000	\$90,000
Pratt	Daniel	Autauga	AL	Manufacturer	\$92,319	\$250,000
Smith	Malcolm E.	Autauga	AL			\$134,000
Vasser	Rebecca	Autauga	AL			
Sibley	Origen	Baldwin	AL	Overseer		
McNab	John	Barbour	AL	Merchant	\$80,000	\$116,000
Scott	David B.	Bibb	AL	Manufacturer	\$4,000	\$50,000
Rudolph	John B.	Butler	AL	Planter	\$14,468	\$67,890
Farmer	J. H.	Calhoun	AL	Farmer	\$2,000	\$6,000
Whatley	George C.	Calhoun	AL	Lawyer	\$7,000	\$20,000
Hill	G. F.	Chambers	AL	Farmer	\$6,000	\$25,000
McMillon	N. A.	Choctaw	AL	Hotel Keeper		\$2,000
Peebles	Howell W.	Clarke	AL	Farmer	\$5,000	
Laird	W. H.	Coffee	AL	Merchant		\$6,000
Johnson	William R.	Colbert	AL	Physician		
Hayley	Jesse J.	Dale	AL	Physician	\$1,500	\$1,500
Babcock	Joseph	Dallas	AL	Merchant	\$700	\$15,000
Barclay	Thomas	Dallas	AL	Merchant		
Burns	J. H.	Dallas	AL	Merchant	\$20,000	\$90,450
Chambliss	N. R.	Dallas	AL			
Davis	William L.	Dallas	AL	Planter	\$28,000	\$48,000
Dawson	Nathaniel	Dallas	AL	Lawyer	\$40,000	\$1,200,000
Eager	William H.	Dallas	AL			
Ellerbe	A. W.	Dallas	AL	Farmer	\$63,750	\$140,000
Evans	James L.	Dallas	AL	Lawyer	\$5,000	\$9,000
Farley	Charles K.	Dallas	AL	Physician	\$9,360	\$10,310
Gardner	Virgil H.	Dallas	AL	Planter	\$96,000	\$105,000
Goldsby	Thornton	Dallas	AL	Planter	\$639,500	\$273,400
Griffin	William H.	Dallas	AL	Farmer	\$6,000	\$12,000

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Harris	W.W.	Dallas	AL	Printer		
Huggins	W. D.	Dallas	AL	Merchant		
Hunter	John S.	Dallas	AL	Lawyer	\$150,000	\$215,380
Hunter	Charles	Dallas	AL	Farmer	\$40,000	\$50,000
Lang	W.W.	Dallas	AL	Farmer	\$28,000	\$126,000
Lapsley	John W.	Dallas	AL	Merchant	\$7,500	\$17,000
Lee	F. A.	Dallas	AL	Farmer	\$14,000	\$47,000
Lide	C. M.	Dallas	AL	Farmer	\$20,800	\$41,770
Mathews	Thomas M.	Dallas	AL	Farmer	\$150,000	\$335,000
Morgan	John T.	Dallas	AL	Lawyer	\$6,500	\$10,000
Morgan	J.	Dallas	AL	Physician	\$50,000	\$6,000
Norris	William	Dallas	AL	Bank President		\$35,000
Pegues	Eliza H.	Dallas	AL	Widow of Planter	\$31,000	\$84,000
Plaut	G. H.	Dallas	AL	Tanner	\$2,500	
Provost	William F.	Dallas	AL	Farmer		
Reese	A. J.	Dallas	AL	Physician	\$18,000	\$150,000
Rives	Thomas	Dallas	AL	Farmer	\$14,390	\$53,800
Robinson	J. N.	Dallas	AL	Merchant		
Smith	Washington	Dallas	AL	Farmer	\$45,000	\$80,000
Smyly	Daniel C.	Dallas	AL	Planter	\$35,000	\$78,000
Stradman	F. W.	Dallas	AL	Merchant	\$3,000	\$1,000
Malone	John L.	Franklin	AL	Farmer	\$40,000	\$40,000
Peden	Warren W.	Franklin	AL	Farmer	\$26,000	\$60,000
Pride	H.J.	Franklin	AL	Farmer	\$20,000	\$80,000
Rutland	John W.	Franklin	AL	Farmer	\$40,000	\$65,000
Alexander	Abram	Greene	AL	Physician	\$80,000	\$134,000
Coleman	Radford E.	Greene	AL		\$6,000	\$14,500
Collier	John J.	Greene	AL	Planter	\$8,000	
Crawford	M.A.	Greene	AL	Merchant		
Creswell	Samuel L.	Greene	AL	Planter	\$20,000	\$113,000
Hale	Stephen	Greene	AL	Lawyer	\$8,000	\$47,000
Lightfoot	Philip L.	Greene	AL	Physician	\$45,000	\$122,000
Means	David J.	Greene	AL	Physician	\$21,000	

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Ridgeway	Bradley H.	Greene	AL	Planter	\$98,200	\$130,000
Rogers	W.A.	Greene	AL	Physician	\$40,000	\$120,000
Suggs	Calvin A.	Greene	AL	Merchant		
Meeks	L.B.	Jefferson	AL	Farmer		\$175
Barrow	John T.	Lauderdale	AL	Commission Merchant		
Smith	Etheldred L.	Lauderdale	AL	Farmer	\$15,000	\$21,000
Wren	J.K.	Lauderdale	AL	Manufacturer		\$6,000
Shegog	George	Lawrence	AL	Physician	\$200	\$14,000
Shegog	George	Lawrence	AL	Physician	\$200	\$14,000
Sledge	William H.	Lawrence	AL	Farmer	\$1,640	\$6,000
Samford	William J.	Lee	AL	Lawyer	\$15,000	\$39,000
Dudley	John, Jr.	Lowndes	AL	Farmer	\$20,000	\$57,880
Meek	H.J.	Lowndes	AL	Farmer		\$311
Banks	S.P.	Macon	AL	Physician	\$2,240	
Banks	James J.	Macon	AL	Farmer	\$11,200	\$25,600
Battle	Cullen	Macon	AL			
Berry	J.R.	Macon	AL	Planter	\$16,000	\$92,000
Crawford	Joel T.	Macon	AL	Farmer	\$28,000	\$41,000
Jermigan	C.H.	Macon	AL	Physician	\$3,500	\$17,000
Fackler	John J.	Madison	AL	Commission Merchant	\$14,000	\$1,500,000
McCalley	Charles W.	Madison	AL	Merchant		\$2,500
McCalley	William J.	Madison	AL	Planter	\$40,000	\$65,000
Moore	David L.	Madison	AL	Planter	\$137,000	\$180,000
Scruggs	James H.	Madison	AL	Judge	\$6,000	\$9,000
Davidson	John H.	Marengo	AL	Planter	\$1,500	\$375
Drummond	W.F.	Marengo	AL	Physician	\$3,500	\$7,000
Pritchard	William	Marengo	AL	Overseer	\$8,000	
Whitfield	Gaius, Sr.	Marengo	AL	Planter	\$102,000	\$300,000
Root	R.P.	Marshall	AL	Clerk		
Dunn	William D.	Mobile	AL	Railroad	\$100,000	\$50,000
Eastman	Herndon	Mobile	AL	Brick Mason		
LeBaron	Charles L.	Mobile	AL	Commission Merchant	\$10,000	\$4,000
Miller	Thomas R.	Mobile	AL	Exchange Broker	\$40,000	\$120,000

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Nott	Josiah Clark	Mobile	AL	Physician	\$40,000	\$10,000
Petty	John F.	Mobile	AL	County Jailer/Deputy		
Sawyer	R.P.	Mobile	AL	Insurance		
Stein	Albert	Mobile	AL	Engineer	\$10,000	\$2,500
Williams	Price	Mobile	AL	Merchant	\$24,000	\$110,000
Armistiad	William B.	Montgomery	AL	Physician	\$33,000	\$4,000
Barton	Absalom A.	Montgomery	AL	Farmer	\$5,000	
Bibb	William J.	Montgomery	AL	Planter	\$9,000	
Brown	Thomas B.	Montgomery	AL	Planter	\$20,000	\$50,000
Cook	N.L.	Montgomery	AL	Printer		
Copeland	Mack M.	Montgomery	AL	Cotton Broker	\$8,000	\$6,000
Crommelin	Charles	Montgomery	AL	Lawyer		
Gilmer	Francis	Montgomery	AL	Merchant	\$83,500	\$563,500
Goldthwaite	George	Montgomery	AL	Lawyer	\$101,500	\$310,000
Grant	William A.	Montgomery	AL	Cotton Broker		
Gunter	Charles	Montgomery	AL	Planter	\$200,000	\$125,000
Harrison	Edmund	Montgomery	AL	Planter	\$44,100	\$19,000
Jackson	A.B.	Montgomery	AL	Farmer	\$1,320	\$16,820
Jackson	P.M.	Montgomery	AL	Manufacturer		\$3,600
Lewis	H.M.	Montgomery	AL	Agent	\$1,500	
Martin	Abram	Montgomery	AL	Lawyer	\$38,000	\$17,000
Merriwether	James B.	Montgomery	AL	Planter	\$36,000	\$115,561
Moulton	Thomas M.	Montgomery	AL	Lawyer		
Murphy	John H.	Montgomery	AL	Commission Merchant	\$75,000	
Myers	Robert C.	Montgomery	AL	Planter	\$20,000	
Myrick	Richard J.	Montgomery	AL	Physician		
Nash	James M.	Montgomery	AL	Broker		\$50,000
Pfister	Arnand P.	Montgomery	AL	Merchant		
Pickett	Albert J.	Montgomery	AL	Planter		
Pollard	Charles T.	Montgomery	AL	Railroad	\$215,000	\$350,000
Roberts	Israel W.	Montgomery	AL	Merchant	\$161,000	\$125,000
Roberts	J.W.	Montgomery	AL	Merchant	\$167,000	\$125,000
Sayre	P.T.	Montgomery	AL	Lawyer	\$27,000	\$76,740

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Taylor	William H.	Montgomery	AL	Commission Merchant	\$187,000	\$210,900
Watts	Thomas H.	Montgomery	AL	Lawyer	\$190,000	\$300,000
Winter	Joseph S.	Montgomery	AL	Exchange	\$150,000	
Bailey	James F.	Perry	AL	Judge	\$10,000	\$25,190
Brooks	William	Perry	AL	Lawyer	\$26,000	\$50,000
Clark	Richard	Perry	AL	Physician	\$2,000	\$40,000
Curry	Jabez L.	Perry	AL	Farmer	\$140,000	\$200,000
Gorce	Robert T.	Perry	AL	Farmer	\$10,000	
Grayhan	J.P.	Perry	AL	Lawyer	\$32,000	\$60,000
Haines	W.M.	Perry	AL	Farmer		
Houston	James H.	Perry	AL	Physician	\$2,500	\$12,000
King	Porter	Perry	AL	Judge	\$80,000	\$100,000
Lawson	P.B.	Perry	AL			
Lockett	Napoleon	Perry	AL	Lawyer	\$45,000	\$202,600
McAlister	William T.	Perry	AL	Physician		\$2,000
Miree	William S.	Perry	AL	Farmer	\$12,000	\$70,545
Moore	Andrew B.	Perry	AL	Lawyer	\$3,000	
Pitts	David W.	Perry	AL	Planter	\$30,000	\$40,000
Price	James L.	Perry	AL	Planter	\$70,000	\$100,000
Reid	John C.	Perry	AL	Lawyer	\$1,500	\$10,970
Ried	Rufus J.	Perry	AL	Lawyer	\$3,500	\$25,375
Royston	L.Y.	Perry	AL	Lawyer		
Shephard	Alexander K.	Perry	AL	Planter	\$25,000	\$5,000
Weissinger	Leonard	Perry	AL	Farmer		
Henry	James	Pickens	AL	Physician	\$13,000	\$2,200
Neal	Absalom D.	Pickens	AL	Farmer	\$15,000	\$40,000
Stone	Lewis M.	Pickens	AL	Lawyer	\$12,000	\$34,595
Cobb	M.E.	Shelby	AL	Teacher		
Shortridge	George D.	Shelby	AL	Lawyer	\$5,000	\$10,500
Caldwell	John H.	St. Clair	AL	Lawyer	\$1,000	\$1,000
Boyle	John C.	Sumter	AL	Merchant	\$1,500	\$4,000
Fulton	William	Sumter	AL	Farmer	\$40,000	\$90,000
Hadley	John L.	Sumter	AL	Physician	\$24,180	\$83,165

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Hadley	John L.	Sumter	AL	Physician	\$24,180	\$83,165
Hibbler	William H.	Sumter	AL	Farmer	\$80,000	\$150,000
McDow	William L.	Sumter	AL	Farmer	\$32,400	\$76,000
Myers	William P.	Sumter	AL	Farmer		
Pettigrew	Elinezer C	Sumter	AL	Farmer		
Saunders	G.B.	Sumter	AL	Registrar in Chancery	\$3,500	\$800
Sledge	William H.	Sumter	AL	Physician	\$40,000	\$53,250
Huey	James G.L.	Talladega	AL	Merchant	\$20,000	\$37,000
Jemison	Robert S.	Talladega	AL	Farmer	\$30,000	\$26,250
Gilmer	James J.	Tallapoosa	AL	Farmer	\$60,000	\$140,000
Pearson	James M.	Tallapoosa	AL	Planter	\$11,500	\$60,000
Clements	Luther M.	Tuscaloosa	AL	Physician	\$50,000	\$100,000
Leach	Sewall J.	Tuscaloosa	AL	Merchant		
Moody	Washington	Tuscaloosa	AL	Lawyer	\$6,600	
Ormond	John J.	Tuscaloosa	AL	Lawyer	\$122,800	\$190,850
Sellers	Daniel C.	Wilcox	AL	Planter	\$29,000	\$108,700
Moore	James H.	Arkansas	AR	Planter	\$80,000	\$32,200
Hilliard	Isaac H.	Chicot	AR	Planter		
Harris	J.L.	Clark	AR	Physician	\$3,800	\$5,000
Gordon	Anderson	Conway	AR	Merchant	\$12,000	\$23,000
Allen	A.A.	Drew	AR	Merchant	\$6,000	\$10,000
Williams	R.P.	Hempstead	AR	Farmer	\$600	\$1,058
Anderson	Robert	Jackson	AR	Lawyer	\$18,920	\$900
Auls	John	Jackson	AR	Laborer		
Board	C.W.	Jackson	AR	Merchant	\$4,000	\$1,000
Bowen	John L.	Jackson	AR	Farmer		
Brown	W.D.	Jackson	AR	Speculator	\$2,000	\$2,000
Clay	L.R.	Jackson	AR	Farmer	\$10,000	\$8,000
Dodd	William	Jackson	AR	Physician		
Gossett	L. C.	Jackson	AR	Carpenter	\$750	\$100
Henderson	J.	Jackson	AR	Gambler		
Hunter	J.	Jackson	AR			
Jones	H.M.	Jackson	AR	Physician	\$4,000	\$10,000

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Jugo	W.H.	Jackson	AR	Book Keeper		\$300
Kellogg	R.R.	Jackson	AR	Circuit Court Clerk	\$10,000	\$2,000
Mathews	C.J.	Jackson	AR			
Patterson	W.K.	Jackson	AR	Lawyer	\$10,580	\$15,080
Pickett	W.H.	Jackson	AR	Physician	\$54,000	\$60,000
Prichard	L.K.	Jackson	AR			
Redman	C.	Jackson	AR	Clerk	\$1,500	\$300
Selvey	Garland	Jackson	AR			
Shupe	Sam	Jackson	AR			
Simmons	J.B.	Jackson	AR	Physician	\$1,000	\$2,500
Smith	W.R.	Jackson	AR	Merchant		\$5,000
Ward	T.R.	Jackson	AR	Farmer	\$5,600	\$6,400
Watkins	F.	Jackson	AR	Physician	\$2,500	\$5,000
Wickersham	John	Jackson	AR			
Bell	M.L.	Jefferson	AR	Lawyer	\$44,000	\$24,000
Breighton	W.R.	Phillips	AR			
Briscoe	H.L.	Phillips	AR			
Briswell	L.O.	Phillips	AR			
Brownson	C.J.	Phillips	AR			
Burton	Robert A.	Phillips	AR	Physician	\$5,000	\$5,000
Hanly	Thomas	Phillips	AR	Lawyer	\$100,000	\$20,000
Hubbard	James M.	Phillips	AR	Farmer	\$75,000	\$80,000
King	Charles	Phillips	AR	Merchant	\$5,000	\$50,000
Priston	Walter	Phillips	AR	Farmer	\$50,000	\$100,000
Robertson	F.J.	Phillips	AR	Physician		
Thompson	Arthur	Phillips	AR	Gentleman	\$35,000	\$18,000
Henry	James A.	Pulaski	AR	Merchant	\$5,000	\$15,000
Pike	Albert	Pulaski	AR	Lawyer	\$200,000	\$40,000
Main	John H. F.	Sebastian	AR	Physician	\$39,040	\$30,000
Bliss	James	Alachua	FL			
Palmer	David L.	Duval	FL	Farmer	\$7,000	\$30,000
Batchelder	G.F.	Escambia	FL	Merchant	\$40,000	\$10,000
Clapp	L.L.	Escambia	FL			

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Creighton	W.L.	Escambia	FL			
Hawkins	George S.	Escambia	FL			
Linerantz	W.P.	Escambia	FL			
Maxwell	E.A.	Escambia	FL	Lawyer	\$7,000	\$8,000
Raney	David G.	Franklin	FL	Commission Merchant		
Dupont	Charles H.	Gadsden	FL	Judge	\$55,000	\$75,000
Milton	John	Jackson	FL	Lawyer	\$40,000	\$40,000
Anderson	James E.	Leon	FL	Physician		
Berry	Robert H.	Leon	FL	Merchant	\$4,000	\$7,000
Bloxham	William D.	Leon	FL	Farmer		\$25,000
Bond	L.S.	Leon	FL			
Bradford	Edward	Leon	FL	Planter	\$29,000	\$74,000
Brembry	R.	Leon	FL			
Brevard	T.W.	Leon	FL	Lawyer	\$15,500	\$25,000
Brown	Thomas	Leon	FL	Planter	\$30,000	\$2,000
Brunch	H.H.	Leon	FL			
Bryan	C.A.	Leon	FL	Clerk		\$300
Call	Richard K.	Leon	FL	Planter	\$31,000	\$81,000
Carr	William A.	Leon	FL	Farmer	\$31,000	\$56,000
Chaires	C.P.	Leon	FL	Farmer	\$18,000	\$58,000
Craig	W.P.	Leon	FL	Planter	\$13,000	\$37,000
Croom	George A.	Leon	FL	Planter	\$15,000	\$40,000
Davis	William	Leon	FL	Lawyer	\$5,000	\$20,000
Donnelly	W.E.	Leon	FL			
Fisher	A.A.	Leon	FL	Farmer	\$16,000	\$47,230
Flagg	F.H.	Leon	FL	Treasurer of Railroad	\$4,000	\$2,000
Gamble	Robert	Leon	FL	Planter	\$8,000	\$15,000
Gamble	John G.	Leon	FL	Physician		
Gillispe	T.L.	Leon	FL			
Hannon	G.	Leon	FL			
Haywood	R.	Leon	FL			
Long	Medicus A.	Leon	FL	Lawyer	\$20,000	
Maxwell	G.T.	Leon	FL			

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Parkhill	G.W.	Leon	FL	Physician	\$36,000	\$133,000
Perkins	Thomas J.	Leon	FL	Merchant	\$4,000	\$40,000
Poole	James	Leon	FL			
Randolph	J.L.	Leon	FL	Engineer		\$400
Rutgers	H.L.	Leon	FL	Commission Merchant		
Sanders	Richard	Leon	FL	Sheriff of County		\$8,000
Saraje	L.K.	Leon	FL			
Thompson	Noah L.	Leon	FL	Planter	\$40,000	
Walker	David S.	Leon	FL	Judge	\$6,000	\$13,000
Ward	George	Leon	FL	Planter	\$70,000	\$130,650
Williams	R.W.	Leon	FL	Planter	\$6,000	\$6,500
Williams	James M.	Leon	FL	Merchant	\$5,000	
Harrison	Richard	Madison	FL	Farmer	\$10,000	
Campbell	Robert P.	Monroe	FL	Merchant	\$25,000	\$10,000
Chain	John	Santa Rosa	FL	Lawyer	\$200	\$1,000
Alexander	William F.		GA			
Harris	J.	Baldwin	GA			
White	Samuel G.	Baldwin	GA	Physician	\$18,900	\$45,350
Ayres	Asher	Bibb	GA	Merchant	\$50,000	\$59,200
Bowdie	P.E.	Bibb	GA			
Huff	William A.	Bibb	GA	Merchant	\$4,500	\$10,000
Rasdal	L.W.	Bibb	GA			
Ross	John B.	Bibb	GA	Railroad	\$120,000	\$332,000
Woolfolk	James	Bibb	GA	Commission Merchant	\$18,000	\$23,000
Palmer	John T.	Burke	GA	Physician	\$10,000	\$6,248
Adams	William B.	Chatham	GA	Book Keeper		\$1,500
Austin	Thomas S.	Chatham	GA			
Bashlor	James H.	Chatham	GA	Merchant		\$1,500
Brigham	Henry	Chatham	GA	Commission Merchant	\$32,000	\$35,000
Cohen	Moses S.	Chatham	GA	Commission Merchant	\$7,000	\$10,000
Colby	Charles L.	Chatham	GA			
Cunningham	Alexander F.	Chatham	GA	Physician		\$3,000
Currell	Spencer	Chatham	GA			

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Erwin	Robert	Chatham	GA	Commission Merchant	\$3,000	\$96,000
Gowdy	Hill	Chatham	GA	Commission Merchant	\$1,000	\$10,000
Guerard	John M.	Chatham	GA	Lawyer	\$1,500	\$5,000
Hamilton	James S.	Chatham	GA			
Hamilton	Luke M.	Chatham	GA	Railroad		
Hardee	Noble A.	Chatham	GA	Commission Merchant	\$50,000	\$100,000
Hartridge	Algernon S.	Chatham	GA	Commission Merchant	\$13,400	\$147,000
Hertz	Edward	Chatham	GA	Commission Merchant		
Holcombe	Thomas	Chatham	GA	Merchant	\$27,000	\$10,000
Lachlison	James	Chatham	GA	Machinists	\$7,300	\$15,400
Lathrop	James W.	Chatham	GA	Commission Merchant	\$28,000	\$75,000
Reid	Francis W.	Chatham	GA	Commission Merchant	\$6,500	\$1,000
Sims	Frederick W.	Chatham	GA	Publisher	\$2,400	\$20,500
Stiles	B. E.	Chatham	GA			
Tison	William H.	Chatham	GA	Merchant	\$14,000	\$45,000
Tunno	William M.	Chatham	GA			
Wilcox	Albert	Chatham	GA	Dentist		\$500
Williams	William T.	Chatham	GA	Book Dealer, Stationer	\$7,050	\$38,000
Flournoy	Josiah	Chattooga	GA	Mechanic		
Church	Alonzo	Clarke	GA	Minister	\$2,500	\$25,000
Green	Frank M.	Clarke	GA			
Linton	John	Clarke	GA	Manufacturer/Planter	\$10,000	\$55,000
Arnold	C.	Cobb	GA			
Denmead	Edward	Cobb	GA	Farmer	\$65,000	\$20,000
Glover	J.H.	Cobb	GA		\$26,000	\$100,000
Phillips	William	Cobb	GA	Lawyer	\$16,000	\$16,000
Wooding	Robert E.	Columbus	GA	Planter	\$3,000	
Arnett	F.G.	Decatur	GA	Farmer	\$20,000	
Hill	R.G.	Decatur	GA	Farmer	\$10,000	\$20,500
Dickens	Ephraim	De Kalb	GA	Farmer	\$200	
Printup	Daniel S.	De Kalb	GA	Railroad		
Moremen	John S.	Dougherty	GA	Farmer		
Warren	L.P.D.	Dougherty	GA			

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Pledger	W.H.	Elbert	GA	Farmer	\$2,000	\$2,700
Alexander	John R.	Floyd	GA	Lawyer	\$4,000	
Bently	George	Floyd	GA			
Berrien	John	Floyd	GA	Farmer		
Butler	G.B.	Floyd	GA			
Lumpkin	Joseph H.	Floyd	GA	Judge	\$9,000	\$48,000
Prentiss		Floyd	GA			
Shorter	Alfred	Floyd	GA	Farmer	\$125,000	\$232,000
Smith	W. R.	Floyd	GA	Farmer	\$100,000	\$72,000
Spallock	James M.	Floyd	GA	Farmer	\$12,000	\$18,000
Sullivan	A.J.	Floyd	GA			
Yarborough	N.	Floyd	GA			
Baker	Boling	Fulton	GA	Lawyer		
Clark	Thomas M.	Fulton	GA	Merchant		
Clarke	Robert C.	Fulton	GA	Merchant		
Hulbert	Edward C.	Fulton	GA	Railroad		
McCamy	S.R.	Fulton	GA			
Meaders	L.F.	Fulton	GA			
Sharp	George S.	Fulton	GA			
Willis	Richard J.	Greene	GA	Farmer	\$30,000	\$86,000
Word	R.H.	Greene	GA	Farmer	\$7,000	\$37,000
Brown	A.E.W.	Hancock	GA	Planter	\$20,000	\$50,000
Harris	Miles G.	Hancock	GA	Planter	\$25,000	\$54,000
Bunn	Hugh L.	Houston	GA	Teacher		
Henry	John	Houston	GA	Merchant		
McGhee	Edward J.	Houston	GA	Farmer	\$13,800	\$35,000
Pow	Lewis W.	Jasper	GA	Farmer	\$7,750	
Farmer	John J.	Morgan	GA	Farmer	\$1,000	\$1,000
Foster	Nathaniel	Morgan	GA	Lawyer	\$20,000	\$50,000
Jones	E.E.	Morgan	GA	Physician	\$24,000	\$121,000
Ogilby	Hugh	Morgan	GA	Physician	\$15,000	\$60,325
Porter	John W.	Morgan	GA	Farmer	\$13,600	\$32,700
Saffold	William O.	Morgan	GA	Farmer	\$60,000	\$156,000

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Saffold	Thomas P.	Morgan	GA	Farmer	\$25,000	\$50,590
Ansley	Jesse A.	Richmond	GA	Commission Merchant	\$19,000	\$5,000
Barry	Edward	Richmond	GA	Druggist		
Batty	Thomas	Richmond	GA	Druggist		
Beall	Albert A.	Richmond	GA	Cotton Factor		\$6,000
Belcher	J.M.	Richmond	GA			
Bones	John	Richmond	GA	Merchant	\$35,000	\$200,000
Broome	James J.	Richmond	GA	Merchant		\$700
Butt	John D.	Richmond	GA	Merchant		
Carr	H.W	Richmond	GA			
Crump	George H.	Richmond	GA	Merchant		\$150
Dawson	James C.	Richmond	GA	Merchant		
Doughty	Charles W.	Richmond	GA	Commission Merchant		\$700
Dunbar	Barney S.	Richmond	GA			
Fleming	Porter	Richmond	GA	Merchant	\$33,000	\$35,000
Gardner	James T., Jr.	Richmond	GA	Commission Merchant		\$9,000
Gibson	William	Richmond	GA	Lawyer		
Goodrich	William H.	Richmond	GA	Manufacturer	\$80,000	\$135,000
Heard	Issac T.	Richmond	GA	Commission Merchant		
Jackson	William E.	Richmond	GA	Manufacturer	\$72,200	\$46,000
Lathrop	J.T.	Richmond	GA			
Macbeth	J.F.	Richmond	GA			
Marshall	B.S.	Richmond	GA	Printer		
McCord	Z.	Richmond	GA			
Nelson	John	Richmond	GA	Merchant	\$16,000	\$20,000
Robertson	J.J.	Richmond	GA			
Smith	A.J.	Richmond	GA			
Starr	W.P	Richmond	GA			
Thompson	James F.	Richmond	GA	Printer		
Walker	C.V.	Richmond	GA	Clerk		
Walker	E.J.	Richmond	GA	Lawyer		\$3,500
Walker	William W.	Richmond	GA	Railroad		\$500
Adams	A.A.	Sumter	GA	Farmer	\$23,000	\$40,000

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Bruce	A.N.	Sumter	GA	Merchant	\$12,000	\$11,050
Riley	A.H.	Sumter	GA	Farmer	\$7,000	\$48,540
Robertson	A.A.	Sumter	GA			
Bangs	J.H.	Henry	IA	Farmer	\$1,000	\$2,000
Abney	Lucin B.	Fleming	KY	Physician		
Macklin	George B.	Franklin	KY	Merchant		\$2,000
Ainslee	George	Jefferson	KY	Iron Foundry		
Archer	James	Jefferson	KY	Farmer		\$450
Barrett	George T.	Jefferson	KY			
Baxter	John G.	Jefferson	KY	Merchant		
Buchanan	George C.	Jefferson	KY	Merchant	\$300	\$30
Clark	C.S.	Jefferson	KY			
Cochran	Archibald P.	Jefferson	KY	Iron Foundry	\$50,000	\$28,000
Fox	William H.	Jefferson	KY	Merchant	\$25,000	\$69,000
Gardner	Edward A.	Jefferson	KY	Merchant	\$27,000	\$74,000
Kennedy	E.W.	Jefferson	KY			
Newcomb	Henry D.	Jefferson	KY	Commission Merchant	\$200,000	\$250,000
Slevin	Thomas	Jefferson	KY	Merchant		
Snider	James S.	Jefferson	KY			
Speed	John	Jefferson	KY	Clerk		
Tompkins	Samuel D.	Jefferson	KY	Merchant	\$5,000	\$15,000
Warren	Levi L.	Jefferson	KY	Merchant	\$100,000	\$75,000
Watson	John	Jefferson	KY			
Welby	George	Jefferson	KY	Merchant		\$15,000
Weller	Jacob F.	Jefferson	KY	Commission Merchant		
Wicks	George W.	Jefferson	KY	Commission Merchant	\$8,000	\$14,000
Bruce	Eli M.	Kenton	KY	Farmer	\$2,800	\$8,400
Lambert	Robert B.	Nelson	KY	Roman Catholic Monk		
Burnley	Harden	Assumption	LA	Planter	\$25,000	\$45,000
Cushman	Ralph	Avoyelles	LA	Judge	\$6,000	
Haralson	H.B.	Baton Rouge	LA	Farmer	\$10,000	\$52,000
Hart	S.M.	Baton Rouge	LA			
Paul	D.	Baton Rouge	LA			

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Seakles	J.M.	Baton Rouge	LA			
Lewis	A.D.	Bossier	LA	Store Clerk		
Cain	Sylvester H.	Caddo	LA		\$5,000	
Bagley	Anderson	Carroll	LA	Physician	\$69,000	\$94,465
Martin	James	Carroll	LA	Merchant		\$1,800
Scarborough	Thomas C.	Carroll	LA	Engineer	\$2,500	\$5,700
Short	Hugh	Carroll	LA	Lawyer	\$50,000	\$30,000
Brunot	Felix R.	East Baton	LA	Lawyer		
Conrad	F.D.	East Baton	LA	Farmer	\$150,000	\$282,000
Kleinpeter	Josiah	East Baton	LA	Farmer	\$9,000	\$21,750
McChristy	John	East Baton	LA	Farmer	\$2,000	\$12,000
Patrick	Jesse C.	East Baton	LA	Planter	\$1,075,000	\$45,000
Pierce	G.M.	East Baton	LA	Farmer	\$12,000	\$60,500
Robertson	Edward W.	East Baton	LA	State Auditor	\$5,000	\$11,200
Stokes	J.A.	East Baton	LA	Farmer	\$15,000	\$20,000
Janvier	H.P.	Jefferson	LA	Insurance	\$13,000	\$10,000
Billien	J.	Lafourche	LA			
Bush	Louis	Lafourche	LA	Lawyer	\$70,000	\$70,000
Daunis	M.H.	Lafourche	LA			
Gazza	Jean B. C.	Lafourche	LA	Physician	\$6,000	\$2,000
Thibodaux	Bannon G.	Lafourche	LA	Planter		
Tucker	George	Lafourche	LA	Farmer	\$20,000	\$20,000
Webb	F.	Lafourche	LA			
Briscal	Claiborne C.	Madison	LA	Lawyer	\$3,000	\$25,000
Maher	Philip	Madison	LA	Planter	\$300,000	\$5,000
Baker	John H.	Orleans	LA	Toll Collector		
Beard	George R.	Orleans	LA	Merchant	\$14,000	\$2,000
Beling	F.	Orleans	LA	Merchant		
Black	Charles	Orleans	LA	Commission Merchant		
Blakely	James D.	Orleans	LA			
Calhoun	John V.	Orleans	LA	President of Railroad		
Campbell	J.B.	Orleans	LA	Cooper		
Ceiev	William	Orleans	LA			

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Clarke	J.G.	Orleans	LA	Retired Physician		
Conrad	Charles M.	Orleans	LA	Commission Merchant	\$100,000	\$3,000
Cunningham	Michael	Orleans	LA	Merchant		
Denis	Henry	Orleans	LA			
Desmare	Alphonse	Orleans	LA			
Fellows	Cornelius	Orleans	LA	Commission Merchant	\$200,000	\$100,000
Goldenbow	William	Orleans	LA	Shipping Agent	\$20,000	\$5,000
Gunther	Louis	Orleans	LA	Merchant		
Herron	August F.	Orleans	LA	Merchant		
Herron	Francis J.	Orleans	LA			
Lane	Everett	Orleans	LA			
Legarre	Hugh	Orleans	LA			
Lesparre	Auguste	Orleans	LA	Shipping Agent		
Levy	H.J.	Orleans	LA	Merchant		\$2,500
Levy	S.L.	Orleans	LA	Commission Merchant	\$150,000	\$30,000
Levy	E.L.	Orleans	LA	Commission Merchant	\$15,000	\$20,000
Lyman	Joseph B.	Orleans	LA	Lawyer		\$250
Martyn	S. Craig	Orleans	LA	Physician		\$17,000
Mayer	John F.	Orleans	LA	Trader		\$350
McCord	David	Orleans	LA	Clerk		\$500
Miles	William M.	Orleans	LA			
Mitchell	J.J.	Orleans	LA	Merchant	\$2,000	\$3,000
Mittenburger	A.	Orleans	LA	Merchant		
Murray	William	Orleans	LA			
Musgrove	R.G.	Orleans	LA	Cotton Broker	\$18,000	\$40,000
Mussina	Jacob	Orleans	LA	Merchant		
Newton	Cincinnatus	Orleans	LA	Merchant		\$5,000
O'Brien	James	Orleans	LA			
Palmer	Benjamin	Orleans	LA	Minister		\$3,000
Parlta	H.	Orleans	LA			
Pemberton	John	Orleans	LA	Insurance	\$45,000	\$25,000
Poehm	Frank	Orleans	LA			
Pohlhaus	John H.	Orleans	LA	Accountant		

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Richard	A.R.	Orleans	LA	Merchant		
Ross	James	Orleans	LA	State Flour Inspector	\$10,000	\$5,500
Seger	A.B	Orleans	LA	Vice President of Railroad		
Stern	Henry	Orleans	LA	Merchant		
Stone	Harry B.	Orleans	LA	Harbor Man		
Thomas	William H.	Orleans	LA			
Thompson	Edward	Orleans	LA	Merchant		
Trent	George	Orleans	LA			
White	George A.	Orleans	LA	Merchant		
White	Maunsel	Plaquemines	LA	Planter	\$60,000	\$150,000
Beatty	William I.	Rapides	LA	Farmer	\$81,600	\$7,880
Bellier	J.B.	Rapides	LA	Minister		
Calhoun	Meredith	Rapides	LA	Farmer	\$1,079,900	\$50,000
Chambers	Josiah	Rapides	LA	Farmer	\$458,500	\$28,000
Crickshawk	R.H.	Rapides	LA			
Gaines	William	Rapides	LA			
Graham	George M.	Rapides	LA	Farmer	\$206,000	\$14,970
Hynson	Robert C.	Rapides	LA	Farmer	\$148,250	\$69,000
James	John	Rapides	LA	Teamster		
Luckett	Robert C.	Rapides	LA	Physician		
Maddox	Thomas H.	Rapides	LA	Farmer	\$270,500	\$8,870
Magruder	Leonard	Rapides	LA	Farmer	\$88,800	\$6,880
Moore	Thomas	Rapides	LA	Planter	\$320,000	\$24,300
Prescott	Aaron	Rapides	LA	Farmer	\$125,000	\$8,880
Thornton	Charles A.	Rapides	LA	Farmer	\$100,000	\$4,900
Welsh	Micha	Rapides	LA	Farmer	\$12,000	\$2,300
Williams	John R.	Rapides	LA	Farmer	\$330,000	\$24,000
Witten	F.R.	Rapides	LA			
Brown	J.C.	St. James	LA			
Colomb	H.C.	St. James	LA	Dentist		\$3,600
Lebourgeois	Louis S.	St. James	LA	Farmer	\$135,000	\$143,200
Cocke	W.K.	St. John	LA			
Moore	John	St. Martin	LA	Planter	\$25,000	\$10,000

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
McCall	Duncan	Tensas	LA	Planter	\$58,400	\$34,000
Baker	Richard J.	Baltimore	MD	Manufacturer	\$25,000	\$600
Birckhead	James, Jr.	Baltimore	MD			
Cannon	James	Baltimore	MD	Mariner		
Clebaugh	Edward A.	Baltimore	MD	Merchant	\$10,000	\$2,500
Clement	P.P.	Baltimore	MD			
Corner	N.H.	Baltimore	MD			
Cromer	Thomas W.	Baltimore	MD	Merchant	\$10,000	\$5,000
De Ford	Charles	Baltimore	MD			
Dennis	William R.	Baltimore	MD	Cooper		\$100
Dutsow	F.	Baltimore	MD			
Featherson	E.M.	Baltimore	MD	Merchant		
Garther	George O.	Baltimore	MD	Agent		
Gilmor	William	Baltimore	MD	Notary Public	\$110,000	\$10,000
Hamilton	M.A.	Baltimore	MD	Merchant		
Harvey	Joshua G.	Baltimore	MD			
Jenkins	Michael	Baltimore	MD	Lawyer	\$20,000	\$10,000
Kirkland	Alexander	Baltimore	MD	Commission Merchant	\$25,000	\$50,000
Knabe	William	Baltimore	MD	Piano Maker	\$22,000	\$50,000
Lightner	William P.	Baltimore	MD	Collector	\$19,000	\$4,000
Mordacai	M.C.M	Baltimore	MD			
O'Donnell	Columbus	Baltimore	MD	President of Gas Company	\$300,000	\$130,000
Pendergast	James F.	Baltimore	MD	Commission Merchant		
Pennington	William C.	Baltimore	MD	Lawyer		
Powers	B.P.	Baltimore	MD			
Prestman	George	Baltimore	MD			
Slaughter	James M.	Baltimore	MD			
Sterling	Adolph	Baltimore	MD			
Taylor	William W.	Baltimore	MD	Commission Merchant	\$20,000	\$50,000
Archer	James		MO	Merchant	\$8,000	\$3,000
Berthold	Pierre A.		MO			
Block	Henry		MO	Merchant	\$6,000	\$15,000
Blossom	Henry M.		MO	Book Keeper	\$5,000	\$10,000

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Bogy	Lewis V.		MO		\$550,000	\$25,000
Boyd	W. L.		MO			
Burr	William C.		MO			
Burris	S.W.		MO			
Buzzard	Milton M.		MO	Merchant	\$3,500	\$50
Carson	James B.		MO	Brick Layer		
Carter	Walker R.		MO	Merchant	\$100,000	\$25,000
Caruthers	George R.		MO			
Chouteau	Charles P		MO	Manufacturer	\$80,000	\$20,000
Clark	Henry L.		MO		\$163,000	\$2,000
Cohn	Miles D.		MO			
Crawshaw	Joseph		MO			
Deady	John		MO			
Dimick	Horace E.		MO	Gunsmith	\$10,000	\$10,000
Dodd	Samuel M.		MO	Farmer	\$1,500	\$500
Douglass	John T.		MO	Rope Manufacturer		\$3,000
Eaton	Nathaniel J.		MO	Insurance	\$18,000	\$2,500
Edgell	Stephen M.		MO	Merchant	\$2,000	\$10,000
Elam	Edwin M.		MO	Merchant		\$25
Fisher	Francis		MO	Merchant		
Gaylord	Erastus H.		MO	Bank		
Gordon	William R.		MO	Cotton Broker	\$53,000	\$300
Hempbell	Hugh		MO			
Holmes	Nathaniel J.		MO	Lawyer		
Horgadan	W.A.		MO	Merchant	\$33,000	\$10,500
How	John		MO	Merchant	\$295,000	\$802,000
Jameson	Joseph A.		MO	Merchant	\$3,000	\$10,000
Lackland	Rufus J.		MO	Merchant	\$100,000	\$150,000
Langsdorf	Morris		MO	Merchant		
Leggett	John E.		MO	Merchant	\$30,000	\$14,000
Lepere	Francis		MO	Merchant	\$13,000	\$5,000
Lewis	Benjamin W.		MO			
Lindsley	Decosa B.		MO	Merchant		\$600

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Lucas	James H.		MO	Lawyer	\$3,500,000	\$225,000
Lumpkins	G.W.		MO			
Lynch	Peter		MO	Merchant		\$170
McCartney	L.		MO			
McConkin	Charles A.		MO	Merchant		
McDowell	Augustus		MO	Merchant		
Mead	Edward H.		MO	Merchant	\$86,200	\$50,000
Merriam	James, Jr.		MO			
Meyer	Henry D.		MO			
Miller	John S. J.		MO	Merchant		\$3,000
Mitchell	Robert		MO	Cabinet Maker	\$100,000	\$2,000
Oglesby	Joseph H.		MO	Commission Merchant		\$4,500
Orrick	A.C.		MO	Merchant	\$2,500	\$14,025
Patterson	Robert D.		MO	Brick Maker		\$50
Pearson	Richard M		MO			
Perkins	Nathan W.		MO	Merchant	\$5,000	\$800
Pratt	Elon G.		MO			
Price	William		MO			
Rhodes	Thomas		MO	Merchant		\$800
Ridgely	Franklin L.		MO	Insurance	\$50,000	\$10,000
Robinson	George R.		MO	Commission Merchant	\$30,000	\$50,000
Samuels	Moses		MO	Merchant		\$1,000
Scott	William P.		MO	Merchant		\$4,000
Shields	John		MO	Merchant	\$7,000	\$1,000
Slevin	John F.		MO	Merchant		\$50
Stinde	Herman F.		MO			
Stinde	Conrad R.		MO	Merchant	\$8,000	\$25,000
Stoner	William E.		MO			
Suss	Alexander		MO	Merchant		\$5,000
Taylor	Daniel G.		MO	Merchant	\$50,000	\$5,000
Taylor	Thomas M.		MO			
Tripllett	John R.		MO	Merchant	\$3,000	\$5,000
Valle	Jules		MO	Iron Merchant	\$5,000	\$2,500

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Wells	Erastus		MO		\$70,000	\$33,000
Wells	Charles G.		MO	Merchant		\$3,000
Wetzell	Z.F.		MO			
White	David		MO	Book Keeper		
Harvey	E. Jones		MS	Planter	\$13,000	\$30,000
Alexander	Thomas A.	Adams	MS			
Atchison	R.H.	Adams	MS	Physician	\$18,000	\$18,000
Baine	Alex	Adams	MS	Lawyer	\$1,200	
Baker	Edwin B.	Adams	MS	Merchant	\$16,000	\$20,000
Balfour	William J.	Adams	MS	Planter	\$50,000	\$150,000
Boyd	Elijah	Adams	MS	Merchant	\$6,000	\$11,000
Dunbar	Joseph	Adams	MS			
Foster	James	Adams	MS	Physician	\$6,000	\$5,000
Gaillard	Thomas B.	Adams	MS	Planter	\$10,000	\$20,000
Garrett	James	Adams	MS	Law Office Agent	\$1,500	\$10,000
Jackson	Dempsey P.	Adams	MS	Planter	\$12,000	\$18,000
Metcalf	Henry L.	Adams	MS	Planter	\$50,000	\$125,000
Metcalf	Oren	Adams	MS	Sheriff	\$28,000	\$40,000
Metcalf	James W.	Adams	MS	Planter	\$7,000	\$15,000
Roach	J. Wilkins	Adams	MS	Planter	\$16,000	\$42,000
Sargent	George	Adams	MS	Planter	\$75,000	\$19,000
Wood	E.J.	Adams	MS			
Prince	William B.	Carroll	MS	Planter	\$550,000	\$400,000
Featherston	Edward	Chickasaw	MS	Farmer	\$15,000	
Gates	S.P.	Chickasaw	MS	Farmer	\$31,000	\$50,000
McQuiston	W.C.	Chickasaw	MS	Lawyer	\$250	\$20,000
Phillips	M.A.	Chickasaw	MS	Merchant		
Wade	W.	Claiborne	MS			
Marsh	W.D.	Clark	MS	Physician	\$30,000	\$87,000
Perryman	A.	Clark	MS	Planter	\$50,000	\$75,000
York	Zebulon	Concordia	MS	Lawyer	\$12,000	\$5,000
Freeman	J.A.	De Soto	MS	Planter	\$9,000	\$15,050
Nelson	J. H.	De Soto	MS	Professor	\$15,700	\$2,200

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Avery	Edwin M.	Hinds	MS	Merchant	\$5,000	
Barksdale	Ethelbert	Hinds	MS	Editor		
Barnes	J.E.	Hinds	MS			
Barnes	J.M.	Hinds	MS	Teacher		
Boyd	M.W.	Hinds	MS	Physician		
Graves	J.	Hinds	MS	Planter	\$140,000	\$220,000
Harris	Wiley P.	Hinds	MS	Lawyer		
Hill	T.J.	Hinds	MS			
Hooker	Charles E.	Hinds	MS	Lawyer	\$25,000	\$30,000
Moody	E.	Hinds	MS	Planter	\$30,000	\$50,000
Napier	J.C.	Hinds	MS	Farmer	\$25,000	\$14,800
Phillips	Z.A.	Hinds	MS	Factory Manager		\$9,000
Phillips	J.W.	Hinds	MS	Physician	\$15,000	\$24,000
Potter	G.L.	Hinds	MS	Lawyer	\$10,000	\$20,000
Putman	J.M.	Hinds	MS			
Shotwell	Robert	Hinds	MS	Farmer	\$126,000	\$158,500
Tarpley	W.C.	Hinds	MS			
Yerger	William	Hinds	MS	Lawyer	\$150,000	\$160,000
Botters	Sampson	Holmes	MS			
Buckley	H.D.	Holmes	MS	Trader	\$2,000	\$7,329
Capshaw	P.	Holmes	MS	Physician	\$8,000	\$31,500
Cason	J.T.	Holmes	MS	Trader	\$2,500	\$1,500
Davis	H.P.	Holmes	MS	Physician		\$320
Hodges	J.F.	Holmes	MS	Planter	\$10,800	\$26,315
Johnson	S.C.	Holmes	MS	Planter	\$480	\$891
Johnson	N.G.	Holmes	MS	Physician		\$1,850
Torrey	James	Holmes	MS	Farmer	\$13,500	
Coffield	Horatio	Issaquena	MS	Planter	\$52,500	\$57,000
Duncan Jr.	J.H.	Jefferson	MS	Physician		\$9,000
Hicks	Edward	Jefferson	MS	Lawyer	\$17,870	\$30,585
Walker	W.C.	Jefferson	MS	Physician		\$40,000
Tinsley	Fredrick	Kempton	MS	Farmer	\$1,600	\$1,000
Brown	James	Lafayette	MS	Planter	\$485,110	\$189,000

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Howry	James M.	Lafayette	MS	Planter	\$75,000	\$34,000
Banks	James	Lowndes	MS	Physician	\$195,000	\$225,000
Blair	James	Lowndes	MS	Druggist	\$14,000	\$35,000
Blewett	Allen	Lowndes	MS	Planter		
Blewett	Thomas G.	Lowndes	MS	Planter	\$80,000	\$190,000
Cannon	W.R.	Lowndes	MS	Planter	\$38,000	\$45,000
Crump	John W.	Lowndes	MS	Planter	\$75,000	\$50,000
Gibbs	W.E.	Lowndes	MS	Trader	\$3,000	\$8,000
Hamilton	James	Lowndes	MS	Merchant	\$73,000	\$20,000
Murdock	Abram	Lowndes	MS	Merchant	\$20,000	\$30,000
Otley	John K.	Lowndes	MS	Merchant	\$5,000	\$50,000
Ussery	John	Lowndes	MS	Planter	\$4,000	\$75,000
Whitfield	W.W.	Lowndes	MS	Planter	\$55,000	\$50,000
Whitfield	A.D.	Lowndes	MS	Student		
Love	William C.	Madison	MS	Planter	\$27,000	\$36,700
Cade	Charles W.	Monroe	MS	Merchant		
Wicks	Moses J.	Monroe	MS	Merchant	\$7,000	
Ballard	Lott	Noxubee	MS	Planter	\$26,850	\$82,362
Harrison	Wiley H.	Noxubee	MS	Planter	\$3,000	\$80,000
Hunter	Charles M.	Noxubee	MS	Planter	\$6,000	\$12,000
Miller	Calvin	Panola	MS	Lawyer	\$70,000	\$20,000
Ward	M.S.	Panola	MS	Lawyer	\$1,300	\$8,000
Edmondson	Robert W	Pontotoc	MS	Judge	\$3,300	\$29,275
Gordon	Robert	Pontotoc	MS	Planter	\$200,000	\$180,000
Morey	J.B.	Rankin	MS			
Bynum	Joseph M.	Tishomingo	MS	Physician	\$2,500	\$29,000
Parks	Willie S.	Tishomingo	MS	House Carpenter		\$1,200
Arthur	Alex H.	Warren	MS	Judge		\$500
Brooke	Walker	Warren	MS	Lawyer	\$10,000	\$75,000
Cooper	William	Warren	MS	Planter	\$20,000	\$40,000
Emmanuel	Morris	Warren	MS	Physician	\$65,000	\$14,500
Gibbs	A.J.	Warren	MS	Physician	\$30,000	\$7,000
Gibson	D.	Warren	MS	Planter	\$10,000	\$65,000

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Grove	George W.	Warren	MS	Planter		\$240
Hughes	Felix	Warren	MS	Planter	\$10,000	\$10,000
Johnson	W.H.	Warren	MS	Planter	\$85,000	\$115,000
Latham	H.	Warren	MS	Farmer	\$250,000	\$150,000
Marshall	C.K.	Warren	MS	Minister	\$100,400	\$7,000
Mason	Eilbeck	Warren	MS	Lawyer	\$20,000	
Nailer	D.B.	Warren	MS	Physician	\$5,000	\$60,000
Smith	George	Warren	MS	Painter	\$1,000	
Vick	H.W.	Warren	MS			
Whaley	Thomas	Warren	MS	Merchant	\$15,000	
Blanton	Orville M.	Washington	MS	Physician		
Rucks	James T.	Washington	MS	Judge		
Proper	Daniel H.	Wilkinson	MS	Planter	\$1,195	\$19,158
Anderson	L.N.	Yazoo	MS	Planter		\$1,200
Barksdale	Harrison	Yazoo	MS	Planter	\$50,000	\$86,650
Burrus	John R.	Yazoo	MS	Planter	\$72,000	\$160,820
Caldwell	J.V.	Yazoo	MS	Merchant	\$2,100	
Paul	J.S.	Yazoo	MS	Planter	\$50,000	\$65,790
Penny	J.	Yazoo	MS	Planter	\$7,200	\$3,850
Pickett	R.K.	Yazoo	MS	Planter	\$30,000	\$89,070
Smith	F.G.	Yazoo	MS	Planter	\$75,000	\$85,000
Norris	William		NC			
Murray	Eli	Alamance	NC	Farmer	\$13,000	\$20,000
Rodman	William	Beaufort	NC	Lawyer	\$40,000	\$100,000
Battle	William H.	Edgecombe	NC	Farmer	\$130,000	\$204,000
Pender	David	Edgecombe	NC	Merchant	\$3,750	\$40,000
Pfokl	C.G.	Forsyth	NC			
Donnell	Richard C.	Guilford	NC	Farmer	\$2,500	\$7,000
Weller	Sidney	Halifax	NC			
Barry	H.M.	New Hanover	NC			
Ellis	C.D.	New Hanover	NC	Merchant		
Flanner	William B.	New Hanover	NC	Commission Merchant	\$1,000	\$4,000
Hall	A.E.	New Hanover	NC	Commission Merchant		

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Kendall	N.P.	New Hanover	NC			
Martin	Alfred	New Hanover	NC	Merchant	\$22,500	\$6,000
Boylan	William M.	Wake	NC	Planter		
Busbee	Quinton	Wake	NC	Lawyer	\$5,000	\$7,000
Collins, Jr.	Josiah	Washington	NC	Lawyer		\$16,000
Collins, Sr.	Josiah	Washington	NC	Planter	\$200,000	\$250,000
Spurell	H.G.	Washington	NC	Farmer	\$3,000	\$21,500
Appleton	H.	Hamilton	OH			
Ellis	Percy	Hamilton	OH			
Lockwood	Frank T.	Hamilton	OH	Merchant		\$5,000
Lottier	Samuel	Hamilton	OH			
Pearce	William R.	Hamilton	OH	Agent		
Agnew	Samuel T.	Abbeville	SC	Farmer	\$7,000	\$20,260
Orr	James	Anderson	SC	Lawyer	\$35,000	\$31,200
Rivers	C.M.	Barnwell	SC	House Carpenter		\$3,600
Wells	Thomas J.	Beaufort	SC	Teacher		\$4,000
Pringle	R.A.	Charleston	SC	Merchant		
Aiken	William	Charleston	SC	Planter	\$290,600	\$12,000
Aimar	George W.	Charleston	SC	Book Keeper		
Baggett	James H.	Charleston	SC	Bank		\$2,000
Bee	William C.	Charleston	SC			
Brown	S.K.	Charleston	SC	Builder		
Bulwinkle	Henry	Charleston	SC	Merchant	\$14,000	\$8,000
Carere	M.E.	Charleston	SC	Physician	\$31,000	\$15,000
Chaffe	William H.	Charleston	SC	Merchant		\$7,000
Claussen	J.C.H.	Charleston	SC	Baker	\$24,000	\$40,000
Cochrane	John C.	Charleston	SC	Bank	\$10,000	\$5,000
Cumins	John	Charleston	SC	Merchant		
Frenholin	E.L.	Charleston	SC	Merchant	\$50,000	\$5,600
Frost	Edward H.	Charleston	SC	Railroad	\$23,000	
Frost	Henry	Charleston	SC	Physician	\$75,000	\$25,000
Gravely	C.	Charleston	SC	Merchant		\$20,000
Hankel	Thomas	Charleston	SC	Lawyer	\$8,000	\$8,000

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Heins	Henry S.	Charleston	SC	Merchant		
Herte	Isaac E.	Charleston	SC	Merchant		
Heyward	Thomas J.	Charleston	SC	Merchant	\$12,000	\$15,000
Horlbeck	Edward	Charleston	SC	Commission Merchant	\$21,000	\$18,000
Kingman	H.W	Charleston	SC	Merchant		
Magrath	Andrew	Charleston	SC	Lawyer		
Mantone	B.	Charleston	SC			
Marshall	James C.	Charleston	SC	Student		
McBee	Vardry	Charleston	SC	Farmer	\$1,850,000	\$182,350
McCrary	John	Charleston	SC	Professor		\$1,200
McCrae	John	Charleston	SC			
McDonald	Arch	Charleston	SC	Merchant		
Miller	F.C.	Charleston	SC	Accountant	\$3,000	
Moose	J.	Charleston	SC	Merchant		
Muckinfuss	Benjamin	Charleston	SC	Dentist		
Muse	Robert	Charleston	SC			
O'Neill	Bernard	Charleston	SC	Merchant	\$42,000	\$15,000
Panknin	C.J.	Charleston	SC	Druggist		
Porcher	Thomas	Charleston	SC	Planter	\$13,000	\$83,025
Ravenel	Edmund	Charleston	SC	Physician		
Ravenel	H.E.	Charleston	SC	Farmer	\$13,000	\$46,000
Ravenel	Henry W.	Charleston	SC	Farmer	\$10,000	\$55,376
Sale	W.W.	Charleston	SC	Bank	\$1,200	\$15,000
Smith	William B.	Charleston	SC	Merchant	\$33,000	\$50,000
Steele	Joseph H.	Charleston	SC	Clerk		
Steinhouse	Adam	Charleston	SC	Clerk		
Tharin	Marion C.	Charleston	SC	Railroad		
Thouran	Joseph A.	Charleston	SC			
Wagner	J.D.	Charleston	SC	Clerk		
Walker	R.J.	Charleston	SC	Merchant		
Whaley	William	Charleston	SC	Farmer	\$9,600	\$10,000
Williams	George	Charleston	SC	Merchant	\$13,000	\$75,000
Willis	Henry	Charleston	SC	Broker	\$10,000	\$80,000

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Eaves	Nathaniel	Chester	SC	Lawyer	\$86,180	\$118,395
McCaliley	Samuel	Chester	SC			
McLure	James	Chester	SC	Farmer	\$39,376	\$141,645
Poag	James	Chester	SC	Farmer	\$19,500	\$29,350
Wilson	Daniel H.	Chester	SC	Merchant		\$14,812
Durrant	R.R.	Clarendon	SC	Farmer	\$40,000	\$136,000
Bellinger	E.E.	Colleton	SC	Minister	\$5,000	\$15,000
Glover	Joseph E.	Colleton	SC	Physician	\$25,000	\$70,000
Paul	Sampson L.	Colleton	SC	Planter	\$44,391	\$81,000
Perry	Josiah B.	Colleton	SC	Lawyer	\$13,500	\$80,000
Sanders	Benjamin	Colleton	SC	Planter	\$10,000	\$46,000
Townsend	D.J.	Colleton	SC	Planter	\$187,600	\$254,000
Berry	Andrew J.	Columbia	SC	Railroad		
Evans	Thomas C.	Darlington	SC	Lawyer		
Evans	Josiah J.	Darlington	SC	Farmer	\$4,500	
Hart	J. Hartwell	Darlington	SC	Planter	\$25,000	\$44,800
Law	Charles C.	Darlington	SC	Planter	\$10,500	\$40,500
Lide	Thomas P.	Darlington	SC	Planter	\$51,000	\$126,245
Nettles	J.R.	Darlington	SC	Planter	\$42,000	\$106,000
Wilds	Samuel H.	Darlington	SC	Planter	\$48,745	\$152,711
Abney	G.B.	Edgefield	SC	Physician		\$2,250
Adams	W.	Edgefield	SC	Merchant		\$3,000
Bland	J.A.	Edgefield	SC	Farmer	\$27,000	\$55,000
Bonham	Milledge L.	Edgefield	SC	Lawyer	\$17,000	\$50,000
Butler	William P.	Edgefield	SC	Merchant	\$4,000	
Butler	Loudon	Edgefield	SC	Lawyer		
Butler	Matthew	Edgefield	SC	Lawyer	\$7,000	\$17,000
Carroll	James P.	Edgefield	SC	Education	\$35,000	\$100,000
Frazier	Marshall	Edgefield	SC	Farmer	\$42,700	\$136,230
Morgan	George W.	Edgefield	SC	Farmer		\$2,000
Seibles	Edwin W.	Edgefield	SC	Farmer	\$5,000	\$31,500
Tillman	George	Edgefield	SC	Lawyer		
Tompkins	W.	Edgefield	SC	Farmer		\$3,500

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Wardlaw	Francis H.	Edgefield	SC	Judge	\$6,000	\$20,000
Aiken	James R.	Fairfield	SC	Bank	\$8,000	\$71,725
DuBose	Theodore	Fairfield	SC	Planter		
Nelson	S.W.	Fairfield	SC	Planter	\$47,000	\$16,695
Robertson	David G.	Fairfield	SC	Planter	\$2,100	\$24,000
Robertson	W.W.	Fairfield	SC	Overseer		
Woodward	Thomas W.	Fairfield	SC	Planter	\$16,800	\$84,000
Alston	Charles, Jr.	Georgetown	SC	Planter	\$26,000	\$19,000
Bailey	J.R.	Georgetown	SC	Physician	\$3,500	\$1,600
MaGill	William	Georgetown	SC	Physician	\$70,000	\$100,000
McCants	James C.	Georgetown	SC	Overseer		\$15,000
Middleton	John I.	Georgetown	SC	Planter	\$110,000	
Parker	Francis S.	Georgetown	SC	Physician	\$125,000	\$130,000
Ward	Mayham	Georgetown	SC	Planter		\$3,000
Ward	Joshua	Georgetown	SC	Planter	\$1,200	\$20,000
Weston	Francis	Georgetown	SC	Planter	\$90,000	\$130,000
Wilson	Benjamin H.	Georgetown	SC	Lawyer	\$11,000	\$30,000
Fridley	Edward J.	Greenville	SC	Stone Mason		
Norman	James H.	Horry	SC	Physician		
Boykin	L.W.	Kershaw	SC	Planter	\$5,400	\$24,067
Boykin	Burwell	Kershaw	SC	Planter	\$75,000	\$180,000
Chesnut	James, Jr.	Kershaw	SC	Planter	\$71,000	\$95,500
Cook	B.	Kershaw	SC	Planter	\$15,000	\$60,000
Depass	H.L.	Kershaw	SC	Lawyer	\$2,000	\$13,000
Dunlop	James	Kershaw	SC	Merchant	\$50,000	\$245,000
Gilbert	J.E.	Kershaw	SC			
Johnson	R.B.	Kershaw	SC	Physician	\$10,000	\$15,000
Jones	Seaton	Kershaw	SC	Planter	\$10,000	\$27,000
Kennedy	John D.	Kershaw	SC	Law Student	\$16,500	\$335,000
Mickle	J.B.	Kershaw	SC	Planter	\$12,000	\$70,000
Patterson	Lewis	Kershaw	SC	Planter	\$75,000	\$300,000
Perkins	Benjamin	Kershaw	SC	Planter	\$27,000	\$75,000
Shannon	William M.	Kershaw	SC	Lawyer	\$10,000	\$35,000

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Shannon	T. E.	Kershaw	SC	Planter	\$15,000	\$75,000
Taylor	W.R.	Kershaw	SC		\$3,000	\$26,350
Canton	J.K.	Lancaster	SC	Planter	\$36,170	\$55,000
Anderson	George	Laurens	SC	Farmer	\$26,060	\$52,583
Brown	C.B.	Marion	SC	Farmer	\$6,000	\$10,000
Christzberg	B.E.	Marion	SC			
Evans	Nathan G.	Marion	SC	Farmer	\$50,000	\$60,000
Gibson	Samuel	Marion	SC	Planter	\$100,000	\$200,000
Gibson	Jesse	Marion	SC	Farmer		
Godbold	Thomas W.	Marion	SC	Merchant	\$2,000	\$35,000
Graham	Robert F.	Marion	SC	Lawyer	\$4,500	\$15,000
McIntyre	R.C.	Marion	SC	Planter	\$4,000	\$40,000
McRae	John	Marion	SC	Farmer	\$1,600	\$2,500
Tennant	J.K.N.	Marion	SC	Book Keeper		\$600
Caldwell	Joseph	Newberry	SC	Farmer	\$40,000	\$139,600
Lyler	John V.	Newberry	SC	Farmer	\$12,700	\$30,000
Bain	J.C.	Orangeburg	SC			
Elliott	Thomas A.	Orangeburg	SC	Physician	\$3,500	\$4,000
Glover	G.W.	Orangeburg	SC	Judge	\$26,000	\$32,000
Keith	Jacob G.	Orangeburg	SC	Farmer	\$25,000	\$65,000
Legaine	J.S.	Orangeburg	SC			
Whaley	Thomas	Orangeburg	SC	Lawyer	\$30,000	\$100,000
Johnson	L.B.	Pickens	SC	Physician	\$15,000	\$7,405
Dozier	L.	Prince George	SC	Merchant		\$2,000
Geiger	William P.	Richland	SC	Physician	\$8,850	\$6,250
Goodwyn	Robert H.	Richland	SC	Bank	\$8,000	\$10,000
Reynolds	James L.	Richland	SC	Professor		\$8,000
Taylor	Alexander R.	Richland	SC	Farmer	\$12,000	\$50,000
Walker	William W.	Richland	SC	Tailor	\$4,000	\$1,000
Wharley	Ephraim M.	St. John's	SC			
Blanding	James D.	Sumter	SC	Lawyer	\$11,300	\$44,500
Fraser	Thomas	Sumter	SC	Lawyer	\$13,500	\$8,000
Hanks	Louis B.	Sumter	SC	Merchant	\$18,000	\$100,000

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Haynesworth	Joseph C.	Sumter	SC	Physician		
Moses	Franklin J.	Sumter	SC	Lawyer	\$55,000	\$110,000
Gist	James	Union	SC	Farmer	\$4,000	\$18,000
Lowry	William R.	York	SC	Farmer		
Wilson	W.B.	York	SC	Lawyer	\$22,000	\$34,100
Stanton	Joseph B.		TN			
Chance	S.J.	Anderson	TN			
Delong	E.	Anderson	TN			
Jackson	J.R.	Anderson	TN			
Patterson	W.	Anderson	TN	Farmer	\$800	\$900
Saunders	C.P.	Anderson	TN			
Donelson	Samuel	Blount	TN	Farmer	\$3,000	\$2,000
Adams	Adam G.	Davidson	TN	Merchant	\$40,000	\$65,000
Allison	Alexander	Davidson	TN	Merchant	\$45,000	\$100,000
Berry	William W.	Davidson	TN	Druggist	\$100,000	\$565,250
Brennan	John M.	Davidson	TN			
Brown	Aaron V.	Davidson	TN	Politician		
Burch	John C.	Davidson	TN	Editor		
Caldwell	Thomas	Davidson	TN			
Callender	John H.	Davidson	TN	Physician	\$20,000	\$2,000
Cheatham	Felix R.	Davidson	TN	Clerk	\$60,000	\$20,000
Cockrill	Benjamin	Davidson	TN			
Cockrill	James R.	Davidson	TN	Farmer	\$63,600	\$22,000
Craddock	W.C.	Davidson	TN			
Douglass	Byrd	Davidson	TN	Merchant	\$87,500	\$159,700
Dupree	Cornelius	Davidson	TN	Druggist		
East	Edward H.	Davidson	TN	Lawyer	\$3,000	\$3,000
Ewing	John H.	Davidson	TN	Druggist	\$41,000	\$51,165
Fall	Alexander	Davidson	TN	Insurance	\$60,000	\$124,900
Harding	William G.	Davidson	TN	Farmer	\$275,000	\$130,500
Harrison	Horace H.	Davidson	TN	Inspector of Boats		
Hayes	Henry M.	Davidson	TN	Farmer	\$180,000	\$24,000
Hillman	Daniel H.	Davidson	TN	Iron, Charcoal		

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Howell	Morton B.	Davidson	TN			
Hummer	Charles W.	Davidson	TN	Merchant		
Johnson	C.	Davidson	TN	Farmer	\$8,350	\$14,200
Lanier	Buchanan H.	Davidson	TN	Merchant		\$200
Malone	Thomas H.	Davidson	TN	Lawyer	\$4,000	\$5,000
McNairy	R.C.	Davidson	TN	Merchant	\$125,000	\$25,000
Nash	Joseph	Davidson	TN	Agent		
Nichol	Phillip L.	Davidson	TN	Clerk	\$9,000	\$1,000
Parham	R.S.	Davidson	TN	Farmer		
Porter	Alex M.	Davidson	TN	Railroad	\$20,000	\$7,000
Riva	Alexander	Davidson	TN	Merchant		\$3,000
Ross	Horace C.	Davidson	TN	Student		
Saunders	Thomas G.	Davidson	TN	Negro Dealer	\$3,500	\$5,000
Sheppard	W.B.	Davidson	TN	Merchant		\$3,000
Smith	J.R.P.	Davidson	TN	Clerk		
Stevenson	Vernon K.	Davidson	TN	President of Railroad	\$597,000	\$140,000
Thompson	R.H.	Davidson	TN	Physician		
Wade	William J.	Davidson	TN			
Woods	James	Davidson	TN	Iron Merchant	\$120,000	\$360,000
Yeatman	Henry C.	Davidson	TN	Iron Dealer	\$60,000	\$70,000
Burton	William	Fayette	TN	Clerk	\$2,900	
Cannon	William J.	Fayette	TN	Physician		
Cannon	H.J.	Fayette	TN	Farmer		
Chunn	William N.	Fayette	TN	Farmer	\$2,000	\$7,800
Degroffinrew	Henry	Fayette	TN	Farmer	\$1,560	
Donnell	M.	Fayette	TN			
Dortch	W.B.	Fayette	TN	Lawyer	\$4,840	\$42,000
Dowdy	William P.	Fayette	TN	Farmer	\$6,000	\$44,590
Goodall	J.D.	Fayette	TN	Lawyer		
Huchins	Gaston	Fayette	TN			
Hutchins	Gaston	Fayette	TN			
Mosley	J.R.	Fayette	TN	Farmer	\$74,000	\$79,000
Robertson	W.H.	Fayette	TN	Clerk		

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Taylor	Samuel C.	Fayette	TN	Farmer	\$2,000	\$3,000
Wilkinson	Theodore	Fayette	TN			
Casline	E.	Franklin	TN			
Evans	H.	Franklin	TN			
Lacy	J.	Franklin	TN			
Oliver	John	Franklin	TN	Farmer	\$11,940	\$12,000
Rutledge	Arthur M.	Franklin	TN	Farmer	\$105,000	\$35,000
Miller	Austin	Hardeman	TN	Farmer	\$200,000	\$110,000
Peters	George B.	Hardeman	TN	Physician	\$132,000	\$80,000
Bend	William	Haywood	TN	Farmer	\$7,420	\$23,000
Bradford	Hiram S.	Haywood	TN	Farmer	\$49,000	\$72,775
Caldwell	J.S.W.	Haywood	TN	Farmer	\$12,000	\$30,000
Davy	Edward	Haywood	TN	Physician	\$30,000	\$63,000
Farrow	John J.	Haywood	TN	Merchant	\$350	\$1,000
Haywood	James G.	Haywood	TN	Physician	\$4,890	\$14,500
Klyce	A.J.	Haywood	TN	Mechanic/Farmer	\$35,360	\$38,000
Rogers	James A.	Haywood	TN	Farmer	\$35,000	\$55,000
Sheppard	Yancey	Haywood	TN			
Sheppard	Thomas	Haywood	TN	Farmer	\$88,000	\$110,000
Sturdevant	E.C.	Haywood	TN	Farmer	\$11,000	\$15,000
Talliaferro	Lyne S.	Haywood	TN	Farmer	\$12,000	\$18,600
Taylor	John A.	Haywood	TN	Farmer	\$24,000	\$64,000
Whitelaw	H.O.	Haywood	TN	Merchant	\$15,000	\$40,000
Wood	James P.	Haywood	TN	Railroad	\$12,000	\$12,000
Cheek	M.C.	Henry	TN	Merchant	\$3,500	\$4,000
Coleman	L.L.	Knox	TN	Physician		\$150
Chase	William	Lauderdale	TN	Teacher		\$1,500
Gains	R.H.	Lauderdale	TN	Farmer		
Hamilton	James M.	Lawerence	TN	Physician	\$1,000	\$1,000
Steadman	Enoch	Lincoln	TN	Farmer		\$2,000
Brown	John S.	Madison	TN			
Brown	Milton	Madison	TN	Lawyer	\$154,200	\$150,000
Bullock	Micagah	Madison	TN	Lawyer		

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Caruthers	James P.	Madison	TN	Gentleman	\$100,000	\$15,000
Caruthers	William A.	Madison	TN	Lawyer	\$18,000	
Clark	Thomas H.	Madison	TN	Clerk	\$10,800	\$1,200
De Berry	Allen B.	Madison	TN	Planter		
Elrod	James	Madison	TN	Gentleman	\$3,500	\$21,500
Fenner	T.H.	Madison	TN	Farmer	\$1,500	\$6,000
Freeman	S.C.	Madison	TN			
Gamewell	Thomas M.	Madison	TN	Clerk	\$15,000	\$10,000
Greer	John A.	Madison	TN			
Hayes	Stokely D.	Madison	TN			
Hays	Rirchard J.	Madison	TN	Lawyer	\$11,000	\$14,500
Heron	John	Madison	TN	Farmer	\$11,000	\$500
Hunt	G.C.	Madison	TN	Farmer		\$3,000
Lancaster	Samuel	Madison	TN	Merchant	\$30,000	\$35,000
Lyon	Samuel W.	Madison	TN			
Lyons	James W.	Madison	TN	Planter	\$60,000	\$80,000
Mason	Joseph D.	Madison	TN	Physician	\$25,000	\$4,700
McCorry	Henry W.	Madison	TN	Planter	\$150,000	\$60,000
McCutchen	James T.	Madison	TN			
Morrill	J.M.	Madison	TN	Lawyer		
Steward	Joseph C.	Madison	TN	Physician	\$4,500	\$1,500
Totten	Archibald	Madison	TN	Lawyer	\$103,000	\$100,000
Williams	J.J.	Madison	TN	Engineer	\$6,000	\$500
Williams	A.	Madison	TN			
Elder	Joshua	Montgomery	TN	Bill & Note Broker	\$102,180	\$75,000
Gilmer	John	Montgomery	TN	Farmer	\$18,000	\$29,500
Prince	J.H.	Rhea	TN			
Rutgers	S.H.	Rhea	TN			
Ridley	James A.	Rutherford	TN	Physician	\$33,000	
Apperson	E.M.	Shelby	TN	Commission Merchant	\$400,000	\$100,000
Hunt	William	Shelby	TN	Cotton Broker		\$500
Roseborough	Samuel	Shelby	TN	Farmer	\$63,800	\$50,000
Smith	Robert	Shelby	TN		\$30,000	\$12,000

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Tate	Samuel	Shelby	TN	Railroad	\$58,000	\$90,500
Rhea	Samuel	Sullivan	TN	Merchant	\$16,500	\$50,000
Smith	Baxter	Sumner	TN	Lawyer	\$4,500	\$5,000
Walton	William B.	Sumner	TN			
Taylor	Edward T.	Tipton	TN	Agent	\$16,000	\$13,840
Anderson	Paulding H.	Wilson	TN	Farmer	\$59,350	\$82,185
McFarland	James P.	Wilson	TN	Physician	\$85,000	\$22,000
Smith	J.L.	Bexar	TX	Stone Mason		
Perry	Stephen S.	Brazoria	TX			
Shaffer	R.	Colorado	TX	Physician		\$2,000
Crundiff	W.H.	Crockett	TX			
Stewart	W. A.	Crockett	TX			
Buford	N.	Dallas	TX			
Gold	W. A.	Dallas	TX	Merchant	\$20,860	\$10,020
Law	G.W.	Dallas	TX	Clerk	\$3,485	\$3,485
Nicholson	E.P.	Dallas	TX	Lawyer	\$12,000	\$10,150
Pryor	Samuel B.	Dallas	TX	Physician	\$4,258	\$4,970
Shafer	Stephen	Dallas	TX	Merchant		\$400
Shepherd	Harvey O.	Dallas	TX	Farmer	\$1,500	\$6,150
Sherwood	Thomas	Dallas	TX			
Shick	A.	Dallas	TX			
Smith	James A.	Dallas	TX	Farmer	\$15,800	\$15,565
Hunt	E.P.	Galveston	TX	Insurance	\$35,000	\$4,000
James	A.F.	Galveston	TX	Real Estate Agent	\$150,000	\$10,000
Waters	J.D.	Galveston	TX	Stevedore	\$7,000	\$1,200
Coleman	George	Gonzales	TX	Physician	\$1,600	\$3,800
Davidson	A.	Gonzales	TX	Merchant	\$6,400	\$11,200
Denman	G.J.	Gonzales	TX	Farmer	\$20,000	\$25,000
Harrison	Charles	Gonzales	TX	Farmer	\$2,800	\$18,000
Lucknose	Dr. G.	Gonzales	TX			
McNeil	J.A.	Gonzales	TX	Farmer	\$5,000	\$20,000
Monroe	James	Gonzales	TX			
Mooney	John	Gonzales	TX	Planter	\$20,280	\$44,600

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Pelgram	Thomas J.	Gonzales	TX	Broker	\$12,000	\$13,000
Walker	E.M.	Gonzales	TX	Physician	\$3,500	\$3,500
Walker	Thomas	Gonzales	TX	Merchant	\$12,000	\$6,000
Johnson	Thomas D.	Guadalupe	TX	Farmer	\$40,000	\$11,050
Burke	James	Harris	TX	Merchant	\$1,000	\$1,000
Burns	W.	Harris	TX			
Crump	William E.	Harris	TX			
Dickinson	J.	Harris	TX	Merchant	\$150,000	\$25,000
Groesbeck	Abraham	Harris	TX	President of Railroad	\$105,000	\$54,000
Lubbuck	T.S.	Harris	TX	Gentleman	\$15,000	\$25,000
McNeill	S.	Harris	TX			
Thomas	J.L.	Kaufman	TX	Lawyer	\$2,000	\$100
Forbes	R.M.	Lavaca	TX	Merchant	\$10,000	
Ryan	James	Lavaca	TX	Farmer	\$1,250	
Tompkins	A.N.B.	Liberty	TX	District Surveyor	\$2,000	\$600
Sears	J.L.	McLennan	TX	Merchant	\$3,500	\$8,420
Graham	John G.	Rusk	TX	Farmer	\$15,000	\$20,250
Henderson	W.S.	Rusk	TX			
McClarty	John	Rusk	TX	Lawyer	\$1,500	\$2,500
Chambers	J.C.	Titus	TX	Merchant	\$8,600	\$19,595
Loundes	M.	Travis	TX			
Armstrong	John	Washington	TX	Farmer	\$2,500	\$5,000
Green	S.	Washington	TX			
Alexander	M.T.	Wharton	TX	Planter	\$15,000	\$10,000
Beeks	William L.	Wharton	TX	Stock Raiser	\$1,240	
Caldwell	R.	Wharton	TX			
Clark	J.C.	Wharton	TX	Planter	\$132,145	\$104,715
Croom	Jesse	Wharton	TX			
Cureton	M.L.	Wharton	TX	Planter		\$25,000
Duke	Dr. H.	Wharton	TX			
Foster	John	Wharton	TX	Collector		\$1,200
Frazier	G.W.	Wharton	TX			
George	David	Wharton	TX	Planter	\$8,000	\$2,000

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Haudley	A.E.	Wharton	TX			
Moore	R.D.	Wharton	TX	Physician	\$5,000	\$10,000
Myers	J.O.	Wharton	TX	Planter	\$50,000	\$40,000
Sanford	T.G.	Wharton	TX			
Spivey	Jethro	Wharton	TX	Farmer	\$1,554	
Stith	M.G.	Wharton	TX	Planter		
Tilley	John	Wharton	TX			
Wynn	W.L.	Wharton	TX	Farmer	\$2,000	\$3,500
Garrett	Alexander	Albemarle	VA	Estate	\$29,000	\$25,000
Holmes	George F.	Albemarle	VA	Professor	\$15,000	\$16,000
Michie	Thomas J.	Augusta	VA	Lawyer	\$121,000	\$20,000
Faulkner	Charles J.	Berkeley	VA	Diplomat	\$100,000	\$150,000
Jones	J. Ravenscroft	Brunswick	VA	Farmer		\$100
Davis Jr.	Micajah	Campbell	VA		\$10,450	
Anderson	Thomas B.	Caroline	VA	Physician	\$18,000	\$46,230
Chandler	Thomas T.	Caroline	VA	Farmer	\$6,000	\$12,000
Dejarnette	John H.	Caroline	VA	Farmer	\$76,000	\$67,500
Fitzhugh	George	Caroline	VA	Author	\$3,000	\$18,000
Scott	Francis	Caroline	VA	Lawyer	\$31,500	\$39,000
Scott	Thomas L.	Caroline	VA	Physician	\$5,000	\$14,500
Cox	James H.	Chesterfield	VA	Collier	\$25,000	\$126,800
Peek	Thomas C.	Elizabeth City	VA	None	\$8,900	\$7,500
Vinson	Stokely	Fairfax	VA			
Forbes	John M.	Fauquier	VA	Lawyer	\$18,000	\$27,470
Scott	John, Sr.	Fauquier	VA	Capt. of "Black-Horses"	\$30,900	\$10,470
Smith	William	Fauquier	VA	Congress	\$19,200	\$9,155
Taylor	Fielding L.	Gloucester	VA	Farmer	\$30,000	\$70,000
Bassett	George W.	Hanover	VA	Farmer	\$139,830	\$88,729
Tucker	St. George	Hanover	VA	Lawyer	\$7,000	\$10,000
Anderson	Joseph R.	Henrico	VA	Iron Manufacturing	\$480,000	\$275,000
Bacon	John L.	Henrico	VA	Commission Merchant	\$30,000	\$71,000
Barksdale	George A.	Henrico	VA	Merchant	\$100,000	\$5,000
Baskervill	Henry E.	Henrico	VA	Commission Merchant	\$10,000	\$219,000

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Beale	James	Henrico	VA	Physician	\$20,000	\$6,000
Bell	William	Henrico	VA			
Brooke	Henry L.	Henrico	VA	Lawyer		
Brummel	Joseph	Henrico	VA	Manufacturer	\$100,000	\$121,000
Butler	Patrick H.	Henrico	VA			
Cabell	Henry C.	Henrico	VA	Lawyer	\$195,000	\$12,000
Caskie	John S.	Henrico	VA	Lawyer	\$2,500	\$15,000
Cocke	William	Henrico	VA	Lawyer		\$3,230
Crenshaw	Lewis D.	Henrico	VA	Merchant	\$400,000	\$150,000
Crump	William W.	Henrico	VA	Lawyer	\$85,600	\$37,000
Dill	Adolph	Henrico	VA	Tobacco Manufacturing		
Dimmock	Charles H.	Henrico	VA			
Downey	Mark	Henrico	VA	Merchant		
Fry	Hugh W.	Henrico	VA	Merchant	\$87,500	\$58,000
Gibson	J.	Henrico	VA	Tanner		
Gilmer	John H.	Henrico	VA	Lawyer	\$70,000	\$3,500
Goddin	Wellington	Henrico	VA	Real Estate Agent		
Haxall	Richard B.	Henrico	VA	Merchant		
Johnson	Marmaduke	Henrico	VA			
Kent	Horace L.	Henrico	VA	Merchant	\$85,000	\$140,000
Lancaster	John A.	Henrico	VA	Commission Merchant		\$15,500
Lyons	James T.	Henrico	VA	Lawyer	\$100,000	\$50,000
Martin	Nathaniel	Henrico	VA			
Mason	J.B.	Henrico	VA	Merchant		\$500
Mayo	Robert	Henrico	VA	Merchant		
McFarland	William	Henrico	VA	President of Bank	\$90,000	\$90,000
Morton	John B.	Henrico	VA	Bank		
Myers	Samuel	Henrico	VA	Merchant		\$1,000
Patton	John M.	Henrico	VA	Lawyer		
Quarles	W.R.	Henrico	VA	Merchant		
Randolph	John W.	Henrico	VA	Bookseller/Bookbinder	\$15,000	\$30,000
Robinson	Edwin	Henrico	VA	President of Railroad	\$100,000	\$10,000
Royal	John M.	Henrico	VA	Merchant		

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Sheppard	John M.	Henrico	VA	Commission Merchant	\$30,000	\$56,000
Snell	W.H.	Henrico	VA			
Spotts	John J.	Henrico	VA	Merchant		
Taylor	Samuel	Henrico	VA			
Thomas, Jr.	James	Henrico	VA	Merchant	\$250,000	\$100,000
Warwick	William	Henrico	VA	Merchant		
Warwick	Charles D.	Henrico	VA	Merchant		
Warwick	Abraham	Henrico	VA	Merchant	\$400,000	\$50,000
Watkins	J.B.	Henrico	VA	Merchant	\$5,000	\$20,000
Wilson	James H.	Henrico	VA	Tobacco Inspector		
Womble	John E.	Henrico	VA	Commission Merchant	\$25,000	\$20,000
Wortham	Charles T.	Henrico	VA	Commission Merchant	\$20,000	\$40,000
Wedder	G.C.	Independent	VA			
Eiechleberger	George W.	Jefferson	VA	Farmer	\$27,600	\$13,000
Lucas	William	Jefferson	VA	Planter	\$126,000	\$12,100
Lynch	George N.	Jefferson	VA	Planter	\$8,550	\$2,000
Miller	Robert	Jefferson	VA			
Morgan	Robert	Jefferson	VA	Overseer		
Morgan	Richard	Jefferson	VA	Farm Laborer		
Ott	Thomas M.	Jefferson	VA	Merchant		\$750
Ott	John W.	Jefferson	VA	Farmer	\$5,000	\$1,100
Renner	William P.	Jefferson	VA	Physician	\$7,000	\$5,000
Rockingbaugh	W.	Jefferson	VA	Blacksmith	\$600	\$300
Rockingbaugh	Thomas	Jefferson	VA	Merchant		\$750
Schreak	G.	Jefferson	VA	Railroad		\$40
Shafer	William	Jefferson	VA	Planter	\$10,000	\$8,000
Strider	John	Jefferson	VA	Physician	\$20,000	\$7,000
Washington	Lewis W.	Jefferson	VA	Planter	\$40,000	\$20,000
Puryear	R.A.	Mecklenburg	VA	Farmer	\$16,000	\$42,269
Rowland	C.H.	Norfolk	VA	Merchant	\$27,000	\$15,000
Irby	Richard	Nottoway	VA	Farmer	\$30,000	\$43,000
Fowlkes	J.W.	Pillsylvania	VA			
Byrd	W.W.	Pocahontas	VA	Clerk		

Last Name	First Name	County	State	Occupation	Real Estate	Personal Estate
Blanton	Charles	Prince Edward	VA	Merchant		\$3,000
Brown	Stephen D.	Prince Edward	VA	Farmer	\$5,000	\$4,500
McNutt	James M.	Prince Edward	VA	Farmer	\$18,000	\$30,000
Thackston	W.W.	Prince Edward	VA	Dentist	\$5,000	\$46,400
Collier	Robert R.	Prince George	VA	Lawyer	\$22,000	\$48,000
Cuthbert	James E.	Prince George	VA	Bank	\$3,000	\$1,500
Meade	R.W.	Prince George	VA	Farmer	\$1,000	\$15,000
Osborne	Nathaniel M.	Prince George	VA	Farmer	\$30,000	\$100,000
Peebles	Lemuel	Prince George	VA	Merchant		\$4,000
Thompson	R.S.	Prince George	VA	Merchant	\$5,000	\$10,000
Allen	L.S.	Ritchie	VA	Merchant	\$763	\$1,700
Lee	Robert E.	Rockbridge	VA	U.S. Army	\$80,000	
Wilson	Samuel M.	Rockbridge	VA	Farmer	\$6,000	\$6,641
Gilmore	James H.	Smyth	VA	Lawyer	\$7,000	\$3,000
Tucker	E.W.	Taylor	VA			
Boyd	Thomas	Wythe	VA	Hotel Keeper	\$100,000	\$7,250

Appendix 2
Tables

Table 1: 1845 Memphis Commercial Convention: Delegates by State and Occupation

State	Delegates	Occupation			
		Agriculture	Mercantile	Professional	Unknown
Alabama	22	7	2	10	3
Arkansas	20	9	2	4	5
Illinois	21	0	6	9	6
Indiana	7	1	2	3	1
Iowa	4	0	2	0	2
Kentucky	22	4	4	6	8
Louisiana	17	2	2	7	6
Mississippi	178	80	19	37	42
Missouri	36	5	7	8	16
North Carolina	1	1	0	0	0
Ohio	14	0	2	3	9
Pennsylvania	3	0	1	2	0
South Carolina	8	1	3	3	1
Tennessee	197	76	24	59	40
Texas	3	0	0	1	2
Virginia	5	1	1	3	0
Total	558	187	77	155	141

Note: Of the 558 delegates listed as attending the South-Western Convention in 1845, I found 460 names in the 1850 Federal Census. Missing delegates have been included in the “unknown” column, in addition to those found but with unlisted occupations. *Journal of the Proceedings of the South-Western Convention, Began and Held at the City of Memphis, on the 12th November, 1845* (Memphis: 1845); United States Census Office, *Seventh Census of the United States: 1850*. (Washington, D.C., 1850).

Table 2: Distribution of Known Subscribers, By State and Occupation

State	Total Readers	Agricultural	Commercial	Professional	Industrial	Other	Unlisted
Alabama	182	66	30	58	10	11	8
Arkansas	47	8	8	14	1	6	11
Florida	55	15	8	10	1	3	18
Georgia	160	24	78	17	9	7	27
Kentucky	37	2	15	2	2	1	15
Louisiana	128	27	51	15	3	7	25
Maryland	37	0	10	2	4	3	18
Mississippi	119	48	15	25	0	12	14
Missouri	74	1	36	7	7	1	23
North Carolina	24	7	5	3	0	0	10
South Carolina	177	56	29	41	7	15	30
Tennessee	143	35	36	26	8	9	29
Texas	71	18	12	9	2	5	25
Virginia	117	18	35	20	9	10	23
Other	33	1	32	0	0	0	0
Total	1,404	326 (23%)	400 (29%)	249 (18%)	63 (4.5%)	90 (6.4%)	276 (20%)

Note: United States Census Office, *Seventh Census of the United States: 1860*. (Washington, D.C., 1862).

Table 3: Subject of Articles in *De Bow's Review*, 1846—1866

Year	Education	Transportation	Promotional	Commerce	Agriculture	Industry	Slavery	Sectionalism
1846	1	1	12	16	12	5	1	0
1847	5	10	33	40	25	6	4	0
1848	2	3	8	10	20	12	1	0
1849	1	10	14	8	10	6	8	0
1850	0	7	22	3	5	14	12	0
1851	0	12	36	9	2	5	9	0
1852	1	7	15	12	8	6	2	0
1853	0	14	32	21	11	3	7	0
1854	4	25	20	14	16	12	8	4
1855	33	29	32	26	29	56	26	5
1856	12	29	18	20	22	13	23	14
1857	13	18	22	19	23	16	27	12
1858	2	23	29	21	30	22	22	18
1859	17	38	52	30	31	26	24	25
1860	4	39	26	28	24	16	20	41
1861	2	1	3	7	3	4	2	11
1866	9	23	36	39	51	30	25	0

Note: The topics of individual articles were collected from the monthly table of contents of *De Bow's Review*. Promotional articles often crossed over into other subject categories yet focused primarily on the endorsement or sponsorship of individual projects, towns and cities, and ideas. Many of these promotional articles were written by local writers who hoped to increase their city or town's public profile.

Table 4: Comparative Slaveholding Levels, 1860

Group	0 Slaves	1—10 Slaves	11—19 Slaves	20—49 Slaves	50—99 Slaves	100+ Slaves
All Southern Slaveholders	75%	72%	16%	9%	2%	1%
Commercial Convention Delegates	N/A	25%	17%	19%	22%	17%
Confederate Congressmen	N/A	28%	20%	23%	13%	16%
<i>De Bow's Review</i> Readership	6%	29%	11%	26%	17%	16%

Note: Johnson, *The Men and the Vision of the Southern Commercial Conventions, 1845—1871*, 56; Composite Census Records, 1850—1860; John Niven, *The Coming of the Civil War, 1837—1860* (Arlington Heights: Harlan Davidson, Inc., 1990), 34.

Table 5: Investment Patterns of Known Readers in Select Cities and Towns, 1840—1860

City/Town	States	# of Readers	Railroads	Education ¹	Manufacturing	Banks	Civic ²
Nashville	TN	10	7	5	4	3	3
Jackson	TN	12	10	5	0	4	4
Memphis	TN	7	6	2	2	6	4
Montgomery	AL	14	13	0	3	5	7
Eutaw	AL	7	6	0	0	0	1
Selma	AL	5	3	0	3	2	1
Mobile	AL	4	4	0	1	1	1
Total		59	49	12	13	21	21

Note: Composite Census Records, 1850—1860; *Acts of Alabama, 1830—1860*; *Acts of Tennessee, 1796—1850*. Not every identified reader in each city had a documented investment record. For example, although Nashville had fifty overall readers, investment records exist for only ten individuals. Although individual *Review* readers may have invested in more than one project per category, their investment in a particular category counts once.

¹ Educational projects included public high schools, private academies, and colleges and universities.

² Civic projects included public projects such as city gaslights, public art, and urban improvements that benefited entire communities.

Table 6: Population Growth in Southern Cities and Towns, 1850—1860

City	State	1850	1860	+/-%
Augusta	GA	11,753	12,493	+6.3%
Baltimore	MD	169,054	212,418	+25.6%
Charleston	SC	42,985	40,578	-5.6%
Mobile	AL	20,515	29,258	+42.0%
Montgomery	AL	4,935	8,843	+79.1%
Memphis	TN	8,839	22,623	+155.9%
Nashville	TN	10,478	16,988	+62.1%
New Orleans	LA	116,375	168,675	+44.9%
Natchez	MS	4,434	6,612	+49.1%
Petersburg	VA	14,010	18,266	+30.3%
Richmond	VA	27,570	37,910	+37.5%
Savannah	GA	15,312	22,292	+45.5%
Vicksburg	MS	3,678	4,591	+24.8%
Total		437,196	601,547	+37.6%

Note: Joseph C. G. Kennedy, *Preliminary Report on the Eighth Census, 1860* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1862), 242—44.

Table 7: Distribution of *Review* Readers in Urban Centers

City	State	Known Readers
New Orleans	LA	69
Charleston	SC	63
Richmond	VA	54
Nashville	TN	50
Savannah	GA	42
Tallahassee	FL	41
Baltimore	MD	37
Augusta	GA	34
Louisville	KY	33
Montgomery	AL	33
Jacksonport	AR	26
Jackson	TN	25
Macon	GA	20
Alexandria	LA	19
Jackson	MS	19
Warton	TX	17
Selma	AL	17
Atlanta	GA	16
Baton Rouge	LA	16
Camden	SC	16
Natchez	MS	15
Vicksburg	MS	15
Georgetown	SC	13
Halltown	VA	13
Petersburg	VA	13
Rome	GA	13
Somerville	TN	12
Wilmington	NC	11
Cahaba	AL	11
Eutaw	AL	10
Mobile	AL	10

Note: Composite Census Records, 1850—1860; United States Census Office, *Seventh Census of the United States, 1860* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1862).

Table 8: Value of Manufactured Goods in the Southern States, 1850—1860

Industry	1850	1860	Regional Growth %	National Growth %
Agricultural Implements	\$784,452	\$1,582,483	101.7%	160.1%
Steam Engines	\$833,284	\$4,060,803	387.3%	68.2%
Iron Founding	\$1,587,930	\$2,504,362	57.7%	42.0%
Sawed Lumber	\$8,846,476	\$17,941,162	102.3%	63.9%
Flour & Meal	\$16,581,817	\$30,767,457	85.5%	64.2%
Cotton Goods	\$5,665,362	\$7,172,293	26.6%	75.7%
Woolen Goods	\$1,108,811	\$2,303,303	107.7%	N/A
Leather	\$3,577,599	\$4,074,406	13.8%	66.9%
Boots & Shoes	\$1,491,944	\$2,729,327	80.3%	67.8%
Soap & Candles	\$394,778	\$489,913	24.0%	66.0%

Note: Joseph C. G. Kennedy, *Preliminary Report of the Eighth Census, 1860* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1862), 169—85.

Table 9: Investment Patterns of Individual Subscribers in Alabama and Tennessee, 1830—1860

Name	State	Town	Railroad	Turnpike/ Plank Road	College/ University	Factory/ Mining	Civic	Bank/ Insurance
Francis Gilmer, Jr.	AL	Montgomery	2	1	0	0	1	1
Charles Pollard	AL	Montgomery	4	1	0	0	1	2
Joseph H. Winter	AL	Montgomery	0	3	0	2	1	1
John H. Murphy	AL	Montgomery	2	1	0	0	1	0
Charles Crommelin	AL	Montgomery	2	2	0	0	1	0
Thomas H. Watts	AL	Montgomery	3	0	0	1	0	0
William H. Taylor	AL	Montgomery	1	1	0	0	1	1
Bolling Hall, Jr.	AL	Prattville	3	0	0	0	0	1
Daniel Pratt	AL	Prattville	2	1	0	2	1	2
John W. Lapsley	AL	Selma	4	1	0	4	1	1
Thornton Goldsby	AL	Selma	6	1	0	0	0	0
Robert Jemison, Jr.	AL	Talladega	1	1	0	3	1	0
George Shortridge	AL	Montevallo	3	0	0	2	0	0
James L. Price	AL	Perry County	6	2	0	0	0	0
David B. Scott	AL	Scottsville	1	0	0	2	0	0
Vernon K. Stevenson	TN	Nashville	3	1	1	1	1	1
Edward East	TN	Nashville	0	1	1	0	1	1
James Woods	TN	Nashville	0	0	0	1	1	4
Alexander Allison	TN	Nashville	2	0	1	2	0	0
William G. Harding	TN	Nashville	0	3	0	1	1	0
Milton Brown	TN	Jackson	1	0	1	0	1	0
Samuel Lancaster	TN	Jackson	4	3	1	0	0	2
James Elrod	TN	Jackson	4	2	0	0	0	1
Samuel Rhea	TN	Blountsville	3	3	0	0	0	1
Hiram S. Bradford	TN	Brownsville	0	1	3	0	0	1
Joshua Elder	TN	Clarksville	2	1	0	0	0	1
Austin Miller	TN	Bolivar	2	2	0	0	1	1
Paulding Anderson	TN	Lebanon	2	4	1	0	0	1

Note: Composite Census Records, 1850—1860; *Acts of Alabama, 1830—1860*; *Acts of Tennessee, 1796—1850*. Each number represents a separate investment in a public corporation.

Vita

John F. Kvach grew up in Clarksville, Maryland. He graduated from West Virginia University in Morgantown, West Virginia, and graduated with a B.A. and M.A. in history and public history. Kvach obtained his Ph.D. in History from the University of Tennessee at Knoxville in 2008.