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<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>John Caldwell Calhoun</td>
</tr>
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<td>John Laurence Manning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millwood</td>
<td>Wade Hampton II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### North Carolina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plantation</th>
<th>Owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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INTRODUCTION

Impressive Greek Revival mansions found on the upcountry plantations of Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina are a vestige of a bygone era. Yet, in the early part of the nineteenth century, these estates stood as pillars within the community, as did their owners. Although fact sometimes mixes with fiction, compliments of the Reconstruction era “moonlight and magnolias” mythology, the goal of this dissertation is to delve into reality. Increased cotton production and sales in the early nineteenth century, built on the backs of slaves, created a new generation of wealthy and prosperous citizenry in Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina, particularly in the upcountry regions. These planters set the criterion of status for the South and their mansions reflected their positions of power.

Their newfound economic prosperity was reflected in their appropriation of the Greek Revival plantation home which became a mirror of sorts, reflecting the planter himself. The Greek Revival architectural style was not distinct to upcountry Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina, as it existed throughout the entire United States. The design originated and was used in ancient Greece and Rome. It then found a place in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries in Europe. Transported from abroad, this architectural style found its place in Philadelphia, first in the public sector. The Bank of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia, by most accounts, was the initial Greek Revival structure
built in the United States.¹ From this point, this style made its way to the private sector. Successful capitalists built their homes in the Greek Revival architectural style. The imposing pillars which lifted the massive portico, key features of this architectural design, created an image of majesty and might; in essence, power.

Greek Revival made its way from the Philadelphia region and found a home throughout America.² Yet it found a place of distinction in the antebellum South. Wide porticos offered shading from the intensity of the sun. The planter class embraced this architectural style for a variety of reasons. At the most basic level, Greek Revival was functional and practical for the weather, yet still aesthetically appealing. Mark Gelernter asserted in his *A History of American Architecture: Buildings in their Cultural and Technical Context* (2001) that:

> the Greek idea spread to the southern plantation homes where…free-standing colonnades were long employed for climate control in this region. Updating the plantation house in the new style required little more than constructing the columns and entablatures with more accurate Greek proportions…³

Although this architectural design was practical, it was more importantly symbolic. Greek Revival served as a representation of power and of financial means. It

---


became a symbol of the slaveocracy of the nineteenth century, almost in the same manner it was in ancient times. Southern planters embraced this style, but it had added meaning to those in the upcountry. This study will analyze upcountry cotton planters from three of the “traditional” plantation states, Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina, who used Greek Revival as a testament to their social standing, as well as assess how the house, its contents and other possessions defined them as economic, social, and political leaders. In essence, this dissertation explores the roles of these planters, the significance of their building homes in the Greek Revival architectural style and their assessment of property and values. This study focuses on upcountry cotton planters, not low country ones. It also presents why the Greek Revival house was so important to these men. These upcountry planters grew cotton in regions not always considered “cotton” areas and defined their societal positioning by using Greek Revival. These men bound themselves to the legacy of ancient Greece, idolizing its characteristics, ideologies, slavery, and even their version of democracy. This study is about how the Greek Revival house represented these upcountry planters. The house was in fact emblematic of the man and this is an historical examination that has previously not been undertaken.

Since Greek Revival architecture was usually associated with the deep South planters, upcountry cotton planters challenged this classification and used the architectural style as a representation of their often overlooked wealth, status and power. Historical research concerning planters tends to concentrate on those who resided either in the coastal or low country areas. The low country regions of these three states had been filled with planter wealth for generations, money that had been
cultivated particularly from the production of rice, indigo, tobacco and sea-isle cotton. The upcountry regions of Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina prospered in the early years of the nineteenth century, however, from the cultivation of green seed cotton. Cotton helped drive the markets of the nineteenth century and many upcountry planters, like James Henry Hammond, John Caldwell Calhoun and Judge John Harris, were recognized for their service and contribution in politics, even as they were cotton planters. These cotton farmers located their plantations in the upcountry regions in the states in which they resided. They were not absentee planters and built elaborate Greek Revival plantation homes to mark their distinction from the more recognized or noted low country planters which have captured so much of the attention of historians.4

This work focuses on specific upcountry planters, some of whom have been overlooked or perhaps understudied by historians, and examines how these men in Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina embraced the Greek Revival architectural style and used it to document their class, power, and status. In the methodological approach that was taken, each planter had to fit specific criteria: 1) their chief residences were in the upcountry; 2) they grew cotton; 3) their plantation homes were

built in the Greek Revival format. The upcountry cotton planters of Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina were unique, for not only did they cultivate and grow a crop that was certainly a risky undertaking in the upcountry regions of their states, but they all adopted this singular architectural style. Greek Revival defined these planters.

Greek Revival architecture, although used throughout the United States, had particular appeal to many upcountry planters for several reasons. For one, it represented a renewal of the ideals embodied by the ancient Greeks, who firmly adhered to a division of society as well as the need for and use of slavery. Additionally, the upcountry cotton planter of the nineteenth century sought to differentiate himself from the planters of the previous generation, who used the Federal style of architecture. With the prosperity generated from cotton cultivation, the upcountry planters of Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina saw in their Greek Revival plantation house a lasting legacy to their power and societal status. Many planters sought to emulate various aspects of the ancient Greek society. Slave ownership and this architectural style were two of the most identifiable.

The warmer climate found in the south presented a longer growing season, allowing the region to acclimate itself to an agrarian-based economy and society. With the tendency towards single staple crops, the plantation system emerged. Once a planter possessed the necessary acreage to operate in a profitable manner, the decision to construct a home on the confines of his property was a tremendous one. Moving the family from the town borders or from the temporary structures in which they resided required great consideration. Locating the place whereupon to build the main house was a deliberate process undertaken with great care. Since the planter would be
secluded from towns and close neighbors while residing in the midst of his holdings, it was essential that the living quarters be accessible to the means of transportation for the benefit and comfort of the inhabitants. Rivers were desired means of demarcation. Not only could the planter and his family easily travel by boat, but also be accessible to transport his goods to the market. In addition to the careful placement of the home so that it was within reach of roads, waterways, or later, near to a rail line, the structure was positioned with respect to the land as well. The main house was frequently constructed atop an embankment enabling the owners to overlook and relish in their possessions.

Many books in the field of architectural study that mention Greek Revival often relegated it to a chapter or a few paragraphs. A few works, however, stood out as among the more revered. One seminal work on this style of architecture is Talbot Hamlin’s *Greek Revival Architecture in America: Being An Account of Important Trends In American Architecture And American Life Prior to the War Between the States* (1944). He proclaimed in his then groundbreaking work that “…the history of Greek Revival architecture in the southern states is a confused story of local influences, of conservatism in taste, and a sudden and late flowering.” Thus at heart, this design

---


7Hamlin, *account*, p. 192.
took on a different connotation to these southerners. They molded an architectural style to conform to their societal needs and beliefs. Though this monograph covers all areas of the United States and its usage in both private and public structures, its reference to the American South is central to the story.\(^8\) Hamlin argues that “…the Greek Revival of the South stood for…the attempt to create a new and American architecture.”\(^9\) In essence, it came to be symbolic of the slave holding South rooted in the very institution of slavery itself.

Another important work is Amelia Peck’s *Period Rooms in The Metropolitan Museum of Art* (1996). She establishes that it was the first time in the United States that there was a “…national style.” Greek Revival was distinct since architects carefully incorporated the research discovered by those excavating historic sites and relied upon their findings to formulate this architectural style.\(^10\)

A revolution in agriculture took place in the late eighteenth/early nineteenth centuries. Interest in harvests like tobacco, rice and indigo remained essential, although some planters were dallying in the potentials of the cotton crop. The transfer to the cultivation of cotton from other crops was a gradual progress. Eli Whitney’s patenting of, furthered by the perfection of, the cotton gin transformed cotton from a secondary to a primary crop.\(^11\) The gin allowed the fiber to be quickly processed,

---


\(^9\)Hamlin, *account*, p. 212.


facilitating a more rapid transit from the fields to the marketplace. Cotton regenerated the economy and pushed the American South into the forefront of world producers and furnishers of this desired good.\textsuperscript{12}

Backed by the illusion of a sense of financial stability emerging from cotton profits and the accompanying benefits of the gin, large property planters in Georgia, South Carolina and even North Carolina began concentrating their efforts on construction on a more grand scale. Planters like Paul C. Cameron, James H. Hammond, and Wade Hampton detailed in their personal letters their desire to build better homes with their greater financial security.\textsuperscript{13} Gone were the days of transient-like edifices. Now the men of great holdings expressed their prosperity through their familial dwellings. To ensure continued profits, they practiced better land rotation and avoided packing up and abandoning their lands in search of virgin areas. Planters prioritized building a strong

\textsuperscript{12}Gavin Wright, The Political Economy of the Cotton South: Households, Markets, and Wealth in the Nineteenth Century (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1978), p. 91. It is claimed by W. B. Seabrook, President of the Agricultural Society (1844) that the first cotton gin used in South Carolina, however, was designed and implemented by Ogden Holme, found in Harry Hammond, “Agriculture in South Carolina,” Harry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{13}To view examples of fluctuating cotton prices, see various \textit{New Orleans Price Current, Commercial Intelligence and Merchants’ Transcript}, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill.; Various letters from the Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, i.e. Kevin Hamilton to Duncan Cameron, 8 January 1836, 11 May 1836, 19 May 1836, and 15 August 1836.; Letter, unknown name to Paul C. Cameron, 22 November 1860.; Bryce, Henry & Walter Information on British Cotton Market sent to James Henry Hammond, Charleston, 30 August 1834, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division, digital collection.; Sidney Crane, Account of Genl. Wade Hampton, 19 January 1833, Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Letter, William P. Brooks to James Henry Hammond, 17 November 1831, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Letter, [?] to Hon. Wade Hampton, 13 March 1832, Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Letter, George F. Platt to David C. Barrow, Col. David C. Barrow Papers, Hargrett Rare Books and Manuscripts Library, University of Georgia Libraries.
foundation for their families and the Greek Revival set the tone for their era, which began around 1820 and ended around the time of the outbreak of the Civil War.\textsuperscript{14}

The planters, aided by their architects, put great consideration into the design, construction and decoration of the big house. Once built, the grand house was to be a legacy, kept within the family for as long as they were able to maintain the property. The home was to be unique and as distinctive as the family who built it. As John B. Irving wrote in the “Sporting Epistle From South Carolina” in 1844 that the plantation house was “…well adapted to the wants of the family for which it was built…” It would commemorate the planter and his posterity.\textsuperscript{15} Carefully designated with a name, the house was more than simply a hereditary piece of property. It was a namesake. The contents of the plantation were to be passed down including the chattel. By maintaining the servitude of individual slaves within the family, a form of patriarchy was promulgated. This type of behavior was commonly found among the states that had


been engaged in the plantation system since their origins.\textsuperscript{16}

There was great meaning behind the plantation house. Those who resided there viewed the main house as the “…heart & brain…” of the plantation community.\textsuperscript{17} With the dwelling serving as a representation of the family’s stature, attention was placed carefully on what the estate relayed to others. The solitude of plantation life permitted planters to reflect upon their ancestry in order to try to emulate the lives of the landed gentry. Familial heritage extending back to the noble lines of European aristocracy were emphasized. In words and deed, as well as in possessions, this lineage was designed to distinguish the planter class’ status.\textsuperscript{18}

Location on the property was but one of many considerations in the building of the plantation house. By nature of its geophysical positioning, the southeastern United States is prone to intense humidity and high temperatures. With limited options to combat the extreme weather conditions, houses were structurally set up to alleviate some of this burden. Open rooms, with a great distance from floor to ceiling, provided a capacious area and better circulation of the inland, humid summer air.\textsuperscript{19}


If this architectural style was, as Roger G. Kennedy asserted in his *American Greek Revival* (2010), “…the social and political statement of a popular state of feeling and… an aesthetic phenomenon,”\(^\text{20}\) then how did these upcountry planters differentiate themselves from the others who built in this design? In essence, these men shared with their Northern brethren many similar motivations, specifically adopting this architectural style as a means to display their wealth. However, it was a distinct type of wealth, one forged on the backs of slaves laboring in the cotton fields. Although low country planters used this architectural style as well, the upcountry planters sought to truly make it emblematic of their cultural, social and political position in the United States. It was a means of securing their place among the American elite.

Through examination and analysis of various familial letters, diaries, journals and plantation records, this dissertation explores how the upcountry cotton planters of Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina took the popular Greek Revival architectural style and modified it to represent their cultural and societal placement. Since most upcountry planters were often not as revered as the low country planters, even as their wealth and power was equal, the legacy of their reputation as being upcountry lessers remained. By singling out Greek Revival as their architectural design and building their plantations and town houses in this architectural style, they put themselves in the same social classification as low country planters. Greek Revival architecture was a tie to the past. For those upcountry men, it bound them to ancient Greece and its slave society. These men linked themselves, if not justified, their alliance to this ancient society and its adherence to slavery through this architectural

style. What truly differentiated these upcountry cotton planters’ Greek Revival homes from those constructed by Northern businessmen was that they were built by slave labor. The essence of the home was defined by the crop and those who toiled in the fields to cultivate it. Southern Greek Revival took on its own meaning. It was further emphasized by the upcountry planters, who sought to ultimately define their place in the economic and political world. Since they were late comers to the planter elite, they used this architectural style to place themselves in this category. Yet they clearly defined that they were from a new generation of planter. Their world was cotton and it was the slave who ultimately defined their realm.

The first chapter of this dissertation addresses the emergence of Greek Revival architecture in America, particularly in the upcountry region of the plantation South. Through the use of various guide books, both architects and novice builders began to transform American architecture in both the public and private sectors to conform to the European styles. The economic, political, social and physical climate of the American South helped to bring an adaptation to this architectural style.

In the field of architectural study, specifically books on Greek Revival architecture, there is a variety of sources. Scholarship, however, is limited, if not entirely non-existent, about upcountry cotton planters who built in this architectural style. The Greek Revival house held a symbolic place to the cotton planter, and though contemporary scholarship have examined various components of the significance of this housing style, no work explores the complex significance of the Greek Revival home as emblematic of the planter as a slaveholder.
In addressing the issue of landscape and the overall imagery of plantations, Sam B. Hilliard explores the ideal image portrayed by the plantation in his contribution to *The Making of the American Landscape* (1990). Though he suggests that much of what has been created is based on the illusion that Americans have fashioned revolving around the aura of the antebellum South, Hilliard maintained that their overall true objective is to generate wealth for the proprietor.\(^{21}\) In his brief section on the cotton plantations, he writes that the home “…was the focal point…”. In addition, Hilliard also recognizes that Greek Revival was the architectural style of choice of the American Southern planter.\(^{22}\)

Sectionalism of the 1850s found its way into many aspects of life outside of politics. Though specific architectural styles were found in both the North and South, people from these geographic regions interpreted them in their own way. James C. Bonner contends in his article “House and Landscape Design in the Antebellum South” (1977) that southern cotton planters expressed their crop-specific agricultural dependency through the construction of buildings on their property. Planters wanted everyone who saw their home and its surrounding structures to know its connection to a specific crop, which determined their status. They decided to build generously proportioned structures to help tell this story and Greek Revival appeared to be the favorite because it best displayed their wealth and power, with the undertone that this profit was made at the hands of the enslaved.\(^{23}\)


\(^{22}\)Hilliard, “Plantations,” pp. 118 and 119.

In specifying Southern architectural styles, since they proved somewhat unique, Mills Lane’s *Architecture of the Old South* series holds a distinct place. Lane approaches the subject on a state-to-state basis, following the progression of the different architectural styles throughout each specific Southern state by exploring particular families and their individual homes. In addition to these works, the Beehive Press series also published Lane’s works on specific types, the most important of which for this study, *The Architecture of the Old South: Greek Revival & Romantic* (1996). Lane looks at the distinctive panache obtained through the usage of the Greek Revival in public and private structures and its overall relevance to the people and society.\(^{24}\) Lane’s work, along with others in this series, addresses the symbolism and significance of the Greek Revival plantation home but does not fully convey its relevance in defining the planter’s status. Although the series is filled with details about public and private structures that were built in the southern states, he emphasizes the architectural styling of the buildings and not the emotional attachment or relevance to the owner. This dissertation will go beyond the design and function of Greek Revival architecture and examine its significance to the upcountry Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina cotton planters.

In his discussion of agriculture’s ties to architecture, Kenneth Severens explores the relevance of cash crops to certain stylistic approaches in housing construction in *Southern Architecture: 350 Years of Distinctive American Buildings* (1981). He suggests that the big house and the land upon which it was set was devised as a heredity piece or more specifically a legacy and that nothing was transitional or temporary in

\(^{24}\)Lane, *Romantic*. 

14
possession. The theme of the family’s ability to remain situated on designated lands to promote a sense of permanency and identified their power and place.25 Following the theoretical tones of this architectural style being more relevant and regionally specific, Mark Mayfield contends in his *Southern Style* (1999) that Greek Revival found its true home in the South.26 Mayfield recognizes the overall significance of the big house in general, labelling it the quintessence of cordiality; it was a symbol of planter contentment and bliss.27 Though his work addresses many issues concerning the ideology and symbolism of the house, Mayfield’s book does not deal with its overall representation of the planter and his power other than his ability to be genial. Furthering the standard of idealism of the Southern plantation, Paul Grootkerk’s article “Artistic Images of Mythological Reality: The Antebellum Plantation” (1994) tackles the meaning of not only the main house but all the outlying buildings as well. He contends that the structures represent the family’s, and more specifically that of the planter’s, societal place and economic standing.28

The second and third chapters delve into specific planters and their families. Throughout these chapters, the changes in their families’ fortunes and lives revealed how these alterations led the planters away from the past styles and enabled them to build in the new style associated with the upcountry planter slave holding class. Although their familial legacy was not completely forgotten, this new generation of

25Severens, Distinctive, general overview of the book.


27Mayfield, *Southern*, p. 17.

upcountry cotton planters sought to differentiate themselves from their fathers and grandfathers, especially through the architectural styling of their plantation houses. These planters decided to use the Greek Revival style, which appeared to be so inherently tied with slave holding in the South. In addition, these men wanted to generate their identity through their possessions, which were so enjoyed by society.

Georgia contained a variety of Greek Revival houses, many reflecting a lifestyle unachievable by the majority of the population. Only a small percentage of the population had the financial means to construct such homes. Some houses were constructed based on transitory capital generated from bumper cotton crops. The planter, however, was not always able to maintain those financial resources for years to come. However, these majestic residences were still built to reflect the decadence of the era. Georgian plantation homes were not all great in stature and elegance, as was the case for the other the southern states. Many planters were able to only construct moderate accommodations with minimal amounts of furniture. Commonly, those engaged in agriculture as a means of occupation dwelled in the most moderate of structures. Mostly constructed of wood, the almost meager housing facilities were frequently deficient of windowpanes and contained little more than dowels to rest their clothing.29 For the majority of the population, structures of modest standing were the norm as certain areas in Georgia were among the first of these three specific Southern states to flourish with the boom of the cotton market, the 1830s, many planters set

29Burke, Plesure, pp. 32 and 38.; Gowan, Images, p. 278.; Parsons, Inside, pp. 108-109, and 113. Although Charles G. Parsons’ account of his Southern travels reflects Northern bias, his descriptions of the modest homes are highly detailed.
themselves to the task of creating magnificent and lavish homes built on the land that was bringing them their wealth.

Georgia cotton planters had prospered from the sea-isle cotton, which was grown in the low country. The planters who took the chance to grow cotton in the more northern regions did not draw the same attention afforded to the other planters. One of the challenges in researching these individuals is the absence of most of their personal records. Whether destroyed during the Civil War or discarded throughout the years, the lack of private papers and correspondence presented some obstacles in finding out the true significance of the house to the planter himself. This dissertation examines these cotton planters of the more middle and northern regions of Georgia, where patterns of their lives were dramatically different then their lowland counterparts.

In exploring regional differences and the use of architectural style, it is crucial to look at more state-specific books. Aside from Mills Lane’s *Architecture of the Old South: Georgia*, there are other works that examine the usage of Greek Revival in Georgia. Beginning with Medora Fields Perkerson’s *White Columns In Georgia* (1952), which delves into specific homes, particularly those of plantations, found throughout the state to Frederick Doveton Nichols’ *The Early Architecture of Georgia* (1957) which is divided into sections based upon the different geographic regions of the state, Nichols’ use of detailed floor plans, descriptive features, and occasional reference to photographs highlights the Greek Revival tendency in the Piedmont.30 Both Perkersons’ and Nichols’ works mention significant Georgia plantation homes but lack

details about the owners’ attachment to these houses. For the buildings selected in Nichols’ book, the different usages of architectural styles used by the builders and architects equated styles used to the practical guides of the day that were referenced. Though the owner is acknowledged, the nature of his relationship to the structure is not specified in his work. Nichols highlights various architects who were employed as well as the trends in architectural styles used by the upcountry Georgian planters.31 For Nichols, “…Greek Revival, then, remains the great cultural achievement of the piedmont.”32 But, he points out that Georgia planters did not build in this style on their cotton plantation lands: “However, in Georgia the great Greek Revival houses were built chiefly in fall-line towns. The plantation owners preferred town life…”33

*The Georgia Catalog* (1982) by John Linley outlines research on various architectural styles and explores the correlations among all Greek Revival houses as well as the modifications employed by the architects. Linley also places emphasis on the historical significance of pertinent ancient Greek structures such as the shrines found on the Acropolis.34 Again, certain houses are referenced, but consideration was given to the architect, not the owners.

Property owners sought to build their homes following the Greek Revival model. Judge John Harris owned fertile lands just beyond the outskirts of Atlanta’s marketplace. After careful contemplation, he had a six-columned mansion built to serve as a home. Resting on his plantation lands in the vicinity of Covington, the home stood

---


32Nichols, *Early*, p. 139.

33Nichols, *Early*, p. 117.

34Linley, *Catalog*, p. 97.
as a testament to his wealth. The building was later given the name of White Hall, which was the same title bestowed upon an older estate in the same vicinity.\footnote{David King Gleason, \textit{Antebellum Homes of Georgia} (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1987), p. 37. Also of note, this classical Greek Revival home inspired Margaret Mitchell, author of \textit{Gone With the Wind}, to inform David O. Selznick’s historical staff to use this house for ‘Twelve Oaks,’ home of Ashley Wilkes’ family.}

A few miles outside of Madison, Georgia, stands the majestic plantation The Oaks. Although the date of construction and original owner are in question, it is assumed that William Jones financed the building of the house somewhere between 1808 and 1840. The Oaks was initially more of a Federal style home to which a piazza was added in order to transform it into a Greek Revival structure.\footnote{Marshall W. Williams, “A Documentary History Outline Of “The Oaks” Plantation” (n.p.), p. 3. (Marshall Williams is the Morgan County Records Archivist). With the growing trend of Greek Revival architecture, houses were frequently converted from one type to the Greek Revival style.} This was commonly done at the time. At its peak, the plantation swelled to a staggering 12,500 acres.\footnote{Gleason, \textit{Homes}, p. 44.}

Rose Hill, now known as Lockerly Hall, one of the state’s most prominent representations of temple-like architecture, was constructed in 1839. Commonly referred to as “Daniel Tucker’s house…”, Richard J. Nicholls initially owned the Greek Revival home, as well as the surrounding twenty-one hundred acres. Six pillars of the Doric order and floor-to-ceiling windows highlighted the front portico, approximately fifty-nine feet by eleven feet in diameter. Rose Hill is situated near the antebellum Georgia capital of Milledgeville and two miles from the plantation fields. The house contains...
mahogany handrails and lighting fixtures of the finest crystal.\textsuperscript{38} All details of the home indicated that the builder and owner was of great wealth and carefully considered what the structure and furnishings told the outside world. Outside of Milledgeville, Samuel Lowther had his modified Greek Revival plantation house constructed. Completed in 1823, the front door opened to the hall that finished with a graduated winding stairway.\textsuperscript{39}

As in most societies, family was important to South Carolinians. Marriage records indicate that the families of historical legacy or of financial power intermingled their bloodlines.\textsuperscript{40} Planters married within their own social and economic circle, which created an intricate pattern of interconnected plantation homesteads. Upcountry South Carolina planters also saw Charleston as a place to maintain a town house as well as it helped to document the importance of the family name throughout plantation culture. Intermarriage of the prominent families was essential in Charleston society and these homes helped extend it to the plantation society.\textsuperscript{41} The rapid growth and cultivation of cotton, combined with machinery to make the product market-ready, transformed the economic conditions of South Carolina and shifted in the concentration of wealth.


\textsuperscript{41}George C. Rogers, Jr., Charleston in the Age of the Pinckneys (Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1980), p. 23.
Although rice still generated riches, cotton soon made new masters of the world of the upcountry.\(^{42}\)

The Calhoun family established several large plantations in South Carolina. One such estate that ran along the Savannah River was that of Millwood. Bachelor James Edward Calhoun’s ship-shaped home served as a testament to his service in the Navy.\(^{43}\) However, the grandest Calhoun property belonged to the well-known politician and great statesman John C. Calhoun. On eleven hundred acres of land, a proportion of which was hereditary, Calhoun initially dwelled in the existing home until he modified it into a Greek Revival structure. Graced by four fluted pillars on three sides, the main portal to the interior was protected by a veranda. Massive oaks, creating a realm of mystique and elegance, graced the pathway leading to the entrance. The picturesque scenery, visible from all portions of the house, added to the forte of its overall beauty. Like many who opted to keep the professional aspects of their lives distinct from the personal, Calhoun’s study was housed in an outer building.\(^{44}\)


The Hampton family has long held a place of prominence within the Palmetto State, although their property and possessions extended across other southern states. With a noble lineage tracing back to at least eleventh century England, the Hamptons arrived in the colony chartered by the Virginia Company to set their mark on North America. Proud of their heritage, the proprietary estates established throughout the South were reminiscent of noble landholdings. Two of South Carolina’s most classical Greek Revival plantation homes, Millwood and Milford, were built by this family. Wade Hampton I built a plantation in the post-Revolutionary War era in the upcountry on a combination of his own possessions along with property belonging to his in-laws. The plain Woodlands, although not powerful in appearance, was filled with luxuries unbeknownst to most. With the continued wealth obtained from the numerous plantations and their output of cotton, Wade Hampton I built Millwood (bearing the same name as the aforementioned Calhoun house) for his son Wade II as a wedding gift. Wade Hampton II enlarged this house and produced a magnificent structure. Completed in 1844, Millwood reflected an atmosphere of prosperity. A grand stairway led to the front porch, upon which six majestic Corinthian pillars rested. The opulence of this estate was virtually unparalleled, with the exception of the Milford plantation and
a few other families of equal stature of the Hampton wealth.\textsuperscript{46} By the time of his death, as recorded in J.H. Easterby’s “The Three Wade Hamptons: The Saga of a Family of the Old South,” as well as in the Wade Hampton v. Catherine Hampton, et. al. Judgment Roll No. 994, Wade Hampton II had amassed over 1,079 acres of cotton growing land for the Millwood plantation alone, not including the Woodlands’ 625 acres or any of his other vast land holdings.\textsuperscript{46} Building a powerful house for such a great tract of land was only fitting.

Built upon a majestic plateau, Millwood overlooked the Congaree River. Situated on thousands of acres, the main house dwarfed the surrounding structures. A long drive led up to the planter’s residence, with the daytime sunlight shadowed by the billowing trees and lit for evening visitors by the slaves standing in rows while bearing torches. The gardens encircled the home in ornamental patterns and arrangements which eclipsed the view of the practical structures on the plantation. The first buildings seen were the kitchen as well as the barns for the horses, the animals of the greatest

\textsuperscript{46}R. L. Allen, “Letters,” p. 20.; Clemens, Marriage, pp. 98 and 114.; Irving, “Sporting.”; Roger G. Kennedy, Architecture, Men, Women And Money In America1600-1860 (New York: Random House, 1985), pp. 346, 347, 349 and 352.; Virginia G. Meynard, The Venturers: The Hampton, Harrison, And Earle Families Of Virginia, South Carolina, And Texas (Easley, South Carolina: The Southern Historical Press, 1981), p. 172.; The Triad Architectural Associates (John W. Califf), “Millwood: Its Architecture And Ambiance,” Draft Copy (Columbia, South Carolina, n.p., 1982), n.p.; Manly Wellman, Giant in Gray: A Biography of Wade Hampton of South Carolina (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1949), p. 9.; Little is known about Millwood, located on the outskirts of Columbia, South Carolina. Following February 17, 1865, Major-General William Tecumseh Sherman’s Union Army left no more than the remnants of the columns. The similarity of Millwood to Milford has presented modern scholars with more details. Letitia Allen, in “Wade Hampton II’s Patronage of Edward Troye” (p. LA-6) points out that there is only one painting that shows the plantation and that is Troye’s “Argyle,” which is of one of Hampton’s prize racehorses. But Alexander Mackay-Smith, who states that the painting of “Pocahontas” also depicts the house and “Trifle” shows Woodlands, disputes this comment. (found in the Virginia Gurley Meynard Papers, box I, folder 97, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.)

\textsuperscript{46}J. H. Easterby, “The Three Wade Hamptons: The Saga of a Family of the Old South,” The State, 4 March 1934, Virginia Gurley Meynard Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Wade Hampton v. Catherine M. Hampton, et. al., Judgment Roll No 994, Office of the Clerk of the Court, Richland County, South Carolina Division of Archives and History.; Hampton also had 2,529 acres in Mississippi, 180 acres near Charleston, South Carolina and 8000 acres in Texas along with other vast tracts of land.
importance. With the finest bred thoroughbreds, the Hamptons were able to display their English noble heritage as well as enforce their American bloodline. In two distinct areas on the property were the slave quarters. In order to be more time efficient, slave quarters for the field hands were situated on the edge of the cotton fields. Slaves who were “skilled” resided nearer to the buildings that housed the machinery or equipment with which they worked.47

The second outstanding plantation of the Hampton family found in South Carolina is Milford.48 Construction took place between 1828 and 1830. This magnificent house reflected a status that few were able to obtain. The pathway leading to the six Corinthian pillared house was tree lined, with the Spanish moss obscuring a complete view, which added to the seductiveness of the unknown. Externally, the structural setup of both Millwood and Milford were similar. Architect Nathaniel E. Potter was hired to design both houses following the completion of the Charleston Hotel. The first floor of the three-story building gave the illusion of being completely open, facilitated by the high ceilings and mirrors along with the interior columns that served as room separators. Milford, a center hall plantation home, served as the residence of Governor John L. Manning, related to the Hampton family by his first marriage to Wade


48In some articles, papers and texts, the plantation name is spelled “Millford,” instead of Milford.
I’s daughter Susan. Her financial status generated from profits of the sugar crop at Houmas plantation in Louisiana allowed for the construction of this home. \(^{49}\)

Roger G. Kennedy’s *Architecture, Men, Women And Money In America 1600-1860* (1985) dedicates an entire chapter to the three Wade Hampton homes as well as their familial ties to John L. Manning and James Henry Hammond. He also details the known specifics of their plantation homes at Millwood, Milford and Redcliffe.\(^{50}\) He examines the stories of the men and their families as well as the houses that they had constructed. Overall, however, the relevance of the home to the master was not discussed. In *The Venturers: The Hampton, Harrison, And Earle Families Of Virginia, South Carolina, And Texas* (1981), Virginia Meynard studies the Wade Hamptons and their influence in the state of South Carolina as well as to the government. As part of her research, Meynard explores the relevance of these homesteads.\(^{51}\)

James Henry Hammond, a South Carolina attorney, aspired to rise in ranks among the planter elite. With a lucrative marriage to young heiress Catherine FitzSimons, Hammond began his new life at her plantation Silver Bluff.\(^{52}\) Gradually, he


\(^{50}\)Kennedy, *Men*, pp. 352, 354, 355 and 361.

\(^{51}\)Meynard, *Venturers*, general overview of the entire book.

was recognized as a member of this social class, seen as both “...an opulent planter...” and “...an accomplished gentleman...” Meeting with profitable returns from the cotton crops, Hammond had another residence constructed just miles from the active plantation. The house, Redcliffe, a Greek Revival structure that stood upon hundreds of acres, was finished before the close of the 1850s. Hammond filled the house with fine furnishings and magnificent pieces of art, acquired on various visits overseas. Redcliffe, although located adjacent to the plantation lands proper, stood as a testament to the legacy Hammond aspired to leave behind.

Some plantation homes, like that of James Henry Hammond, are found as the focal point of works like Drew Gilpin Faust's *James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery* (1982). This book not only dealt with Hammond's social and political ascension, but also the significance of his marriage that helped him attain a homestead that served as a representation of his status. Faust provides a brief overview of Redcliffe itself, concentrating on its visual appearance as well as the view of the “world” maintained by its master.

---


55John Billings Shaw, “Some Notes On The History Of Redcliffe,” Redcliffe, Aiken County, Research File, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, p. 8.; “Paintings,” Hammond Papers.; Though many paintings had been commissioned for use in Silver Bluff, some were relocated to Redcliffe.

North Carolina did not receive the same type of glowing praises as her South Carolinian counterpart. Geographically situated between the affluent states of Virginia and South Carolina, the 'Tar-Heel' state was seen as a “valley of humiliation between two mountains of conceit.” As within the other southern states, there too was a class differentiation best embodied within the architectural structuring found among the homes. Planters, however, comprised only six percent of the total population of the state.

Tobacco had been the bumper crop for North Carolina throughout the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. Rapidly stripping the land of its rich nutrients, these fields had limited life spans before proving fruitless. Most plantations were not large enough to allow for crop rotation, so relocation was a common solution. North Carolina lands favored smaller farmers, cultivating lesser amounts of a crop. Cotton was grown in the state, but not to the extent it was in other Southern locations. Few planters within the state attained the status found within Georgia and South Carolina. Farmers and planters lived mostly in modest wooden structures without any extravagance.

---

57 Draper, “Southern,” p. 2.; Frederick Law Olmstead in his Journeys And Explorations in The Cotton Kingdom, Volume I, speaks of how “North Carolina has a proverbial reputation for the ignorance and torpidity of her people…” (p. 190). Louise Wigfall, as quoted in Mary Elizabeth Massey, Refugee Life in the Confederacy (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1964), p. 79, proclaimed it was her opinion that she “always thought North Carolina was not good for much…”


With agricultural modernizing agents at work within the state, a new momentum in construction took hold in the 1830s. Cotton affected the economy of North Carolina in a positive way as well. With a sense of newfound prosperity, planters started to build homes with character instead of basic functionality. Following the Greek Revival trend, most new houses were center hall structures, flanked by rooms on each side.60

Montmorenci was one of the greatest examples of this renaissance in architecture that began in the early nineteenth century. Although constructed slightly before the heightened demands for changes in home building occurred, this plantation set the tone for North Carolina. One of the most prosperous of North Carolina planters, William Williams, had this home constructed among his numerous properties. Located near the border of Virginia on an estate of close to seventeen hundred acres, the plantation house was graced by eight slim pillars. Filled with extravagant contents virtually unheard of to most North Carolinians, Montmorenci defined the decadence of this era of building. The most renowned feature found inside the house was the free supporting grand staircase, which spiraled up to the second floor.61 Throughout the house were “…rich cornices, mantels, and moldings” that provided a dominant air of elegance and refinement.62


61Catherine W. Bishir, “The Montmorenci-Prospect Hill School: A Study of High Style Vernacular Architecture in the Roanoke Valley,” in Carolina Dwelling, ed. Doug Swain (The Student Publication of the School of Design, North Carolina State University, 1978): 84-103; pp. 85, 88 and 90.; Mills Lane, Architecture of the Old South: North Carolina (Savannah, Georgia: The Beehive Press, 1985), pp. 137, 138 and 139.; Denmark Raleigh photographs, staircase – Montmorenci (1J-11), Winterthur Library, Winterthur Archives.; Roanoke Advocate, 8 November 1832; Roanoke Advocate, 22 November 1832. Montmorenci was razed in 1940. The stairway as well as the front façade were saved and are displayed at Winterthur in Delaware. However, most accounts claim that it is a reproduction staircase since the original was destroyed during transit.

The Cameron family of North Carolina also found their place among the greatest of property holders in the state. At the turn of the 19th century, a combined Federal and Greek Revival plantation home was constructed and designated as Fairntosh.63 Through the growing of various crops, the family continued its pursuit of prosperity, which peaked with the production of cotton. Further construction of homes coincided with the successful crops and a high market. Paul Cameron had the most prominent of these structures built, the plantation house he named Burnside.64 However, Fairntosh was the main family structure. This modified Greek Revival plantation house reflected the power and legacy of the Cameron family. It was also the home through which the Union armies raided and its owner stood at the challenge in which to preserve his treasured possessions.

The works of Catherine Bishir dominated the historical scholarship of North Carolina architecture and more specifically some of the great old plantation homes. Aside from the general books she wrote with Michael T. Southern, like A Guide to the Historic Architecture of the Piedmont North Carolina (2009), she has also made significant contributions to the compendium edited by Doug Swain, Carolina Dwellings (1978). Bishir states that Montmorenci provided impetus for the distinctive and “…highly personalized…” designed for the few prosperous planters of that vicinity.65 Kenneth McFarland looks at various homes in a specific region of North Carolina in The

---


64Sanders, Cameron, p. 60.

The ownership of humans as property presents a fundamental moral dilemma for us today. How can a man, who believed himself a gentleman and a pillar of his community, have taken away the essence of a human being, that of belonging to oneself? The cotton planters discussed in this dissertation prided themselves as being politically, socially, and culturally astute. They were also men of influence who displayed their wealth through their possessions, particularly their Greek Revival homes. Their cotton was grown by their slaves; their houses were built on the backs of these same slaves. In essence, their status was reliant upon the labor of their slaves. The magnificent Greek Revival homes which were representations of their owners’ statuses were in fact marred by the reality of their power and position; that it was built on the inhumane treatment of chattel property. There is a mythology that surrounds these homes, one that was created in the Reconstruction era and has been perpetuated. The beauty of these homes was an illusion that masked the cruelty of slavery.

The big house that stood as the summit of the property defined the plantations. Symbolic of the planters’ tendency towards paternalism, the home was the most prominent feature, dwarfing the surrounding structures that housed functional outbuildings, provided living accommodations for the slaves in one section and other edifices containing the operational material and livestock. The local population was in

---

many ways reliant upon the planter himself, thus reflected in their stature. Slavery allowed the planter to be a patriarch, as did the vast holdings of his plantation. Their dependence upon him enhanced this notion. South Carolina, of the three states discussed, was the one that enforced patriarchy to the highest degree. The legacy of familial lands, passed down through generations, in addition to the deeded chattel property, aided in the creation of such an atmosphere. The master provided for his slaves, who in turn, cultivated a sort of dependence upon him. The out buildings of the plantation setting were both smaller in size and plain in appearance, enhancing the authority of the planter. As reflected by Christopher Gustavus Memminger, “the Slave Institution at the South increased the tendency to dignify the family. Each planter is in fact a Patriarch-his position compels him to be a ruler in his household…”

The institution of slavery was essential to these planters having the lives they had and most importantly, being able to construct and maintain these Greek Revival mansions. The voice of slaves who resided on these particular plantations might not have been recorded, however, the overall discontent of slaves has been documented. Edward E. Baptist detailed the life of a slave, Charles Ball, who was owned by Wade Hampton I, the father of the planter discussed in this dissertation, in his *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery And The Making Of American Capitalism* (2014). Ball’s experiences in becoming a cotton picker and the type of bondage he underwent as a

---


result “...was inherently new.”\textsuperscript{70} This particular slave recorded the brutality of life on an upcountry South Carolina cotton plantation.\textsuperscript{71} One can only assume that Wade Hampton II followed the example set by his father to effectively run a profitable plantation, one in which slaves were solely chattel that produced the man’s wealth.

The harsh realities of the life of a slave on one of these upcountry plantations are best seen in Sydney Nathans’ \textit{To Free a Family: The Journey Of Mary Walker} (2012). In this scholarship, Nathans looks at the life of Mary Walker, a slave who escaped Fairntosh. This work conveyed some of the horrors of slavery, such as denial of control over one’s own life. More specifically, Nathans showed the difficult factors associated with escape; that of the decision to leave behind one’s children and husband.\textsuperscript{72} Life as a slave was never stable and filled with unknown horrors.

The overall importance of the number of slaves as a determinant of prosperity and affluence was critical to these planters. Thavolia Glymph addressed this in her \textit{Out Of The House Of Bondage: The Transformation Of The Plantation House} (2008). She wrote that “slaves...conveyed household wealth and standing in the community; the greater number of slaves on display, the greater the household’s reputed wealth and reputation.”\textsuperscript{73} Slave ownership was essential to the status maintained by these planters.


\textsuperscript{71}Baptist, \textit{Half}, pp. 114-115, 117, 118-119, 121 and 140.


Among many aspects of slavery explored by Walter Johnson in his *Soul By Soul: Life Inside the Antebellum Slave Market* (1999) was the subject of the overall relevance of slaves as a means to display the planters’ wealth and to serve as symbols of their prominence. The circumstances under which the chattel was purchased, as well the slaves themselves, were manifestations of the planter.⁷⁴

Ideologically, slavery was a capitalistic enterprise. However, scholars debate this theme and it appears in many works. In essence, slavery was at the heart of these planters wealth, which had allowed them to build these Greek Revival houses. It also connected the South with the North, if only in a business sense. As Seth Rockman asserted in his “The Future of Civil War Studies: Slavery and Capitalism,” that “…slavery was indispensable to national economic development, as access to slave-grown commodities and to markers in slave-agriculture regions proved essential to the lives and livelihoods of Americans far removed from the plantation South.”⁷⁵ Rockman’s historiographic article is filled with references to scholarship that examines the ideology of slavery in a capitalist sense. The plantation system was not unique to this nation, yet the social order established through this system in the American South took on a novel and unconventional interpretation. It was a world where each individual planter created a separate identity for their homes. From the earliest establishment of southern plantations, the goal of self-reliance was clearly defined and as time progressed and different crops became profitable for each region, the surrounding physical

---


environments reflected this identity.\textsuperscript{76} The plantation projected an image of refinement, dignity and a sense of nobility, enforcing the exclusivity of this lifestyle. Therefore, great detail was placed upon the decoration of the rooms and the furnishings, for they sought to portray the genteel family. The Greek Revival architecture of the homestead also symbolized the power and wealth generated from slave labor which was reinforced through the social hierarchy of the estate.\textsuperscript{77} Of course, the reality was that most Southerners barely eked out an existence; yet a minority created a world that represented what was called the “Old South.”

The legacy and the allure of the plantations of the Old South are part of a deeply rooted American myth, fostered by the nostalgia produced in the post-bellum era of restoration. Only a small minority of planters were able to hold on to their majestic Greek Revival mansions. Although these homes were spread throughout the South, many of these great homes were located in the upcountry regions of Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina. These big houses were unlike the tidewater or low country


\textsuperscript{77}The South Carolina State House, though not a private dwelling, is a magnificent Greek Revival structure originally designed with a front pediment that contained sculptures. Six of the nine images were of slaves toiling in both the cotton and rice fields, thus tying the style of architecture with the institution of bondage. Refer to John M Bryan, \textit{Creating the South Carolina State House} (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999); The Henry Kirke Bush-Brown Papers, Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division; Christie Zimmerman Fant, \textit{The State House of South Carolina, An Illustrated Historic Guide} (Columbia, South Carolina: R. L. Bryan, 1970), pp. 116-118; and Letter, Johnson M. Mundy to Mary E. Mundy, 20 February 1861, Johnson M. Mundy Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
rice, indigo and sugar estates; these were the product of cotton money. Eighteenth century low country plantation homes were built in the Federal style. This architectural style defined the revolutionary and post-revolutionary generations. As American high society evolved into the nineteenth century, those of means followed the trends of Greek Revival. This marked a distinction.

The story of these upcountry planters who built homes in the Greek Revival architectural style, a style that they embraced as their own, has not fully been told. The planters of the upcountry regions of these states in many ways were distinct from their low country brethren. These planters generated their wealth in a new era. Most plantation money in North Carolina, for example, had been acquired during the eighteenth century from tar and tobacco; cotton was rarely cultivated in this state since it was a somewhat perilous venture given the climatic and soil conditions. The men who experimented in this risky endeavor, who resided and grew this crop in the upcountry region of the state were distinctive and distinguishable. Although the two planters selected for this study, William Williams and Paul C. Cameron, owned multiple plantations within their home state as well as others in deep South locales, they grew wealthy from the boom crop of the era at their upcountry plantations. They were notably different from North Carolina’s other planters for they grew cotton in a region that was climatically uncertain, yet they profited, albeit not just from cotton. The cotton that they cultivated in the upcountry region of North Carolina made them stand out from their neighbors.

The next three chapters explore the relevance of the interior design of the big house, the possessions displayed within, as well as other relevant structures and
assets. The exterior decorations, landscape architecture and additional buildings are also studied. Elements like art and blood horses served as great defining aspects of the planters' lives and revealed not only the character of the man but his perceived quality as well. These chapters also show the significance of slaves and slavery to these planters as well as to the market economy. This essential institution allowed these men to build and maintain their grand houses.

Thoroughbred horse breeding and horse racing was significant to these upcountry planters as well as to planters in general. This helps to show the many dimensions of these planters and what was important to them. In *Race Horse Men: How Slavery and Freedom Were Made at the Racetrack* (2014), Katherine C. Mooney writes that “racing was a useful pastime for men who were inching their way up the social ladder…” and “…wanted to be trusted gentlemen…”78 Mooney used James Henry Hammond as an example of one of these men.79 In addition to these discussions of Hammond, as well as Wade Hampton II, Mooney’s work explores the political and social aspects of the racetrack, as it was tied to the institution of slavery.80 She contends that

the racetrack was…an institution open to the conflicts of the outside world, to debates over how a true democracy should allocate authority, how a slave society could both preserve itself and thrive. At the track Southerners…justified the immunity is should enjoy from Northern interference…81

---


81Mooney, *Race*, p. 27.
All of these components helped to define the status of the planters, and though Mooney does not focus on the houses themselves, it highlights another possession by which these planters defined themselves.

The planter himself has received a great deal of attention in various monographs. One such classic example is Steven M. Stowe’s *Intimacy And Power In The Old South: Ritual in the Lives of the Planters* (1987). Stowe found that the success of the planter was based upon his reliance on organization, providing some sort of structure in the social and political world.82 James Oakes’ *The Ruling Race: A History of American Slaveholders* (1998) looks into the lives of the planters themselves, while carefully addressing the need of slavery to maintain the distinctive world they created. The ability to own a slave represented the overall “…success in the market culture of the Old South.”83 Slavery was critical to the domain of the planter as well as the preservation of the homestead.

John Michael Vlach explores the significance of works of art in the home that depict the plantation home and lands in *The Planter’s Prospect: Privilege and Slavery in Plantation Paintings* (2002). Though others have written on this subject, Vlach addresses the relevance of the paintings of the big house. He asserted that these images were in fact a means of chronicling the prosperity of the man and his homestead.84

---


The household of the plantation is a relevant concept for study as Peter W. Bardaglio, in *Reconstructing the Household: Families, Sex, & the Law in the Nineteenth–Century South* (1995), links the planter class’ ability to maintain and dominate over their own households, just as they were able to do over society. This reinforced the idea of self-sufficiency and status as well as the responsibility to serve in the community.85

Central to their way of life was the cultivation of cotton and those who grew it. Cotton was slave dependent. These planters needed slaves to cultivate their crop and their status and wealth depended upon their labor. Gene Dattel writes in *Cotton And Race In The Making Of America: The Human Cost Of Economic Power* (2009) that “the South had no formidable economic existence without slave-produced cotton.”86 Dattel’s book shows how important slavery was to these planters and how they were able to maintain their possessions because of their slave labor.

Economics was of great significance to these planters. The success of a cotton crop and the market were crucial to their prosperity. In his *The Early American Republic: 1789-1829* (2007), Paul E. Johnson discussed the impact of the cotton gin on the market place and how it transformed the market economy. Thus the use of slave labor created the planter elite.87 For all the displays of wealth and power of these

---


plantations, ultimately they “…were successful agricultural businesses…” The realities of a working plantation took away from the mask of a luxurious lifestyle.

Although there is scholarship about various components of the cotton planters’ lives and homes, how the Greek Revival structure became a representation of the men and their status, especially in the upcountry, has been understudied. The true meaning and relevance of what the house meant to these men, as well as how this house defined them, was found within their own personal papers. There are many letters, records, diaries and plantation journals of these particular planters and their associates that survived the war, which allow scholars a glimpse into the intimate world of these cotton planters. Most of James Henry Hammond’s, Paul C. Cameron and family, and John Caldwell Calhoun’s correspondence and journals survived the vast destruction of the war, allowing us extraordinary insight into their world, especially with regard to the plantation, inclusive of its house, land, and slaves. Wade Hampton II and his family’s letters are also very detailed, offering a glimpse of what he valued most in life. Editorial correspondence, articles of visits to the plantations, as well as correspondence between individuals outside of these families helps to outline the importance and relevance that stemmed from the overall appearance of the house as well as the sphere of influence of the planter himself. Beyond the shelter that it provided, the Greek Revival home for each of

---

88P. Johnson, Republic, p. 91.

89There is, of course, some challenge here. Many family papers and letters, as well as county and state records, were destroyed during the course of William Tecumseh Sherman’s Atlanta Campaign, the March to the Sea and the Carolinas Campaign in addition to Potter’s Raid. In fact, Wade Hampton II’s son, Wade Hampton III, wrote about the loss of familial papers when Millwood was destroyed in a letter after the war. He stated “…when my house was robbed & burned by Sherman’s, all my papers which were in it, shared the same fate.” Letter, Wade Hampton III to General, no date, Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
these men expressed their identity, which promoted the understanding of their essential being. All that was the world of the cotton slaveholding planter was embodied within this structure. Thus the home, with its contents as well as the outbuildings, was the true measure of the man. A better understanding of the true significance of these planters and their Greek Revival plantation homes comes through an analysis of letters, plantation diaries, receipts and other documents that have been left behind. Another avenue involved looking at to whom or for what reason people wrote these letters as well as why they kept such detailed accounts about their homes, its furnishings and its overall significance.

The concluding chapters of this dissertation focus on the destruction that came from the Civil War. The loss of their homes was but one way in which their world was turned upside down. Megan Kate Nelson’s *Ruin Nation: Destruction and the American Civil War* (2013) discussed, among many points, Wade Hampton II’s plantation’s remnants and the aborted efforts to rebuild the structure. Although Hampton intended this home to be a lasting legacy, the realities of the post-bellum era prevented this.  

Marc R. Matrana also researched Millwood as one of the properties incorporated in his *Lost Plantations of the South* (2009). He included a brief account of Wade Hampton II’s plantation and its contents and what became of the property. Matrana’s book shows that ultimately Wade Hampton II achieved his goal, that even in ruin, Millwood continues the lasting legacy and testament to the man as a planter. However, in fact, the

---


remnants of this plantation are a lasting reminder of the brutal institution of slavery. The pillars that stand reflect an age of oppression.

The dissertation concludes with an exploration into what happened to these plantations during the Civil War. Although many of the planters who built these homes, like William Williams, John C. Calhoun and Wade Hampton II, were no longer living by the time the great conflict commenced, their legacies were ever present. Moreover, and most importantly, their homes still stood, which served as everlasting representations of this elite class. Many of these homes were exempt from the swath of destruction while others met with dire consequences. The challenges of the years of war led to loss on many levels, whether it was fine décor, furniture, lives or property in general.

These planters, who stood as the representatives incarnate of the slave-owning, cotton-producing Old South plantations, found themselves at the crossroads of a new order. Their world, their way of life and many of their possessions which had always defined them passed into oblivion. The wealth and prosperity of the cotton boom dramatically affected all aspects of southern life. Architecture too changed drastically. With a growing confidence that cotton prices would soar, albeit at times only temporarily, planters used their new sense of stability to build not just a functional home, but an opulent one as well. Georgia and South Carolina contained some of the most magnificent representations of Greek Revival architecture. In addition, these particular homes were filled with luxurious and striking interior furnishings. These plantation houses symbolized the owners themselves. Although these structures were few in number, they represented the extravagance of a new age, one that was distinctive from the era of rice and tobacco wealth. Thus these men defined themselves with these
possessions, all of which were available to them because of their slave labor. Although short lived, the lasting impressions of these magnificent homes and their interior decorations stood as a testament to the myth of a Southern aristocracy and prosperity.

Each and every one of these homes, filled with its luxuries and surrounded by cotton producing lands, was a symbol of their owners. These upcountry planters opted to use Greek Revival as their architectural style, which had great significance. With the legacy of this architectural design as their basis, they were able to assert themselves to the forefront of the planter class. These upcountry planters sought to differentiate themselves from all others who built Greek Revival structures. Through their desire and efforts, they attained success.

When the era came to a close, it was done with an air of certitude, so that it would not resurface. The design of their world collapsed in 1864 and 1865, as many of these planters lost most of their prized possessions and in some instances, their venerated Greek Revival homes. Furthermore and most importantly, these men no longer controlled vast productive properties based on slave-generated labor. Many of these men and their families, maintained their prestige, but not as masters of slave run cotton lands. Though the plantation system would continue in a form, it would never again be one maintained through the labor of chattel slavery and directed by a class of planter elite who dominated Southern society, culture and politics.
CHAPTER ONE: GREEK REVIVAL ARCHITECTURE
Architectural styles in the United States tend to follow the trends found in Europe. Although the designs used in America were not unique per se, structures took on their own special interpretations. This was especially true of the Greek Revival format. Steeped in the historical traditions of ancient Greece, this nineteenth century representation sought to embody the legacy left behind by this former glorious civilization. The southern cotton planter aristocracy embraced this concept and molded an architectural style to conform to the needs of the slave-generated wealth that they had accumulated. More specifically, the upcountry cotton planters of Georgia, North Carolina and South Carolina adopted the Greek Revival to be symbolic of their planter class.

Greek architecture, particularly that of temples, is geometrically precise. A carefully planned use of line and structure brought forth a perfect proportionality. As builder Alexander Jackson Downing proclaimed in his The Architecture of Country Houses, “…the purest of Greek architecture…are at once highly symmetrical and beautiful…” Each building was constructed for not only the aesthetic, but for the functional as well. Climatic conditions factored into the design. The intended purpose of the portico was to alleviate the burdens of ultraviolet rays, high temperatures and muggy conditions.

2 Downing, Country, p. 29.
Realities of ancient Greek architecture held truths for Southern buildings to come. Great monuments of the civilization’s heritage, like the Parthenon, brought attention to the status and eminence of Greek society and the government. The ability to place so much of the nation’s resources into the construction of such elaborate edifices helped to denote its societal superiority.

Although these great structures were appealing to the eye and served their designated purpose, many were deficient in their planning. Alluring in its appearance, the Parthenon was actually structurally inferior and contained numerous errors in its overall design. To construct the resplendent, inadequacies had to occur. Though flawed in
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structure, many of these markers have stood the test of time, though perhaps somewhat diminished by weather, war, and wear. Their survival is a reminder of the prominent legacy of the ancient Greece. This ideology transcended time and found its way into the American planter culture. The planters hoped to establish a lasting power and sought to leave a reminder of their reign.

As had been in the antediluvian empire of Greece, structures and landscapes stood as testament to the South’s prestige and endurance. Many peoples thereafter, especially embodied by the Southern planter elite, embodied this ideology. The lure of the legacy of ancient Greece and her heritage was a strong one. Archibald Alison, in his contribution to the 8 January 1846 edition of Nashville, Tennessee’s *The Daily Orthopolitan* proclaimed “the taste of Athens continued to distinguish its people long after they had ceased to be remarkable for any other or more honorable quality…to this day the lovers of art flock…to the Acropolis, and dwell with rapture on its unrivalled beauties…” The great buildings of Greece held great aesthetic appeal, radiating both beauty and power. This efforts of the Southern planter class actualized this legacy.

The planter class further evolved their ideologies and concepts about Greece, designating themselves as a modern representation of sorts. The framework of the ancient realm was seen as rigidly structured and organized. Southern high society, too,

---


placed itself at the zenith of societal order as well as the model for maintenance of a semblance of peacefulness and harmony. The independent dominion maintained on a plantation was seen as the true embodiment of Plato’s ideal structuring of government and society.  

Planners embraced the logic that leaders were the most concerned about national interests, an ideology found in Plato’s writings. The library shelves of the great planters included Plato’s works, particularly The Republic, along with many other classics penned by the celebrated masters. These men studied the classics with great vigor, learning from the ancient ideals. The individual who “governs” does so embodying all that is their civilization. The planter’s life was dependent upon the successful workings of his plantation and thus he was concerned with all aspects of its operations. In The Republic, Plato espoused that the leader “…rules those who are really simple and just, while they serve their ruler’s interests because he is stronger than they, and his subjects promote his happiness to the complete exclusion of their own.” This was an ideology embodied by the planter, a concept that transcended time and made its way into the nineteenth-century world. Following this line of thought, the planter could claim that he was helping the African and African-American slave survive by enlightening his

---


10Margaret L. Coit, John C. Calhoun: American Portrait (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1950), p. 383. Ms. Coit cited Calhoun’s book list as found in Clemson College Papers. In contacting the reference librarian at Clemson University, he told me that this list was no longer available. This book was also on the shelf of James Henry Hammond’s Redcliffe.


“…inferior” status. The planter and slave maintained a unique relationship with each other, one in which the master believed he was aiding the slave, guiding him through what would be an unproductive life without this much needed assistance. Not surprisingly, many slaves were appalled by this ideology but they were forced to acquiesce. Slave owners were cognizant that they needed to keep their chattel inferior in order to profit; in addition, they needed the system to propagate. There was a challenge in acceptance of their slaves’ inferiority, however. Slaveholders did acknowledge that their chattel was more than just property. As Walter Johnson claimed in his *River of Dark Dreams: Slavery and Empire in the Cotton Kingdom* (2013) that “slaveholders were fully cognizant of slaves’ humanity—indeed, they were completely dependent upon it.” Ultimately, this was ironic since planters maintained that chattel were property. Hence, these planters’ thoughts were convoluted. Slaves had to produce for their masters in multiple ways. Edward E. Baptist discussed the planters’ recognition of their need for the growth of slavery in his *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery And The Making Of American Capitalism* (2014). He mentioned that slavers
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equated “…slavery’s expansion with its prosperity, with the growth of their own wealth and power…”\textsuperscript{16} Thus, slavery needed to be a self-perpetuating system.

Ancient Greece found its place in the dominion of the southern cotton planter, in the political, social and architectural realms. Ideologies and theories shared in Plato’s \textit{The Republic} were ones that the upcountry cotton planter applied to his life. The essence of the big house was of great significance to the planter. Technically, it embodied all that the man was and how he hoped that the world would perceive him. The plantation house was also symbolic of the South. Though perhaps some architectural styles were used both north and south of the Mason-Dixon line, those in the South stood as the embodiment of the slave holding, planter aristocracy-dominating world that guided the thoughts, practices and actions of this distinct region of the country. In his 1969 article “The Plantation House: An Analogical Image”, Guy A. Cardwell expanded on these concepts, while looking at the plantation home in terms of both historical and literary perspectives. Cardwell assessed:

\begin{quote}
these actual mansions, like the houses in Southern fiction, occupied a central position in a series of linked analogies. Each plantation aimed at being more-or-less self supporting little worlds modeled after some ideal on the order of Plato’s republic [sic]. The plantation house was a dramatic center; it brought everything to a focus.\textsuperscript{17}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{16}\textit{Baptist, Half}, p. 346.

\textsuperscript{17}\textit{Cardwell, “Analogical,”} p. 5.
Temples were one of the key structures that dominated the skyline of ancient Greek city-states, particularly that of Athens. The structure built was a consecrated place with the purpose of providing a haven for the specified deity or at least as a locale from whence to conduct homage.\textsuperscript{18} People ventured to these temples for guidance and as a means of attaining assurance from a force that was beyond their control in order to answer their needs. Comparatively in the nineteenth century, the planter and his home served in a similar capacity. Planters offered a variety of types of assistance, financial as well as in terms of advice, to their neighbors, particularly those of lower economic standing. People came to their plantation homes in order to attain this guidance.\textsuperscript{19}

Many aspects of these piedmont cotton planters’ plantation homes and properties were the embodiment of the legacy of ancient Greece. These vast columned homes stood as testaments to the planter as well as this exalted ancient civilization. E. T. Shaffer proclaimed in his classic \textit{Carolina Gardens} of Manning’s Milford plantation that it “…linked the life of the Old South with a glory that was Greece…”\textsuperscript{20}

Greek Revival architecture served as a rejoinder to the simplistic, nationalist style found with the preceding era’s structural design. This Southern antebellum version derived its roots not from Americana but from the historical legacy left from when Pericles ruled over Athens. Steeped in the religious heritage of the pantheon of mythological Greek gods, the edifices constructed to their honor reflected the


\textsuperscript{19}Collins, \textit{White Society}, p. 37.

undercurrents of monumental power. With Greece serving as the representative, the plantation house built in the Revival format epitomized these notions.\textsuperscript{21} Optimism expressed through Greek Revival infused a promise of a great American empire, like that of the glorious antediluvian civilizations.\textsuperscript{22} Ancient Greece was also imbued with a tradition held dear to the Southern planters, that of slavery. The institution of involuntary servitude, deemed as the “corner-stone” by South Carolinian James Henry Hammond, was reflected both in the ideals espoused in ancient Greece and the antebellum southern United States.\textsuperscript{23}

This architectural style found its place in America initially in the North, specifically in Philadelphia.\textsuperscript{24} Public structures were the initial ones built in this design. Gradually, prosperous individuals embraced this style for their private domiciles. The motivations as to why this style took hold in the United States were not clear. Nationalism, democratic trends, warfare, and culture were concepts cited as incentives, yet there was not one decisive impetus.

Scholarship is inconsistent about the ultimate motivation behind the growth of Greek Revival in America. There have been claims that it was a result of the struggle


\textsuperscript{22}Peck, “Parlor,” p. 239.


\textsuperscript{24}Mills Lane, \textit{Architecture of the Old South: Louisiana} (Savannah, Georgia: A Beehive Press Book, 1997), p. 96.
by the Greeks to overthrow the reigns of the Turks.\textsuperscript{25} However, W. Barksdale Maynard challenged this theory in his contribution to Keith L. Eggener’s edited work \textit{American Architectural History} (2004). He offered that “…the endlessly quoted linkage…” of Greek Revival “…with the Greek War for Independence seems to be based on little or no documentation.”\textsuperscript{26} As there is no decisive, cohesive impetus on the part of Americans who employed this architectural design, one can only speculate as to the true meaning of this style and make the assumption that it was a personal choice.

The essence of Greek architecture allowed for interpretation. In sharp contrast to the formal styles of the preceding era, the new ornate detailing heightened emotional expression. Although previous architectural styles were not completely overlooked, a new measure of class and status came forth to represent the owners.\textsuperscript{27} Greek Revival homes stood as depictions, or interpretations, of classical temples. Following the traditional manner, the pillars upholding the front pediment reflected the various orders. Replicating the standard orders, such as the ornate Corinthian and the basic Doric, or even the Roman style of Tuscan, that meshed two distinct foundations together, the colonnades accentuated and enhanced the stylistic interpretations. Other structural and design variations were implicated on the columns, straying from the simple rounded model.\textsuperscript{28} In addition to the historical foundations, the porticoed house functioned as a

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{25}Gelernter, \textit{Cultural}, p. 133.
  \item \textsuperscript{27}Hamlin, \textit{Account}, p. 188.; Benjamin Henry Latrobe, \textit{The Journal of Latrobe} (New York: Appleton and Company, 1905), p. 139.
  \item \textsuperscript{28}Linley, \textit{Catalog}, pp. 99 and 105.; Perkerson, \textit{Columns in Georgia}, p. 6.; Oliver P. Smith, \textit{Domestic Architecture: Comprising a series of original designs for rural and ornamental cottages} (Buffalo: Derby & Co.,
measure of protection from the potent ultraviolet rays. Weather and temperature were big factors in the design and selection of architectural styles.

The evolution of Greek Revival architecture in United States required many different facets. One such component revolved around the knowledge of Greek structures and forms. Archaeological excavations enabled architects to learn from their findings and reconstruct their own interpretations of the structures of antiquity. But Greek Revival architecture was far more than just a facsimile of the original structures themselves. Thomas U. Walter, the fourth architect of the U.S. Capitol, expressed this in a 1 January 1841 article in *The Journal of The Franklin Institute* proclaiming “the Popular idea that to design a building in Grecian taste is nothing more than to copy a Grecian building, is altogether erroneous…” This was but one attempt to dispel the myth that what was being built was merely a duplication. With great zeal, architects across the nation sought to create their own version of these ancient temples. Americans embarked on the creation of their own Grecian format.

The 19th century upcountry cotton planters wanted to differentiate themselves from earlier masters. Cotton was their crop; the successful growth of cotton done


29Lane, Romantic, p. 8.


through slave labor had generated a source of wealth for them.34 With their own crop, these planters wanted to display their independence through a different architectural style. They sought to represent their stature and affluence through a permanent means. With prosperity came the desire to portray one’s wealth and status. The house was among the most substantial and eternal of possessions through which the planter could display the perpetual reminder of his power. Large in size and grand in appearance, the big house stood as a measure of many things. The essence of its style, that of Grecian (Greek Revival), provided great depth to its overall meaning. Ancient Greece had been a tremendous as well as an enduring power, one that the Southern planter aspired to emulate and imitate.35 Grecian structures left a distinguished legacy, a recollection of the prestige of the glorious era, as represented in their architecture. It was the aspiration of the planter class to follow this model, yet never allow their civilization to succumb to another authority. Cotton planters bound themselves to this architectural style for many reasons. There was solace in the vestiges of ancient Greece.

Though not all architects readily embraced this style, the publication of certain written material gave impetus to the explosion of Greek Revival architecture in America and Europe. The most prolific work that had the greatest impact was written in five comprehensive volumes over a period of sixty-eight years (1762-1830). Based upon their own personal observations and explorations, James Stuart and Nicholas Revett helped bring the architecture of ancient Greece to life in their series The Antiquities of
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34 Lacy K. Ford, Deliver Us from Evil: The Slavery Question in the Old South (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), kindle edition (no page numbers are visible).

Published in England, these monographs made their way across the ocean to America, but were available only at a high price.

Technically Stuart and Revett were not the first to publish the findings from their personal excavations of Greek sites. Their practices inspired others and hastened them to claim the notoriety of being the trendsetter of modernizing Greek architecture. Impassioned by the prospect of revealing the splendor of this temple form, Julien-David Le Roy (Le Roi) conducted his own research and produced *Le ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grece* (1758), hoping to attain the accreditation for giving impetus to this new style.37

Though LeRoy’s book preceded those published by Stuart and Revett, it was *The Antiquities of Athens* series that inspired architects in England and the United States to try to capture the essence of ancient Greece. Stuart and Revett set the precedent for the great Greek style architectural books. With this impetus, others set out to produce similar works, among them Stephen Riou’s *The Grecian Order Of Architecture, Delineated and Explained from the Antiquities of Athens*. Riou published this work soon after the release of the first volume of *The Antiquities of Athens,* closely following along the trends established by Stuart and Revett.38

---


38Stephen Riou’s work, published in 1768, has proven difficult to find. There appears to be relatively few existing copies in the United States. Although the Library of Congress lists the book in their holdings, searches in the General Reading Rooms, Rare Book Reading Room and Folios proved futile. No staff member, after conducting multiple lengthy searches, from any of these locations was able to locate the book.
The Stuart and Revett books were aesthetically appealing, filled with landscape portraits with the structures as they had stood and in partial decay, as they appeared when these men made their observations. In addition to these works were pen and ink sketches of architectural features of the various structures as well as of the plans. *Volume The Second*, published initially in 1787, highlighted the Temple of Minerva – the Parthenon. Stuart and Revett included in their description the key figures who enabled the construction of the monumental temple, that of Pericles, Callicrates, Ictinus and Phidas.39 Included in this study are the evaluations made by previous explorers, particularly that of Sir George Whaler and Dr. Jacob Spon. In the late 17th century when these men arrived in Athens, the Parthenon looked similar to its original appearance. Their accounts detailed the Venetian attack in 1687 that effectively diminished the temple’s overall composition and appearance.40 Stuart and Revett incorporated Whaler and Spon’s findings with that of their own personal observations as to ascertain many of their conclusions about the ancient Greek architecture.

Although Stuart and Revett found some of their predecessors’ discoveries helpful, there were those that they met with disdain. They assailed Sir William Chambers’ assessments, proclaiming that they had “…so little foundation in real

39James Stuart, FRS and FSA, And Nicholas Revett, Painters And Architects, *The Antiquities Of Athens, Volume The Second* (New York and London: Benjamin Blom, 1968) [reprint of London: John Nichols, MDCCCLXXXVII], p. 1. It has proved a difficult task to view the original copies of these works. At the Library of Congress, they were unable to provide these original volumes to me in the various reading rooms, although they are in the catalog. In searching for original copies, I came across one location, a book dealer who is selling the five volumes, which retail for $37,338.60. Few libraries hold even the reprinted versions of the books. Of the libraries that do have the title on their records, many do not have all five volumes.

40Stuart and Revett, *Second*, p. 3.
Julien-David Le Roy (Le Roi) was not exempt from such criticism either. Stuart and Revett challenged his surveying appraisals of structures early in their *Volume The Third*, claiming that he erred in his assessments.\footnote{Stuart and Revett, *Third*, p. viii.}

*The Antiquities of Athens* series was resplendent with its vivid imagery, transporting the reader to the sites of these architectural masterpieces. The drawings of the temples were done with great precision, so as to delineate the detailed craftsmanship in the pediments, cornices, columns and other parts of the structures. The various depictions as well as plans of the different temples, such as the Parthenon and the Temple of Thesus, helped to represent the overall essence of ancient Greek architecture.\footnote{Stuart and Revett, *Second*, pp. 9, 10 and 11.; Stuart and Revett, *Third*, pp. 5 and 6.} It was from these drawings that many American architects drew their inspiration and gained impetus for the Greek Revival house. In viewing these drawings, one can see the transformation of the Greek temple into the cotton plantation big house, stunning with its columns and pediment. Though James Stuart and Nicholas Revett’s books were not the sole texts published in the 18th and 19th centuries that highlighted ancient Grecian architecture, their influence appeared to have the most profound effect.\footnote{Lane, *Romantic*, p. 8.}

The initial pattern books used by American architects, builders and carpenters were all from abroad, thus making them all the more costly. Many who learned this...
trade did so at the hands of studying these valuable sources.\textsuperscript{45} However, in 1818, Philadelphian John Bioren published the nation’s initial pattern book. In his defining work \textit{The Builder’s Assistant Containing The Five Orders Of Architecture, for the Use of Builders, Carpenters, Masons, Plasters, Cabinet Makers and Carvers}, the foreign-born John Haviland helped introduce Americans to the column orders, which are so critical to the Grecian style.\textsuperscript{46}

This work indoctrinated American architects, designers and builders to produce their own guide books. Various architectural books flooded the market with both plates of stylistic options as well as personal treatises by the architect himself on the relevance and significance of these styles. Asher Benjamin, a New England builder, designed various guides in order to provide guidance in designing buildings and houses. It was not until the sixth edition of his \textit{The American Builder’s Companion} (1827) however, that he truly brought to light all the details and finery of Greek Revival architecture. His emphasis on the column orders is completed by the mythological-historical stories that motivated the designation for each.\textsuperscript{47} Benjamin’s work also provided plates along with the mechanics of how to construct the various components of the modern Grecian adapted architectural style.

\textsuperscript{45}Letter, B. Henry Latrobe to Robert Mills, 12 July 1806, Robert Mills Papers, Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division.


Another influential book published and used in the United States was Andrew Jackson Downing’s final contribution to the field. In his *The Architecture Of Country Houses* (1827), Downing succinctly lays out the relevance of a fine and permanent home. He commenced by pointing out that “…a good house…is a powerful means of civilization.” The planter class clearly embodied this notion. The Greek Revival home, their specified choice of architectural style, was a symbol of their world, their power, their lifestyle. Downing went on to further his thesis, citing that “…the individual home has a great social value for a people” as well as that “…there is moral influences in a country home…” Granted Downing himself was no advocate of the upcountry planters’ favorite style. He believed it served a limited purpose though it was tasteful in its application. However, his expression about the relevance of the house itself was found firmly planted in the ideology of these men of the South.

Interestingly, Downing makes reference to, as he states in *The Architecture of Country Houses*, “…another hand” and commentary of Greek architecture made by this unidentified person. “Again, we have the pure Greek temple…This can be used in a special way (having its individual expression). It is the most simple, rational, and harmoniously elegant style…” His commentary is furthered by stating “buildings which have but one object, and which require one expression of that object, cannot be built in
a style better adapted to convey the single idea of their use than in the Grecian temple form."\textsuperscript{53}

Column orders were one of many features of ancient Greek architecture presented in these texts. The column orders of Greece found a significant home in the Revival style. Starting with the most modest and unadorned style, the Doric brought forth a smooth or straight capital appearance. This antiquated column style is the most traditional of all the orders. Its volute classifies the Ionic order, a slightly more ornate feature not found in the previously stated style. Thirdly, and last of the true Greek line, is the Corinthian. The most elaborate and adorned in form, it is enhanced with the curvature found in the tips of the sculpted acanthus leaves.\textsuperscript{54} Asher Benjamin, in his \textit{The American Builder's Companion}, proclaimed that “the Corinthian order is proper for all buildings, where elegance, gaiety and magnificence are required…”\textsuperscript{55} In many instances, the upcountry cotton planters used this type of column to adorn their plantation homes. Nathaniel F. Potter clearly specified that he planned to use the Corinthian order for the pillars at the entrance of John L. Manning’s plantation, Milford.\textsuperscript{56}

At a later point, another column order was added, though not considered to be a traditional Greek style. The Tuscan, created from a fusion of Greek and Roman orders,

\textsuperscript{53}Downing, \textit{Country}, p. 22.


\textsuperscript{55}Benjamin, \textit{Builder’s}, p. 35.

\textsuperscript{56}Potter, “Specifications.”
was used infrequently, particularly in the American structures.\textsuperscript{57} In addition to Benjamin’s work, another Northern architect/designer composed some of the other influential guides for this era. Minard Lafever’s books, \textit{The Modern Builder’s Guide} and \textit{The Beauties of Modern Architecture}, both penned in the antebellum era, had a tremendous influence on architectural design and composition.\textsuperscript{58} Mills Lane evaluated these men in many of the monographs in his \textit{Architecture of the Old South} series. In his \textit{Architecture of the Old South: South Carolina} (1984), he contended that “…Lafever’s designs were more elegant than Benjamin’s, more complicated, expensive and used less often…”\textsuperscript{59}

Greek “fever” took a strong hold over American architects as well as their employers. Although not all embraced this modernized version of the ancient style, its popularity rapidly exploded on the American scene. Benjamin Henry Latrobe, one of the architects of the Capitol building in Washington, DC, himself proclaimed, “I am a bigoted Greek in the condemnation of the Roman architecture…the Grecian style can be copied without impropriety…”\textsuperscript{60} Although many of Latrobe’s works were public structures, he recognized how defining the Greek Revival edifice was of its proprietor. When reflecting upon one such bank, he claimed that it was “…a pure specimen of Grecian simplicity in design, and Grecian permanence in execution, the existence and

\textsuperscript{57}Smith, \textit{Domestic}, pp. 19.


The columns, the pediments and facades signified the emergence of a new distinction in architectural style. Soon, American streets included public structures of the Greek Revival form. Greek Revival rapidly became the favored style initially for judicial and governmental structures. Two prominent examples of this are the United States Capitol and the South Carolina State House, both of which, at points, had plans, though perhaps not truly under consideration, that incorporated slaves into the architectural design. The architectural plans for both structures underwent many changes. The U.S. Capitol extension plan of 1853, as designed by United States Army Captain Montgomery C. Meigs, called for pediments to define the new wings being added to the original structure. This commenced a careful search for the appropriate symbols designated for placement in the pediments, particularly amidst the mounting tension within the nation.

In 1855, abolitionist Henry Kirke Brown was the first sculptor to send design plans to Montgomery C. Meigs for the pediment of the House of Representatives wing. In his proposal, the central figure was the female embodiment of America, who dwarfed all other symbols of this country. Among those images was that of a slave atop a bale

---


of cotton, the so-called “Thinking Negro.” Meigs advised Brown to remove this sculpture from his pediment upon the initial submission of this plan. The tone of the nation as a whole could not tolerate such a figure gracing its national capitol that stood in the District of Columbia, which was so precariously geographically located between North and South. Henry Kirke Brown would, however, find acceptance for his slave sculpture from a small audience.

Architectural plans for the new South Carolina State House were similar to the end product that stands today in Columbia. There was one major difference found in the plans for the pediment not included in the final product. Hired to sculpt two medallions to adorn the Capitol in order to honor two of her native sons, Henry Kirke Brown moved to South Carolina in 1859. The men of power within the state, pleased with his work upon completion, then called upon him to extend his stay in the Palmetto

---


67Due to the advents of secession and the attack on Fort Sumter, the state began using her financial resources for other means and had to suspend work on the Capitol building. See: Letter, R. W. Gibbs to Henry Kirke Brown, 13 May 1861, Henry Kirke Bush-Brown Papers, Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division.

state so that he could to produce a pediment.69 Once again Brown would have a chance to create a pediment in which he could place the true representations of the region. Upon the submission of his plans in 1860, Brown received a favorable response from the leaders of the state, like the “…Hampton’s [sic], Manning’s [sic]…”70 It was the great leaders from the planter class who granted their ascensions to the pediment design. Much like their Greek Revival homes that had been built as a result of slave labor, their Capitol would now stand as a testament that Greek Revival and slavery were bound together. Both Wade Hampton II and John L. Manning resided in Greek Revival homes; now their capitol building would be a reflection of their homesteads in the usage of this same architectural style.

Originally the fronton was to be carved with different representations of the state. “…Hope, Justice and Liberty…” were central to the pediment, flanked by slaves laboring in the fields and moving cotton bales. Rice and cotton, the derivations of great wealth in the Palmetto State, and the bonds people who produced them, filled the majority of the gable. In the farthest corners was a slave on each side, who was in a relaxed, or a “lazy,” position.71 Plans to have slaves sculpted in the United States Capitol had been
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71 Letter, Johnson M. Mundy to Mary E. Mundy, 20 February 1861, Johnson M. Mundy Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Letter, Jno. Niernsee to H. K. Brown, 19 Jan. 1860, Henry Kirke Bush-Brown Papers, Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division.; John M. Bryan, Creating the South Carolina State House (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999), pp. 52-53.; Image, “The New State House, The Capital Of South Carolina – From a Sketch By Our Special Artist,” Frank Leslie’s Illustrated Newspaper, 17 August 1861, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division. (The pediment, however, is not clearly detailed in this sketch.) Photographs, Design for Pediment, State House, South Carolina, Right Hand Fragment and Left Hand Fragment, Henry Kirke Bush-Brown Papers, Manuscripts Division, Vol V: 1333 A, 1369 A and 1369B.; In the sixth issue of Confederate currency (April 1863-February 1864), one of the $10 bills (T304) also used an image of
previously rejected, but the Greek Revival South Carolina State House was to have her source of her wealth, her slaves, as prominent fixtures on the building. These figures, images of this institution and symbols of their labors, were not to be hidden within the context of the pediment; they were to be on prominent display. Each was to stand roughly ten feet in height.

In intermixing the artistic images of these distinctly opposite ideologies of freedom, equity and bondage, together in one scene helped to portray the ideology espoused by the planter class that these ideals were harmonious and congruent. It was with their assent that this pediment was to be sculpted and carved, the Capitol forever bearing the institution of slavery. This would be one of their great symbols to help emphasize the righteousness of this institution. Though Brown’s goal was to show slavery in a monument, his motivation was perhaps not quite the same as the planters. However, when this symbol of Southern wealth and power was finally to be put in place, it found its way to grace a Greek Revival structure. Thus the association of this architectural style and the institution of chattel slavery were confirmed and were to be on public display for the entire world to view. Though this had long been shown before

---

72 Bryan, Creating, pp. 48-49.; Savage, Standing, pp. 32, 35 and 36.
by the cotton planters’ columned porticoed houses, the state Capitol would further cement the union of Greek Revival and slavery.

The Greek Revival State House for South Carolina as designed was not to be, however, for the advent of the planning for and commencement of the Civil War brought a change in the allotment of funds within the state. With construction halted, the vision of the building with slaves embedded in the pediment too would be terminated. Architect Henry Kirke Brown had believed that the structure, upon completion, would be “…the finest building in the country not excepting the new Capitol at Washington.” Ultimately war brought a drastic alteration to these plans. The empty shell of the State House was all that would stand for the next few years. The pediment, as so designed to include slaves, would pass into a distant memory, mostly forgotten by history as well.

In 1860, the cotton planter class found another tie binding them and their institution of chattel slavery to Greek Revival architecture. When the South Carolina secession convention met for the first time on 17 December 1860, the delegates met at the First Baptist Church in Columbia. Although secession was not

---

77 Letter, James Jones to Governor Pickens, 28 April 1861, James Jones Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

78 Letter, Johnson M. Mundy to Mary E. Mundy, 20 February 1861, Johnson M. Mundy Papers. South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

officially declared there, the initial meeting took place in a symbolic structure – that of a majestic brick Greek Revival building.\textsuperscript{80}


Greek Revival and slavery seemed to be inherently tied together. The connotations of this architectural style were intrinsically different to Southerners than its significance to their fellow Americans. To the men of wealth and power of the South, the institution that gave them their status found relevance, perhaps an interpretation, in this architectural style.\textsuperscript{81}

\textsuperscript{80} Ordinance of Secession, South Carolina Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Personal observations of the historical displays in the interior and the exterior of the First Baptist Church, 1306 Hampton Street, Columbia, S.C.; When Sherman’s armies converged on the city on 17 February 1865, the soldiers sought out this structure. A sexton directed the troops to another church, in an effort to save this building.

In the private sector, George Hadfield put his architectural training to work for plans for a member of the initial first family, effectively incorporating Greek Revival into the southern architectural style. Years after the passing of his mother, George Washington Parke Custis commissioned the British architect to draw plans for his Virginia home. Recognized as the preeminent classical piazza in a Southern place of residence, Arlington (commonly known as the Custis-Lee Mansion) embodied the heritage of ancient Greek design. Thus began the 19th century architectural pursuit of fusing the Greek style into the homestead.

Though Hadfield brought the architectural style to the South in general, it was two other men who helped to fuse it on to the scene of the particular region of the easterly realm of the American South. William Jay and Robert Mills were credited for truly molding this style to conform to the needs and wishes of prominent individuals of this region. It would be in this area of the country that the great pillared cotton plantation homes were erected. Jay and Mills gave impetus to this style through their designs of city/town structures for many of the prominent families of the South as well as the state of South Carolina. Robert Mills’ built his initial Greek Revival structure in the Palmetto State in the low country. In the First Baptist Church of Charleston, Mills

---


believed he had created the quintessential Greek Revival building, having meticulously followed the true Greek temple symmetry and arrangement.\textsuperscript{84}

Among many of the great works constructed under Mills’ tutelage, the Ainsley Hall mansion in Columbia, South Carolina, epitomized all that Greek Revival architecture was to embody. Four majestic Ionic pillars that were crowned by a pediment graced the façade of the structure.\textsuperscript{85} Though many of Mills’ Greek Revival contributions were found in public structures, this is but one of his prominent private edifices.

Greek Revival was not only used in public structures as well as town houses but found itself used greatly by the upcountry planter class. Not all Greek Revival plantation homes were built specifically in that particular architectural style. As Greek Revival became more popular and began to stand as a symbol of this socio-economic class, many modified their existing structures. The addition of columns and a pediment transformed Federal style homes, much like Fort Hill, the home of John C. Calhoun.\textsuperscript{86} Fairntosh, one of the Cameron family’s North Carolina plantation homes, was modified into a Greek Revival structure through the adjoining of a columned veranda. This transformed the overall appearance and character of the home.\textsuperscript{87} Throughout the upcountry South, plantation houses were constructed in the Greek Revival form,

\begin{flushright}

\textsuperscript{85}Historic American Buildings Survey, Ainsley Hall House, South Carolina.

\textsuperscript{86}J. Whitney Cunningham, “South Carolina Architecture,” Maverick and Van Wyke Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division, pp. 11-12.

\textsuperscript{87}Letter, Jean Cameron Syme to Mary Anderson, 31 May 1827, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.
\end{flushright}
whether modified or built in the true architectural style. Wade Hampton II painstakingly transformed his modest residence into one of the most magnificent Greek Revival homes of the era, one that was legendary for its beauty and grandeur.88

The American architects who built these planters’ mansions found themselves reliant upon the aforementioned various guide books produced here and abroad. For example Nathaniel F. Potter, whose works included the Charleston Hotel as well as Milford, John L. Manning’s plantation, readily acknowledged his use of these instructional books. In his “Specifications for a House to be Built in Sumpter [sic] district, South Carolina, for John L. Manning Esq.,” Potter concluded the formal written specifications with “all the above plates referenced to are from Lafever’s Modern Architecture of 1835.”89

Private letters, diaries and the account books of these planters, however, did not always fully disclose the architect used to draft the plans for the homes nor do they always reveal the selected design books. In researching this aspect, at times, one can only speculate as to the resources used, based upon other architectural and design examples. For instance, Redcliffe “…was designed and planned by the General himself, and constructed by mechanics under his direction.”90

As Roger G. Kennedy pointed out in his Greek Revival America (2010),

the largest, most ambitious, and most

88Irving, “Sporting.”
89Potter, “Specifications.”
90“Editorial Correspondence,” Charleston Courier.
sophisticated houses built during Greek Revival…
are known to us by the names of the their owners,
not their architects…it does indicate that the
American Greek Revival was the social and
political statement of a popular state of feeling…\(^91\)

He furthered this thought by proclaiming that “Greek Revival was a statement of
power.”\(^92\) These statements are significant as clearly who designed these homes was
relatively insignificant. It was the man, who at the whims of his mastery over enslaved
humans, built these mansions. Lost in the details was the fact that it was the people
held in bondage were ultimately responsible for these Greek Revival homes.

Cotton planters in the upcountry of Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina
particularly took to this great architectural style. As cotton brought a sort of
permanency, the planters opted to remain on their tracts of land instead of moving from
their worn lands. It was on these lands that they built these pillared mansions, which
marked their place in this world. These planters intended this world to last, with their
families residing in their Greek Revival plantation homes, guiding society. The Greek
Revival mansion was symbolic of the wealth obtained by the planter through the slave
cultivated cotton crop as well as the image he tried to portray. It was allegorical of the
planter’s financial status, his cultural and political standing but most importantly, as a
master of slaves. This ideology had been entrenched in ancient Greek society; it found

\(^{91}\)Kennedy, Revival, p. 14.

\(^{92}\)Kennedy, Revival, p. 23.
a place in the American South as well. These upcountry planters particularly formed an attachment to this architectural style.

As Roger G. Kennedy assessed in his 1985 monograph, *Architecture, Men, Women And Money In America 1600-1860*, the planters, particularly John C. Calhoun, found their essence, their way of life in a world that was not to last, within these Greek Revival plantation houses. Kennedy went on to espouse that “…to the southern reasoning and to the southern architecture of the time, there clings a scent of desperation …”\(^{93}\) Further expanding on the inherent tie of architectural style and slavery, Kennedy stated that “…each house expressed an anxious supremacy over the passions of each owner…”\(^{94}\)

The transition to the growth of a shorter fiber cotton gave planters the opportunity to locate their plantations away from the low country. Thus upcountry Georgia and South Carolina became “…the first great short-staple cotton region.”\(^{95}\) The men who opted to raise this crop in the upcountry embarked on this endeavor with aspirations of great returns. Not all attained great wealth and status, but there were men who did. Those who achieved planter status, as defined by a certain number of slaves, rose to the top of the social order. As Paul E. Johnson astutely proclaimed in *The Early American Republic: 1789-1829* (2007), that “plantation masters-both the southeastern nabobs and the cotton planters of newer regions-were the acknowledged economic,

---

\(^{93}\)Kennedy, *Men*, p. 345.

\(^{94}\)Kennedy, *Men*, p. 345.

\(^{95}\)P. Johnson, *Republic* p. 90.
social, cultural, and political elite of the South.\textsuperscript{96} Essentially, these planters dominated all aspects of society as well as their own lands. Yet this new generation of planters needed to provide a display of their status, one to differentiate themselves from their parents’ generation. The Greek Revival home was one such measure. It was representative of the wealth found among this new generation, both North and South. As this design made its way into the South, it gained significance among the cotton planter elite. As a final step to differentiate themselves from the low country, long-staple cotton planters, the upcountry planters constructed their homes in this architectural style, ultimately seeking to make it their own. Greek Revival soon after became recognized as the home of the upcountry cotton planter elite.

The Greek Revival house took on a unique role in the plantation South. Although this architectural style was found in both Europe and all over the United States, its tones reflected a unique status for those who reaped profits from the institution of chattel slavery. It became the icon of this labor practice, that of holding men in bondage, who cultivated cotton, as well as the successes generated for those who owned these individuals.\textsuperscript{97} In his \textit{Greek Revival America}, Kennedy asserted that “the slave-owning South had its own Greek Revival, different from that of the North and very different in implications.”\textsuperscript{98} This assessment could be taken to another level in that this architectural style in fact was emblematic of plantation slavery in the South while representative of industry in the North.

\textsuperscript{96}P. Johnson, \textit{Republic}, p. 90.

\textsuperscript{97}Gowans, \textit{Images}, p. 281.

\textsuperscript{98}Kennedy, \textit{Revival}, p. 5.
Even before Greek Revival took such a hold over the nation’s architects, T. Walter acknowledged that the essence of this style would morph itself into suiting the needs and images of particular institutions found within the nation.\textsuperscript{99} Occurring simultaneously with the commencement of the cotton boom, the thrust of this architectural style rapidly became associated with slave-generated wealth.\textsuperscript{100} Southern planters made the Greek Revival their own. Embodying the principles and legacies of this architectural style, they modified it to conform to the realm of the slave holding class.

Upcountry Georgia and Carolina cotton planters embraced this architectural style in their own way, attempting to differentiate themselves from the rice and indigo planters of the coastal regions. This architectural design became a measure of status for these men, for it marked them as being their own generation of planters, no longer using the Federal style of the previous era. Whether through modification or outright construction of a new home, the Greek Revival plantation house became symbolic of the upcountry Georgia, North Carolina and South Carolina cotton planter. These planters were knowledgeable of the ways of the ancient Greeks and embraced their practice of slavery. Planers were inherently bound to slavery, much like the ancients Greeks. Thus they chose a symbol of this ancient society, the temple, and modified it to serve as a representation of themselves. Although found in many parts of the country, this architectural style was a definite component of the life of the upcountry planter. This defined his status.


CHAPTER TWO: BUILDING OF GREEK REVIVAL PLANTATION HOUSES IN UP COUNTRY SOUTH CAROLINA

The planters' decision to build a house in the Greek Revival format was not one that was taken lightly. Before the construction of the big house, the planter took many factors, like the production of successive crops, into consideration. Some homes were built as new structures in this architectural style outright. Meanwhile, other houses were modified from their original architectural designs and then transitioned into a Greek Revival homestead. Making additions to the structure enabled the planters to go along with the trend of the times as well as with the style patronized by their fellow planters. The house was to be a lasting testament to the status of the man and his family a perpetual reminder of the power and prestige of the upcountry cotton planter.

Plantation life resembled a self-contained world. The planter attempted to be virtually self-reliant, and this helped to mold the type of man into whom the cotton planter evolved.¹ As John Townsend Trowbridge assessed in his The South, written

during the course of his excursion through the South in the aftermath of the Civil War, “the buildings of a first-class plantation form a little village by themselves.” In reality, planters were far from self-reliant. The world in which they built their plantations existed solely because of the slaves whose labor produced the crop, cotton, which generated their wealth and provided them with these fortunate lives. As Walter Johnson advocated in his Soul By Soul: Life Inside The Antebellum Slave Market (1999), “…every slaveholder lived through the stolen body of a slave.” The life of a slave was sacrificed to give the planter his authority. Johnson also astutely asserted that as “slaveholders became visible as farmers, planters, patriarchs, ladies, and so on, by taking credit for the work they bought slaves to do for them.” As a leader on the plantation itself as well as in the community and the state, his status as a man in power was clearly represented and defined.

One such means of enforcing this designation was through the house. The lands might have been familial with an existing structure upon them, but the Greek Revival house identified the antebellum cotton planter. In attempting to make himself unique from his predecessors, the upcountry cotton planter of this generation opted to define himself through the prestige and vigor of the Greek Revival structure. The Greek Revival home was a symbol of power and it was used to distinguish the upcountry planter. This generation of upcountry planters sought to use this style of architecture as
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3Baptist, Half, p. 118.; Glymph, Bondage, p. 49.
4Johnson, Soul, p. 214.
5Johnson, Soul, p. 102.
a means of independence. It freed them of the legacy of the previous planters so that they gained their own identity.

With the development of the Carolina prefecture in the seventeenth century, the English crown acquired fertile lands ripe for cultivation. The numerous rivers were duly noted in early documentation of the region, which provided prodigious promise of vast agronomy of water-born crops. In time, this all came to fruition. The great wealth of South Carolina was initially acquired from the production of crops like rice. Colonial and post-Revolutionary farmers cultivated this crop, from which many generated a healthy income. As Edward E. Baptist highlighted in his recent scholarship *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery And The Making Of American Capitalism* (2014) that "low-country Carolina planters were the richest elites in the revolutionary republic." Rice, however, gradually gave way to a new bumper crop around the time of the turn of the century. Planters soon found that wealth and prosperity were to be gained from cotton as well. The cotton gin was instrumental in this since it aided getting cotton to market more efficiently and expeditiously.

Different varieties of the fiber generated markets and proved to be regionally specific. The coastally grown variety, the “sea island” cotton, was of the greatest

---


7Baptist, Half, p. 4.

Although this long-grain cotton, as well as two other types, were cultivated, the most commonly grown variety was the “mulkeen” or “yellow” type. This was the cotton that was readily made into cloth and used within the home. It was from raising this variety of the fiber that some of the greatest wealth and plantations prospered.

Farmers and planters embraced cotton as their new future. As Lacy K. Ford emphasized in his *Deliver Us from Evil: The Slavery Question in the Old South* (2009), that cotton “…lured many…into staple production since cotton production required a much smaller capital outlay than rice or sugar.” Although rice was still cultivated along the waterways of the state, cotton eclipsed all other crops. By the early 19th century, many agriculturalists were planting the fiber, allowing those of the greatest land holdings to reap the highest rewards in the market place. Like many of the plantation crops, the cultivation and production of cotton was labor intensive, even with the use of the efficient cotton gin. Slaves were the essential work force, necessary for the planting, cultivation, picking and processing of the fiber. The need for more slaves to work the fields increased as more cotton was planted. Chattel property brought the

---


11Ford, *Deliver*, kindle edition (n.p.).


crops to fruition, thus allowing their owners to reap the financial rewards as well as, at times, the losses.

Many of the lands of the state were adequate enough to produce bountiful crops. Authorities on the planting and cultivation of this fiber advised the usage of particular types of earth in order to generate the most profit. Ground that was “…of deep and soft mold…” that was a mixture of “…the sandy and spongy…” was promoted as yielding the best outcome.\(^\text{14}\) South Carolina’s terrain was filled with a variety of soil types as well as vegetation, plant life and flora. By its nature, the state is divided into two distinct regions. The northern portion of the state, which incorporates the western area as well, is deemed the upcountry. Planters and farmers in this vicinity made their living off mostly subsistence crops, growing foodstuffs as well as harvesting their northern neighbors’ prime commodity, tobacco. With the rapid growth and cultivation of cotton, combined with the machinery that facilitated making the fiber market-ready, the economic conditions of South Carolina were transformed. Although rice still generated wealth, affluence and prosperity were gained through the growth of cotton. The low country bred moneyed and landed gentry who rose to prominence in the state, especially in the realms of government and economics. However, prosperity extended well beyond this portion of the state, for even those of the
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upcountry started to benefit from this flourishing crop.\(^{15}\) Powerful individuals emerged with vast wealth and prestige. Through booming crops, successful business transactions as well as through advantageous marriages, particular families began to exert great authority over the region and in the nation.

The Hampton family has long held a place of distinction in the state of South Carolina although familial legacies expanded far beyond these borders. Like many others who established themselves in the Carolinas, the Hampton family had initially settled in the Virginia colony, leaving behind their English gentility heritage that dated back from estimates ranging from the fourth to the eleventh century. Histories account William Hampton as being the first of the family to arrive in the New World, followed by the establishment of his estate Hamptonfield, although inconsistencies do exist, with claims of the Reverend Thomas Hampton as the initial family member to set foot on the American soil. Although these discrepancies in the genealogy are present, the family was definitely in Virginia by the 1630s.\(^{16}\) Thomas Hampton, Jr., who like his father served the Episcopal Church as a member of the cloth, had a grandson also named John Hampton, Jr., who united the Hamptons to the Wade family by his marriage, thus the significance of the name Wade. Of their progeny, two, in their own manner, left distinctive marks on the colony of South Carolina. Daughter Rosamund Hampton had


bound herself by the sacrament of marriage to William Winn of the Winn brothers, who founded Winnsboro. However, it was John and Margaret Hampton, Jr.’s son Anthony who would truly leave behind a more renowned legacy. Relocating to the region of Spartanburg before the commencement of the American Revolutionary War, Anthony Hampton and his children would firmly establish the place of the Hamptons in South Carolina. Although he fathered seven children, his son Wade Hampton I would rise to the most notable distinction.17

In 1775, the family suffered a severe tragedy. With the open western lands still inhabited by Native American tribes and the white settlers continually encroaching upon their terrain, hostilities were frequent occurrences. In an effort to come to terms with harmonious relations in the wake of the impending war with the British, a contingency of Cherokees met with two of Anthony Hampton’s sons. Although an amicable alliance had been reached, it had been concluded under false pretenses, since the Native Americans had already agreed to act on behalf of the Crown to cause havoc among the colonists.18 After the discussions had come to a close, warriors set out on a course of destruction in which the Hampton family was impacted. Tomahawks were used to kill four family members, including Anthony and his wife, while their home was burned. Those who survived the raid did so by hiding in the swamp, and one youth was taken to


18“Revolutionary,” Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
reside with the tribe until forced back unwillingly into white civilization in 1777. 19
Colonial militia under the leadership of Henry Hampton sought out these warriors and
exactted vengeance. Meanwhile, others sought out various Cherokee communities and
brought them to ruin. 20

In the years that followed, the five surviving sons went on to serve the colonies in
the Revolutionary War. One son, Wade Hampton I, earned distinction for his command
of a cavalry regiment under the leadership of Brigadier General Thomas Sumter. The
guerilla activities of these mounted soldiers were influential in the outcome of the war
fought in South Carolina, and Hampton was thereafter lauded for his actions. 21 With the
cessation of hostilities, the young officer went on to pursue an agricultural career but
later went on to serve in the War of 1812 as a one star general. 22 Even while serving
his country on the field of battle, Wade Hampton still placed great emphasis on his
home lands, leaving John Hopkins in charge of tending to the plantations and their
activities. 23

19A. Hampton, “Family,” p. 19.; “Revolutionary,” Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library,
Manuscripts Division.

20Letter, Commissioner Earl D. Church to Mrs. J. D. Landersilk, February 14, 1930, Hampton, Wade,
W10078 National Archives Microfilm Publication, M-804 Revolutionary War Pension and Bounty Land Warrant
(Sally) Strong Baxter Hampton Papers, South Carolina Library, Manuscripts Division.; “Revolutionary,”
Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; The Triad Architectural Associates
n.p.


22Laura Jervey Hopkins, Lower Richland Planters: Hopkins, Adams, Weston and Related Families of South
With the availability of cheap land readily available in the new state of South Carolina, Hampton expanded his holdings. His purchase of one thousand acres in 1789 added to land already owned, as well as the Richland County plantation Hampton was in possession of as a result of his marriage to his first wife (Mrs.) Martha Epps Howell, and it was upon these lands, near Mill Creek (Gill Creek), that Woodlands was constructed. With direct access to the Congaree River, this plantation was optimally situated. The house itself was modest in structure and appearance. Through the front door, an individual walked directly to a stairwell which was properly positioned in the center hall. Each floor had four rooms total, with the stairs serving as a dividing point. An attached service room, which was not part of the original construction, was placed off the rear section of the home. Like many residences of the era, the detached kitchen was in its own structure.

In September 1792, Wade Hampton I added an additional thousand acres to Woodlands, increasing his holdings to well over two thousand acres. On these lands various foodstuffs and indigo were cultivated; however, Hampton was among the first to risk undertaking the growth of a new agronomical crop - cotton. He saw great potential in cotton and hoped for a prosperous future, but the potential for success was

---


26 Land survey dated 7 July 1789 and deed dated 5 Sept. 1791, Wade Hampton Papers, M-871 (#871), microfilm reel 1 of 1, Southern Historical Collections, Manuscript Division, The University of North Carolina.
somewhat limited, since it was so labor intensive to generate a propitious cotton crop. With Eli Whitney's 1793 patent of a functional cotton gin, cotton became economically feasible to grow, cultivate and market with a fair return.\textsuperscript{27} Planters of the inland region of South Carolina, as well as Georgia and eventually North Carolina, saw a bright new future on the horizon with this crop. Accompanying this transition was an influx of more slaves.\textsuperscript{28} In 1799, Hampton was not only among the forerunners in South Carolina who employed a gin and generated a substantial profit within the year but was also the initial South Carolinian to use hydro-sources to operate this gin at Woodlands.\textsuperscript{29}

When the state capital transferred from Charleston to Columbia, opportunities presented themselves and Hampton sold primary land holdings at a profit. Many of the upcountry farmers deemed Charleston as not truly meeting their needs, nor serving their interests. Upcountry planters made a push for a capital that would be located geographically and culturally in the center of the state. In pursuit of a compromise, Revolutionary War veteran Senator John L. Gervais presented a new bill in 1786. The


state capital was to be moved to an undeveloped area located in the middle of the state. Both houses passed a bill situating the new capital “…on a tract of land two square miles, near Friday’s Ferry, on the Congaree River…” with the name Columbia in honor of Christopher Columbus and the spirit of opportunity. The new seat of government was formed in proximity to Wade Hampton I’s plantation. Land to build this new city was purchased from Hampton at a high cost. He reinvested these profits into equine assets. This commenced the Hampton family’s pursuit of the purchase and racing of horses of great bloodlines.

Wade Hampton I continued his quest in acquiring great land holdings in South Carolina as well as in other states that set the stage for long-term familial stability. Gradually he became one of the largest property owners comprising cotton and sugar cane lands, city residences, slaves, and prize racehorses. Through his success, his children were able to carry on the traditions of the southern plantation owner that he had established. The general’s eldest son Wade Hampton II and his youngest daughter Susan Francis Hampton both carried on this legacy and had magnificent structures built to serve as their main residences in their native state of South Carolina.


Following his second marriage to Harriet Flud, Wade Hampton I finally became a father. In 1791, Wade Hampton II was born, as the first of eight progeny. Spending his early years at Woodlands along with his siblings, he grew accustomed to the lifestyle that was afforded those of the planter class. Wade II spent his time on the lands and among the fine thoroughbreds that raced on the family’s private turf and gained a great appreciation of both.

Wade Hampton II was properly educated as was expected of the son of a respected planter. Though he opted not to finish his studies at South Carolina College, he turned his attention to the means that had made his father a wealthy man. From this point forward, with the only exception when serving in the War of 1812, Wade Hampton II was a master of plantation lands. All of his life’s endeavors stood as a measure of his standing as a member of this elite aristocratic class. His land holdings, possessions and property earned him the reputation of “…a noble representative of the best school and class of Carolina planter.”

---


36Bailey, et. al., Biographical, p. 654.; Account-Wade II, Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

37Obituary, Wade Hampton II, Charleston Daily Courier, 12 February 1858.
After the War of 1812, Wade Hampton II returned home and soon after married Ann FitzSimons, the daughter of the wealthy Christopher FitzSimons. In celebration of their nuptials, the FitzSimons gave Wade and Ann Hampton a plantation in Georgia. As a gift to the newlywed couple, General Wade Hampton I commissioned the construction of a home named Millwood adjacent to his Woodlands in Richland County. From its onset, this plantation was the sight of great social engagements and it was renowned for the luxurious accommodations and availability of gourmet foods provided for guests. Henry Junius Nott reveled in delight with his dinners with Wade Hampton II, stating “…it is not a bad country where one can…eat Scotch Salmon, pates foie gras,…not to mention the common things…” On a visit to Millwood, George Tattersall wrote “the Champagne Corks are flying up to the ceiling and…there are 3 noisy fellows playing at “vingt-un”…” But these were the accounts of the original version of Millwood, not the palatial estate into which it was transformed.

38 Wade Hampton II served General Andrew Jackson at the Battle of New Orleans. [See Virginia Clay-Copton, A Belle of the Fifties: Memoirs of Mrs. Clay, of Alabama, Covering Social and Political Life in Washington and the South, 1853-1866 (New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1905), p.213.] As stories account for, he was then sent on to ride to Washington, DC to bring the news of the victory.


40 Account –Wade Hampton II, Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; H. Hampton, “Hampton,” p. 1.; The brides parents had also given a gift, that of a plantation called Goodale along with its slaves.


42 Letter, George Tattersall to J. Harvey, Esq. of N.Y., 2 February 1837, George Tattersall Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
As Wade II continued his social ascendency, he modified his home accordingly. Impressed by the work done on the Charleston Hotel, Wade Hampton II employed one of these architects, Nathaniel Potter, who had worked with Charles F. Reinhart on the hotel. The façade of this hotel was adorned with a street-long row of Corinthian pillars, a testament to the architectural trends in the South employed by the planter class. Thus Millwood was renovated in a similar fashion, and it became one of the most renowned and impressive structures in the South.
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With this vast transformation, the plantation became a true measure of its owner’s standing.44

In his article for the 27 September 1844 edition of *The News and Courier*, John B. Irving detailed his impressions of Millwood, recognizing the plantation house as a true example of Greek Revival architecture.

This mansion, only recently completed from designs by Potter, may be regarded as a fair specimen of the

---

progress which architectural taste has been making of late years among us a fine effect is produced without any seeming effort to create it, unlike those labored production of false taste which too often disfigure the face of a country, reminding the classical observer of the pupil of Appelica, who not having the genius to represent Helen captivating, determined at all events to make her very fine.\textsuperscript{45}

Millwood was an impressive structure, with a majestic row of columns featured on the façade. After ascending up the stairway and passing through the colonnade across the porch, at the midpoint was the entranceway into the house. Upon passing through the doorway, one stepped into an immense hallway which featured great works of art, inclusive of original paintings like Edward Troye’s \textit{Bay Maria and Foal} as well as copies of famous Italian works like \textit{Christ Fed by Angels} painted by James DeVeaux, and was embellished with the grand stairwell. The first floor was for entertainment and business while the second was used for the private chambers.\textsuperscript{46} For times of social engagement, the eight rooms of the main floor could all be opened and, in conjunction with the two main hallways, to create the illusion of one gigantic space.\textsuperscript{47} This

\textsuperscript{45}Irving, “Sporting.”


\textsuperscript{47}Conjectural Diagram of Millwood, National Register of Historic Places Inventory – Nomination Form, Millwood-Richland County Research File, South Carolina Division of Archives and History.; Irving, “Epistle.”
plantation house held many of the great social events of the day and became the location for the elite to gather.48

The aura projected by the Millwood plantation, with its stately oaks curving to guide and shade the entranceway to the majestic pillared mansion, helped foster the “moonlight and magnolia” mythology of the Old South. The sheer size of the property alone stood as a testament to the wealth, power and prestige of this particular planter family. Rising above the lands on a slight knoll, the Greek Revival house embodied all that was thought of the legendary antebellum South.49 Millwood was a testament to the owner and his family, a legacy of the power of the upcountry cotton planter. Those who visited were awed by its impressive stature. The heritage of this home was to remain for generations as a symbol of the family’s greatness.

These upcountry farmers and their plantations were used as the representations of the cotton plantation system, as shown to those traveling from abroad. Politician Henry Bailey wrote to John C. Calhoun on 30 May 1844 about the noted lawmaker Baron Von Raumer and his entourage’s visit to South Carolina. Here he briefly mentioned the visit to Millwood.

They also were hospitably entertained at the plantations of Hampton and Tailors, which they

---

49Irving, “Sporting.”
Drawing of Millwood and First Floor Plan (1844), Information provided by Katherine Richardson of Historic Columbia Foundation.
examined very minutely, and they had a very full and fair opportunity of seeing something of the economy of a cotton plantation, and the treatment of slaves.\textsuperscript{50}

By 1850, Wade Hampton II, along with his three sons, all held the classification of planter in the Richland District census. Wade II’s property value was assessed at around $90,000.\textsuperscript{51}

Millwood was furnished with great precision, so noted in the press “…that it is not only remarkable for the taste, but also for the judgment with which it is finished.”\textsuperscript{52} Placement of the furnishings was done with much thought, as to demonstrate to a visitor that this family had the means to spend lavishly. Since most would only see the first floor of the home, the most impressive or expensive pieces of furniture were placed there. In the home, the splendor of the layout of the furnishings as well as the overall design engulfed the guests. The planter and mistress were intentional in what they wanted to portray to outsiders, as shown through these means.

The house, the family and the plantation as a whole were symbolic of the splendor of the cotton planter class. Through marriage, Sarah (Sally) Baxter of New York became a part of the Hampton family. In her letters, she clearly expressed her veneration for the different standard of living with which she was experiencing. “It is all


\textsuperscript{51}L. H. Buff, Jr., The Richland District (SC) 1850 Census (Lexington Genealogical Association, 2000), p. 81.

\textsuperscript{52}Irving, “Sporting.”
such a new life, so different from anything we in the least know of at the north that until you see it you cannot form an idea of it.” She continued on about the manner in which all aspects of life were carried out that it “…makes it seem so natural that one forgets what is in reality great magnificence.”\textsuperscript{53} These accounts further demonstrate that the Greek Revival plantation house, its owner and possessions not only defined life in the South but also stood as symbols of the planter himself. All these elements combined to further differentiate the upcountry Southern planter from his low country counterparts as well as his Northern neighbors. The upcountry cotton planter used these possessions to define himself. They were the embodiment of the man.

Millwood was the true representation of the upcountry cotton planter status that he held. To Wade Hampton II, however, this mansion was in fact his home, a place of solace and comfort. He was overjoyed to return to Millwood after his trips. Frequently Hampton expressed his happiness about being home in his letters. In one such note to his sister Mary, he wrote “Yesterday I reached this place & found all well.”\textsuperscript{54} James Henry Hammond, however, felt that Wade Hampton II’s efforts to aggrandize his plantation home was done out of pure jealousy of Hammond’s Silver Bluff plantation. He contended that Hampton was without the resources to enlarge Millwood but was so spurred on by his animosity as well as his desire to outdo Hammond.\textsuperscript{55} Their bitterness


\textsuperscript{54}Letter, Wade Hampton II to Mary, 26 August 1857, Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

towards each other stemmed from allegations of impropriety on behalf of Hammond towards Hampton's daughters.\textsuperscript{56} However, only structure built by Wade Hampton II’s sister and her husband, John Laurence Manning, rivaled this house’s beauty.

For many years, the Richardson-Manning familial line dominated the gubernatorial ranks of South Carolina. Having arrived in America during the colonial era, the Manning family rapidly ascended into the upper hierarchy of governmental ranks. The young Laurence Manning, the initial family member in North America, had taken an active role in the northern campaigns of the Revolutionary War.\textsuperscript{57} He later went on to serve his adopted home state of South Carolina by being appointed to handle administrative details but never rose above the office of adjutant general. Laurence Manning’s descendants, however, were elected to the highest office in the state government.\textsuperscript{58}

This colonist’s grandson, John Laurence, was born in the early part of 1816 to the future governor, Richard Irvine Manning, and his wife Elizabeth Peyre Richardson Manning. The family resided at a plantation in Clarendon County, which had been bestowed with the name of Hickory Hill.\textsuperscript{59} Their son went north to be educated at the College of New Jersey (Princeton University). John L. Manning, however, did not complete his academic learning here, for he was required to return home upon the


\textsuperscript{58}Meynard, \textit{Venturers}, p. 517.

demise of his father. He fulfilled his education requirements in Columbia at South Carolina College, along with many of the other planters’ sons. His experience in New Jersey, however, had a profound impact upon him.

The importance of architectural style and decorating taste held somewhat of an appeal to the young John L. Manning. While attending the College of New Jersey, he made the acquaintance of the gubernatorial family. In the realm of polite tradition, the governor invited Manning to his residence and treated him as a member of the family. In writing home about attending these fine meals, he described the décor of the Stockton home with great relish. Manning recounted that the dwelling’s interior was like that “…of magnificence of descriptions of a palace.” He went on, proclaiming “I have never seen such taste displayed in the adornment of a house, so simple yet so elegant.” Though the building of his Milford was many years in the future, perhaps these personal observations were ones to which he would hold in order to make his mansion one of exceptional presence, both structurally and decoratively.

Although Manning terminated his educational pursuits in New Jersey after three years, the time he spent in Princeton during the mid-1830s was not in vain. John Manning came away with many great ideas of a home, what it could represent as well as what it was capable of providing. Another attribute of the governor’s residence that

---


61 Letter, John L. Manning to Mother, 6 January 1835, John L. Manning File, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.

62 John L. Manning biographical information compilation for Class of Ex-1837, preparation material for the new edition of the General Catalogue of Alumni, Officers and Honorary Graduates of Princeton University, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.
he would employ in his own home, one that actually helped it garnish the name "Manning's Folly," was the concept of a form of heating. In addition to the traditional methods, stoves that were beneath the floor boards and thus warmed the rooms generated heat.63

The young John Laurence Manning, who aspired to expand his social standing, married General Wade Hampton I's daughter Susan Francis Hampton, who had inherited a portion of her father's profitable Houmas plantation. During their first year of marriage, the couple decided to build a residence that reflected their influential and prosperous status.64 The Manning's employed the aforementioned architect, Nathaniel Potter for both the design and construction of this home.65

Nathaniel F. Potter had achieved a distinguished reputation as an architect of quality. Before John L. Manning hired Potter, the South Carolinian was advised “…that a Gentleman wishing to build a handsome house could not get into better hands…”66 Manning wished to enhance his status, and was cautious not to allow any person to hinder this. Thus the letter of introduction of Potter was very significant. Although modifications were made, the gentlemen entered into an agreement for construction of

63Letter, John L. Manning to Mother, 6 January 1835, John L. Manning File, Department of Rare Books and Special Collections, Princeton University Library.


65“Milford Plantation, 1839-1869,” Milford Plantation, Sumter County, Research File, South Carolina Department of Archives and History.

66Letter, Mr. Gregg to John L. Manning, 2 May 1839, Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
Milford on 6 May 1839. The “Articles of Agreement” provided for Nathaniel Potter “…to build & completely furnish A house 50 feet by 60 feet & A kitchen 50 feet by 20 feet…in the best Style & work manship [sic]…” With this document, the project of constructing a grand plantation house and outer buildings for John L. Manning commenced.

John L. Manning never seemed to regret his choice of Nathaniel Potter as his architect. He expressed his pleasure in seeing the projected outcome to Potter in his response upon receipt of the architectural drawings. “I can find no fault…[this portion of the letter was torn off] It suits my taste in every aspect.” Manning seemed delighted with the plans for his new home. The realization of the magnitude of this plantation house came to light with the first glimpse of the architectural drawings. Wasting no time, John Manning quickly showed them to his acquaintances and reveled in their accolades. With such positive responses, Manning thought to share these expressions with his architect. In an afterthought in his letter to Nathaniel Potter, Manning proclaimed “the drawings have been very much admired by those…[torn] I have shown them. I only rec.d [sic] them yesterday.” In these plans, Manning saw the projection of his status in the planter and political community.

Construction expenditures were $45,300.00 for Milford and the outbuildings, which was an exorbitant figure for that time period. However, it appeared that the

---

67“Articles of Agreement” signed by Jos. Fenney, C.L. Hampton, Nathaniel Potter and Jn. L. Manning, 6 May 1839, Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

68Letter, John L. Manning to Nathaniel F. Potter, 22 September 1839, Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

69Letter, John L. Manning to Nathaniel F. Potter, 22 September 1839, Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
expense was worthwhile as it was done to Manning’s liking.\textsuperscript{70} A monumental structure, Milford consisted of many virtually unheard of features. Despite the fact that the residence was named Milford, it was frequently referred to as “Manning’s Folly.” This somewhat unflattering designation was due to the excesses of the house as well as the exorbitant cost of construction.\textsuperscript{71}

John and Susan Manning were both from families of the upper echelon of society. They constantly strove to maintain, if not exceed, this status and image. This Greek Revival mansion served as such a measure, especially being located in the upcountry region of the state. Nevertheless, this couple and their extravagant house did not impress all of South Carolina society. In May 1838, M. O. Miles (?) raised some doubts about Manning’s character, writing “…I rather expect that his brilliant schemes will never be realized. An independently wealthy young man, with a wife fond of show…wealth is generally more worshipped then [sic] talent…”\textsuperscript{72}

One feature that made Milford so unusual was the entrance. The front of the home was “…dominated by the monumental portico of six stop [fluted Corinthian columns modeled after the monument of Lysicrates at the floor of the Acropolis…”\textsuperscript{73} The “…porch…” was “…paved with black and white tiles…” which led to the

\textsuperscript{70}Account Pages, John L. Manning, Esq. to NF Potter & C., November 1839 – 28 April 1841, Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.


\textsuperscript{72}Letter, M. O. Miles (?) to E. G. R. Henry, 13 May 1838, Bryce Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

\textsuperscript{73}“Millford [sic] Plantation,” Congaree Land Trust, November 9, 1997 in Milford Plantation (NHL) Sumter County file, South Carolina Department of Archives and History.
“…mahogany door…” with silver-plated locks and hinges…"74 Once inside the plantation home, however, it resembled other Southern styled architecture with its spacious center hall. The entrance incorporated Greek design adorning the entablature itself, resting above the pillars which graced the doorway.75

Historian E. T. H. Shaffer noted Milford as being a structure “…that linked the life of the Old South with a glory that was Greece…”76 In

---

74 “Millford [sic] Plantation,” Congaree Land Trust, November 9, 1997 in Milford Plantation (NHL) Sumter County file, South Carolina Department of Archives and History.

75 “Milford Plantation,” South Carolina Archives and History Center, Private file of Dr. Rodger Stroup, p. 3.

76 Shaffer, Gardens, p. 184.
essence, the house was symbolic of the ancient Greek temples. It stood as a reminder of the power of slaveocracy. The interior design and decoration of Milford stood to match the exterior beauty. Doors made of mahogany served as the entrances to the

Milford Plantation, Interior-Dining Room Doors, South Carolina Division of Archives and History, Milford Plantation File (Sumter County),
rooms, each outfitted with handles made from silver. Centered in the structure was the stairwell, circling up to the next levels of the house. Many of the designs were taken from the *Beauties of Modern Architecture* by Minard Lafever.\(^77\) The elaborateness of

77Drawing/House Plans (Milford) by Nathaniel F. Potter, May 1839, Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; South Carolina Heritage Trust Advisory Board, Meeting, 24 August 1990, Milford Plantation Research File, South Carolina, South Carolina Archives and History.; “Specifications for a House to be built in Sumpter [sic] district, South Carolina, for John L. Manning, Esq.,” May 1839, Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
Milford was intentional. It showed all people Manning’s power and wealth; that he was able to spend lavishly without financial ruin. Milford was the definition of its owner.

Much like the Hampton and Manning families, the Calhoun family settled in South Carolina during the colonial era. The Calhouns arrived in America in the 1730s from Ireland. Having migrated from Virginia to the Ninety-Sixth district, they encountered many of the familiar challenges such as surviving Indian attacks. Patrick Calhoun was young when he made this move with his parents. He and “…his three brothers & his sister with her husband arrived in the district (Abbeville) February, 1756, & settled in a group in what is now known as Calhoun’s Settlement…” There appears to be a lack of definite information about the events of the family’s migration from Ireland to their settlement in South Carolina. John C. Calhoun noted that "I am not certain who accompanied them, or who immediately followed them & settled in this neighborhood." The family did, however, encounter violence from the American Indians during the course of the French and Indian War, which appeared to spur their movement to South Carolina.

---


79 Calhoun, “Account.”

80 Calhoun, “Account.”

Once established in South Carolina, Patrick Calhoun began his life as a planter and a father, having married into the Caldwell family.\textsuperscript{82} He and his wife Martha had five children. It was their fourth child that gained the most notoriety. John Caldwell Calhoun was born in 1782.\textsuperscript{83} He grew up in modest accommodations but gained an “…independent mind…” from his father.\textsuperscript{84} When his father died, Calhoun took over many of the duties of the farm until he left to study at Yale. He practiced law upon returning to South Carolina, he began the practice of law.\textsuperscript{85} Soon after, Calhoun entered the world of politics with his election to the legislature.\textsuperscript{86} On a personal note, “…in 1811, he married his second cousin Floride…”\textsuperscript{87} Calhoun made his residence in the upcountry, a region where his wife’s family owned property. His mother-in-law bought Clergy Hall (eventually Fort Hill) and its land, a location upon which John C. Calhoun and his wife resided.\textsuperscript{88}

Not all Greek Revival homes originated in that architectural design. Fort Hill was in fact a modified house, in both name and structure. The desire to relocate to then purchase this upcountry residence stemmed from a variety of reasons, inclusive of familial medical conditions. As the editors of \textit{The Papers of John C. Calhoun} noted in

\textsuperscript{82}Jenkins, \textit{Life}, pp. 20-21.
\textsuperscript{84}Coit, \textit{Portrait}, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{85}Coit, \textit{Portrait}, pp. 9, 14, and 34.
\textsuperscript{87}Coit, “Introduction,” p. 2.
\textsuperscript{88}“Fort Hill History,” \url{http://www.clemson.edu/about/history/properties/fort-hill/}
the introduction to Volume X, that in 1825 “…John C. Calhoun, Jr., almost perished from a lung affliction in Washington but improved as soon as the family, in desperation, set out on the road south. Calhoun wasted no time in making up his mind to relocate.”

John C. Calhoun wrote to his mother-in-law about this decision to leave the Washington, D.C., home to move to South Carolina and outlined his plans for the transformation of the house. In this 14 June 1826 letter to Floride Bonneau Colhoun, his mother-in-law, he wrote that “…Floride [Colhoun Calhoun] and myself have concluded, that we will best advance our interest by fixing our residence in the South instead of this place…” He continued on by sharing some plans for the homestead, commenting that “…I have requested John [Ewing Colhoun] to have some improvements made in the house by repairing the piazza and enlarging the side, in which the stair case runs up, as you will see in my letter to him.”

The homestead that became the foundation of John C. Calhoun’s Fort Hill plantation was initially designated Clergy Hall (Old Clergy Hall). With Calhoun’s 1825 relocation to the house, he began to make modifications so as to conform to the lifestyle he sought to maintain. Calhoun recognized that the house itself was in dire need of repair, but he also saw a chance to adapt the residence to fit into the architectural style so enjoyed by his upcountry cotton planter class. John C. Calhoun immediately set to


work transforming its appearance on both the interior but especially the exterior. In a letter to his brother-in-law, who was in the South Carolina upcountry while he was still in the nation’s capital, Calhoun wrote:

I must request a favour [sic] of you, preparatory to our return, to have Clergy Hall repaired, so as to answer for a temporary residence. We wish the piazza to be repaired and such an enlargement of the space, through which the stair case passes, as will give a pantry of good size, and a comfortable bed chamber instead of the little room…92

Calhoun expressed a great anticipation, almost an air of excitement, about the prospect of what this house would become. “Clergy Hall will be our future residence; and I have commenced improving by adding largely to the old establishment.”93 Thus the true transition of the house had begun. Transforming the interior as well as the exterior of the structure signified not only the transference of ownership but the modification of the edifice to be a reflection of the owner’s personality.

Intent and determined to have the changes to the house and property made exactly to his specifications, Calhoun was compelled to stay in residence to oversee the alterations. He bound himself literally and figuratively to the estate. “…I cannot leave home without the greatest inconvenience. I may say, that I am setting a new place, and


while at home, from publick [sic] business, my presence is continually necessary, with the workmen. "94 But the desired effect was produced. This home was so dramatically renovated that it became an entirely different one. “…the house will soon be completed; so remodelled [sic] you will not know it."95 Clergy Hall was transformed into Fort Hill through the expansion of the colonnade and veranda, thus allowing it to truly become a Greek Revival house.96 From the entranceway looking out, the panorama of the countryside was impressive.97

The name of the plantation was in fact significant to the owner. For example, John C. Calhoun called his upcountry plantation by its old name, Clergy Hall, upon its acquisition and for a few years thereafter.98 It was not until 1830 that he referred to the plantation by the name Fort Hill. This was after the renovations had completed. Most importantly, the personality of the home had melded with that of John Calhoun.99 This was also at a time when Calhoun and President Andrew Jackson had verbally sparred


95Letter, John E. Colhoun to James E. Colhoun, 4 May 1827, quoted in the editor’s preface of the 1827 chapter of Volume X, ed. Wilson and Hemphill, 246.

96Letter, John C. Calhoun to John E. Calhoun, 14 June 1826, John C. Calhoun Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.


at the Jefferson Day Banquet and their professional relationship had begun to decline. It also coincided with the start of the nullification crisis.\textsuperscript{100}

John C. Calhoun found Fort Hill to be a reflection of himself and welcomed visitors into this inner sanctuary. In addition, it was a representation of his family members. Calhoun called upon his friends, colleagues, associates and acquaintances alike to find their way to his plantation whenever they were near.\textsuperscript{101} Visitors accounted for this, as the house was an insightful look into the owner’s character and caliber. George W. Featherstonhaugh was a guest at Calhoun’s plantation while on one of his trips throughout the United States. He wrote of his feelings about both the planter and the plantation home, ascertaining that “…here I found myself in a charming house, amidst all the refinement and comfort that was inseparable from the condition of well-bred and honourable [sic] persons.”\textsuperscript{102} Calhoun was the master of this world, his world of Fort Hill. On these lands and in these buildings, he lived up to his reputation that “he was born and educated a ruler.”\textsuperscript{103} It was on Fort Hill that Calhoun was his own man. In the political world, no matter the position he held, he was always technically dominated by another, whether it was the President or the wishes of Congress as a whole. Fort Hill was, however, his domain and his alone. He was able to conform and

\textsuperscript{100}VP John Calhoun,” http://www.senate.gov/artandhistory/history/common/generic/VP_John_Calhoun.htm

\textsuperscript{101}Letter, John C. Calhoun to Honorable Ingersoll, 14 August 1847, John Caldwell Calhoun Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.


mold this entire plantation to reflect who he was as an individual and a man. It was a retreat, a place of solace; but also, his power was absolute here, something that he lacked in the nation’s capital.

Calhoun was clearly cognizant of his choice to reside in the ideal location of the upcountry of the state. He knew the upcountry was more immune to disease but also “competition.” Masters of great cotton plantations were fewer in number in the upcountry region. The reality also was that it was a healthier environment. Planters of the low country were plagued with threats of sickness, especially “fever,” hence the upcountry was optimal for more salubrious conditions. In writing to Martin van Buren, John C. Calhoun attested to the benefits of residing in this area. “Our residence in [South] Carolina is near the mountains in a delightful and healthy climate.” He followed this sentiment up a little more just a few months later, reporting to another acquaintance that “we find the mountains in a delightful and healthy climate.” He followed this sentiment up a little more just a few months later, reporting to another acquaintance that “we find the climate here under our little mountain delightful. We are all well…” Calhoun even went on to proclaim in another epistle that “…I think this [is] one of the best climates in the country, being almost except from bilious cases as any

---

part of New England and much more so from other diseases.” This planter was well aware that the upcountry was the idyllic locale to live, to prosper and in which to cultivate a flourishing cotton crop, relatively immune from the pestilence and diseases that plagued the low country plantations.

It was from Fort Hill in 1831 that Calhoun composed his “Address To The People Of South Carolina,” in which he espoused his theories of states rights in regard to the tariff issue that was plaguing the American South, specifically South Carolina.  

---


appears as though there was a connection between these sentiments and those which were embodied in his plantation home. The elitism expressed in this address was tied to the heritage of the ancient-based architectural design of his home. Power was a common theme. This is an address for which he is commonly known. Nevertheless, it seems that Calhoun received the greatest gratification from his plantation lands. He immersed himself in all the activities of Fort Hill whenever he was in residence.\footnote{Letter, John C. Calhoun to Mrs. A[nn]a M[aria Calhoun] Clemson, 6 April 1839, in \textit{Volume XIV}, ed. Wilson: 600-601, p. 600.}

When Calhoun took a brief break from public service in 1843, he found great comfort and solace in Fort Hill. Calhoun had left because “his private affairs had become considerably embarrassed, in consequence of his protracted absences from home, and his inability to supervise and direct their management except during brief intervals.”\footnote{Jenkins, \textit{Life}, p. 400.}

His exodus from office was relatively brief. However, biographer John S. Jenkins wrote in 1852 about Calhoun: “Retired to the privacy of his beautiful home at Fort Hill...he was far happier, in the enjoyment of domestic happiness, and in the occupations and pursuits of a planter, than while mingling in the bustle and turmoil of party politics...”\footnote{Jenkins, \textit{Life}, pp. 401.}

It was at Fort Hill that Calhoun was truly in his essence, embodying all of the characterization of a proper gentleman as well as being at ease within his own element.\footnote{Ex-Gov B. F. Perry, \textit{Reminiscences Of Public Men} (Philadelphia: John D. Avil & Co., Printers and Publishers, 1883), p. 45.} In a letter he wrote from Fort Hill to Secretary of State James Buchanan,
Calhoun expressed the happiness he felt in being at his Greek Revival cotton plantation.

As to my going again into the Senate, I do not contemplate to return ever again to publick [sic] life. I am entirely content with the portion of the publick [sic] honors, which have fallen to my share, and expect to spend the rest of my days in retirement, in my quiet retreat near the foot of the mountains. I find ample & agreeable occupation both of mind & body.  

Calhoun, even while in Washington, DC, cared for the productive operations of Fort Hill. Having bonded with his daughter Anna Marie through their elaborate political discussions and written correspondence, in addition to the time she spent aiding her father in his work in D.C., he relied upon her insight as to the ongoing affairs of the plantation. Her marriage to Thomas Green Clemson helped draw Anna Marie’s husband into this special bond that was shared between Anna Marie and her father, which granted him much favor with Calhoun. During his absence from Fort Hill, he

---


accorded Clemson with managerial tasks in his stead.\footnote{Letter, Anna Calhoun Clemson to John C. Calhoun, 21 December 1840, JCC Papers, Special Collections, Robert Muldrow Cooper Library, Clemson University, in Julia Wright Sublette, “The Letters of Anna Calhoun Clemson. 1833-1873. Volume I. Chapters 1-3: 1833-1850. Volume II. Chapters 4-5: 1855-1873”, Ph.D. Dissertation, The Florida State University, Fall Semester 1993, Major Professor, Elisabeth Muhlenfeld, Ph.D., South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.;  Alester G. Holmes, Thomas Green Clemson: His Life and Work (Richmond: Garrett And Massie, Incorporated, MCMXXXVII), pp. 16-17.} Clemson took his supervisory duties very seriously, overseeing operations and meticulously sought payments for materials and goods from those who purchased from Calhoun without extending any special concessions.\footnote{Letter, Thomas Green Clemson to James E. Calhoun, 8 January 1843, Thomas Green Clemson Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division (copies of the originals housed at Clemson University).;  Letter, Thomas Green Clemson to James E. Calhoun, 25 March 1843, Thomas Green Clemson Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division (copies of the originals housed at Clemson University).} This ensured smooth operations as well as a more efficient cotton production without Calhoun’s presence. The property eventually came under Clemson’s tutelage after John C. Calhoun’s passing.

Biographer Margaret L. Coit acknowledged in her Pulitzer Prize work \textit{John C. Calhoun: American Portrait} (1950), that it was his plantation house that really had the greatest meaning to Calhoun. “Fort Hill was the symbol of all in life that he prized.”\footnote{Coit, \textit{Portrait}, p. 385.} It was his homestead, the location where his power was definite and absolute. Calhoun served America in various elected positions as prominent as vice president. In the many facets of life in which he served, Calhoun prided himself by his agricultural work. “I am a planter – a cotton planter.”\footnote{John C. Calhoun, “Resolution On The Slave Question” in \textit{Calhoun}, ed. Coit: 51-52, p. 51.} W.J. Megginson contended in his book \textit{African American Life in South Carolina’s Upper Piedmont 1780-1900} (2006) that “although
employing an overseer Calhoun thrived on personal involvement. Calhoun embraced the life of the politician and the planter, in which he attained success in both.

John C. Calhoun spent a good deal of time in Washington. Nevertheless, his breaks were spent at Fort Hill, where he further embraced and relished his life as a planter. He wrote to his daughter on 6 April 1839 from Fort Hill proclaiming “I have been more engaged about the plantation & garden, than you have ever seen me. With the exception of meal time, I am scarcely ever in the House.” Calhoun continued, voicing his enthusiasm about his actions at the plantation. “…I frequently am out, with the exception of a half hour at dinner from breakfast till [sic] nearly dark; so anxious am I to seize on the breif [sic] interval of leisure, from other vocations, to put the place in good order.”

The upcountry cotton planter created the illusion of an idealistic world in which he thought those of a lower station of life would want to emulate. The Greek Revival plantation home to which he attached himself did differentiate him from the previous generation of planter. However, it was just a means of beautifying the exterior of a world that's interior was harsh and brutal. Operation and maintenance of a cotton plantation was done on the labor of slaves. Cotton planters were responsible for this. Not all were born into this station in life; many worked, through various means, to make it to the planter ranks. At times, one ascended to this position through marriage. Many prominent South Carolina families were united through marriage. Some, in fact, used


their marital relations to such powerful families to aid in their rise to power. James Henry Hammond was one who initially benefited from his extended relations to the Hamptons as well as through his own marriage into the FitzSimons family. Stemming from a reasonably modest background, James Henry Hammond’s father had migrated from the North down to South Carolina. It was the elder Hammond’s pursuit to set up an academic institution upon his arrival in the southern state.\textsuperscript{120} It was here that Elisha Hammond met his wife, who had aspirations of an inheritance she did not receive until late in life, and where their progeny were born and raised.\textsuperscript{121} The Hammonds had several children, but it was their eldest son who achieved the lifestyle that had eluded his parents. James Henry Hammond came in to this world on 15 November 1807, the sixth generation of the family name born in the United States.\textsuperscript{122}

Driven from an early age to attain success and wealth, James Henry Hammond truly began his pursuit of a planter class life following his graduation from South Carolina College. Continuing his studies, the callow Hammond started his practice in 1828. Although he was steadily gaining notoriety in this field, it was not his true calling and his intentions swayed towards the political arena. Soon after, he began working as an editor of a newspaper published in the state capital, through which he was able to

\textsuperscript{120} “The Hammonds,” Hammond, Bryan, and Cumming Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscript Division, p. 7.; Meynard, \textit{Venturers}, p. 155.; Elisha Hammond’s initial purpose of relocating to South Carolina is not specifically clear, for there are dissenting opinions as to why he relocated. In Secret And Sacred: The Diaries of James Henry Hammond, a Southern Slaveholder, editor Carol Bleser notes that Hammond “…went, for reasons unknown…” but later became a teacher, professor and principal. (pp. 3 and 4)

\textsuperscript{121}Bleser, \textit{Secret}, pp. 3-4 and 15.

promote his political theories.\textsuperscript{123} Hammond was rising in name, but his social status remained deficient. Ultimately though, he lacked the familial ties to the South Carolina aristocracy and was determined to attain them through marriage.

Wade Hampton II, active himself in government, frequently entertained the great political minds of the day at his lavish Millwood plantation. It was here that guest Hammond met a plain, yet exceptionally wealthy young woman. Conveniently, she was the sister of Hampton’s wife. Catherine FitzSimons, against her family’s wishes, was paid suit to by Hammond and eventually became his wife.\textsuperscript{124} With this marriage, the “outsider” began climbing his way to the ranks of the top of the social hierarchy. The realm of the planter class no longer stood out of reach, for Hammond became the owner of his wife’s inheritance, an extensive plantation complete with enough slaves to classify him as a large property holder.\textsuperscript{125} The newlyweds moved to Silver Bluff in the western portion of South Carolina to begin their lives together.\textsuperscript{126} Upon this Beech Island land, Hammond began his ascent in to the life of a planter. He used these lands to cultivate healthy cotton crops, thus allowing him to truly become a master of the lands and the slaves.\textsuperscript{127}


\textsuperscript{127}Letter, James Henry Hammond to Mrs. C.E. Hammond, 6 April 1842, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.; Perry, Reminiscences, p. 105.
A transformation from a modest lifestyle took place, bringing the young man to stand among the class of people of whom he strove to be a part. James Henry Hammond participated in many activities of this planter class. Active in the growing of profitable crops as well as in the politics of both his state and nation, he also turned his attention to various forms of livestock. In addition to the animals necessary for the operations of a farm, Hammond invested in the planters’ sport of horse racing. Taking full and partial ownership of some of the great turf equine bloodlines, he was able to join the planter ranks and participate in the popular race season.\footnote{Harry Hammond, “The Estate of James H. Hammond Deceased in Account with Harry Hammond Executor,” Account Book 1886-1893, Harry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; James Henry Hammond, Stud Book, 1833-1839, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; James Henry Hammond, Stud Book, 1833-1840, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Mooney, Race, p. 32.}

During the 1850s, Hammond sought to build a testament to his status; thus he constructed Redcliffe. In Hammond’s mind, it was a house to rival all others and to be worthy of someone of his stature.\footnote{“Hammonds,” Hammond, Bryan, and Canning Families Papers, pp. 7 and 25.; Letter, L. Berkman to Hon J. H. Hammond, 16 April 1859, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.} There was nothing discernibly different about the plantation houses at Silverton and Silver Bluff, drawing no accolades from Hammond’s peers; therefore, he was motivated to have Redcliffe built to show his standing in the planter ranks.\footnote{Billings, “Notes,” Redcliffe, Aiken County Research File, South Carolina Division of Archives and History.} Not surprisingly though, the Redcliffe plantation was built on the foundations of these other plantations, both financially and geographically. Redcliffe provided “…an extensive view of the surrounding country, reaching even Silverton, the
great Cotton and corn plantation…” which usually sent “…500 bales of Cotton and 30,000 or 40,000 bushels of corn to the Savannah market.”

In 1855, when Hammond acquired the property where he built Redcliffe, there was already an existing structure upon it. Having determined that this house did not meet his needs, coupled with his aspiration to construct the grandest homestead in the state, Hammond opted to have a larger and more prominent home erected on these lands. He named the plantation estate and house Redcliffe, after the terrain. Hammond lamented that he would have rather built the home he had in Columbia on this land, but he put his future in the hands of Redcliffe. This was to be his enduring legacy.

Throughout the entire building process, Hammond was filled with great anxiety and anticipation. He wanted the house erected and lamented to Harry Hammond, who at the time was abroad, that he feared it would be quite some time before it was built and ready for use. Construction seemed to come to a relative standstill, according to Hammond, as he waited for the lumber to be prepared for the building process. Eventually, the plantation home was completed and Hammond would have his enduring structure that was yet another symbolic testament to the legacy of his life and actions.

This house embodied all the components of the patrician lifestyle James Henry Hammond had striven to attain. Redcliffe was meticulously laid out, and each room was

---

131 “Editorial Correspondence,” Charleston Courier.
132 James Henry Hammond diary entry, 12 May 1855, in Bleser, Secret, p. 266.
133 Letter, James Henry Hammond to Harry Hammond, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
properly furnished and adorned. Each piece of furniture, every fireplace mantle, and all artwork were selected as a means to display Hammond’s wealth. It served as a means for Hammond to show his status. James Chesnut gave Hammond his greatest accolade in a letter he wrote him in 1859. In this note, he proclaimed “your classic taste, & love of antiquity have, it seems, carried you beyond the Classic Era-even to the time & example of the patriarchs.”

It was said of James Henry Hammond that “…his desire…” was “to develop what was, in fact, one of the most productive plantations in South Carolina…Redcliffe…” In contrast though, Hammond proclaimed that the building and move to Redcliffe was done in an attempt to ease his ill health. He reinforced this idea in a letter to his son, stating that from the initial evening there he found “…the air better & sleep better…” Regarding his health, Hammond continued on stating [I] “…altogether am better”, but

---

134 “Editorial Correspondence,” *Charleston Courier.*

135 Letter, James Chesnut to James Henry Hammond, 1859, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

his motivation was rooted much deeper.\textsuperscript{137} Hammond sought to build the greatest house in the Palmetto state, hoping to usurp that honor from Governor Manning’s plantation home, Milford.\textsuperscript{138} As Hammond ascended into the rank of the planter elite, he was determined to prove that he belonged in that place. Maintenance of a grand, if not the best plantation home, was one such means. Conversely not all modern

\textsuperscript{137}Letter, James Henry Hammond to “Major” (Col. M.C.M. Hammond), 24 June 1859, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

\textsuperscript{138}Billings, “Notes,” Redcliffe, Aiken County Research File, South Carolina Division of Archives and History.; Shaffer, Gardens, p. 184.
assessments concur with Hammond’s goal of Redcliffe being the grander structure. Regarding Redcliffe and Milford as projections of the men who had them built, Roger G. Kennedy, in his Architecture, Men, Women And Money In America 1600-1860 (1985), proclaimed that James Henry Hammond’s Redcliffe “…is a graceless barn of a place, as a representative of the harsh, unapologetic, egocentric and querulous man who built it as is Milford of the stately and fastidious Manning.” The elegance and beauty of Milford in fact surpasses that of Redcliffe.

Hammond opted to use Redcliffe as more of a haven of recreation and investigation into new agricultural techniques instead of his main area of operations for his cultivation of cotton. The Greek Revival homestead he built here was also to stand as a testament of his planter standing “as well as a servant of S.C.” The property that surrounded the house also was a measure of the man. He used this land for a variety of agricultural pursuits. Hammond’s affinity for fine wine probably helped spur his decision to try his hand at cultivating his own vintage. Clearly, he had been a connoisseur of fine wines. In fact while he traveled abroad in the 1830s, Hammond duly noted his pleasure in viewing where the grapes were cultivated and the wine produced, as well as his acquisition of a variety of vintages. Over the years he purchased wines both at home and abroad as well as took the time to pursue means to cultivate the

---

139Kennedy, Revival, p. 361.


141James Henry Hammond, Diary of European Trip, 8 April 1837 – 18 November 1837, entry 8 April 1837 from Paris, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
grapes before setting his sights on trying this venture at Redcliffe.\textsuperscript{142} Though he was no longer making his grand trips to Europe, he remained intrigued by wine, hence his desire to produce it at Redcliffe and “…dug a wine cellar to support his vineyard experiments.”\textsuperscript{143}

Redcliffe held a special place to James Henry Hammond. It was with great pride and enthusiasm that he penned his “…first letter…” from the plantation to William Gilmore Simms, unable to conceal his excitement in being at his new residence.\textsuperscript{144} In fact within a few years of taking up residence there, Hammond reflected upon giving up his prominent role as master of so many lands and devoting himself completely to the actions being undertaken at Redcliffe.\textsuperscript{145}

Hammond’s passion and enthusiasm for his new estate were beyond the basic appeal of another plantation. There was a great sense of accomplishment in the development of this new venture. Admittedly, Redcliffe had deeper meaning as well. Amid great scandal that involved inappropriate conduct towards his young nieces, Hammond decided to abandon his residence in the state capitol. He felt that “…the Columbia clique” had denied him his “…moral character and …were determined to

\textsuperscript{142}James Henry Hammond, Diary of European Trip, 8 April 1837 - 18 November 1837, entry 8 April 1837 from Paris, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Letter, C. M. Grant to James Henry Hammond, 6 February 1832, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Letter, Higham Fife (?) to James Henry Hammond, 7 August 183_, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

\textsuperscript{143}Ballard, et. al, “Quarters,” p. 4.

\textsuperscript{144}Letter, James Henry Hammond to William G. Simms, 13 May 1855, James Henry Hammond Papers. Library of Congress, Manuscripts Division, microfilm.

\textsuperscript{145}Letter, James Henry Hammond to Major, 8 July 1859, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
destroy whatever reputation…” that he had made for himself. With the problems at hand, Hammond found a great escape from his actions and persecution in Redcliffe. Through this plantation, Hammond achieved one of the goals he sought with great zest; he created a permanent legacy to be viewed by future generations.

As a whole, these nineteenth century upcountry cotton planters were trying to distinguish themselves from the past precedents established by the previous generation’s planter class. However, some elements still remained. Just as Thomas Jefferson positioned his Monticello facing west, as to look to the future, James Henry Hammond technically followed suit. Hammond geographically situated Redcliffe westward to match his vision of expansion. He was adamant “…that it must face South or SW.” Although the aspect of positioning the house in a specific direction might have been overlooked by the average person, its message was clear to the planter class. They looked upon their present and their future.

Many plantations graced the lands of the Palmetto state. Although the coastal rice plantations of South Carolina probably gave the state her first notoriety for housing great planter wealth, the upcountry cotton planters facilitated its continuance. Since the great plantation wealth originated in the low country, these planters had really set the trends and were the first to rise to prominence. Those in the upcountry initially did not receive the same accolades. This notion stemmed particularly from the fact that upcountry plantation homes were initially not as grand as those of the low country.

---


147 Letter, James Henry Hammond to Harry Hammond, 21 September 1855, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
However, in time, this changed. The Hamptons, Hammonds, Calhouns and Mannings brought these attributes to the upcountry region through their construction and modification of their plantation houses. Their Greek Revival homes serve as representations of the grandeur of life that was feasibly attained through slave ownership and the cultivation of cotton. James Henry Hammond attested to the power of cotton before Congress when he made his grand declaration that “cotton is king.”

Antebellum South Carolina appeared to offer much to the cotton planter elite. Those who journeyed to this state frequently found the people hospitable though perhaps some customs and institutions were foreign. The reality was camouflaged because it was in fact a cruel environment, one forged on the labor of the enslaved. The splendor of the Greek Revival mansions masked the horrors that enabled them to be built. Though Charleston and the surrounding vicinity held the reputation for being the area for the elite, the upcountry cotton planters established a society that tried to rival the one of the low country. These upcountry planter families helped South Carolina maintain the rights to the notion that it was in fact “…the oldest cotton state…”

148 J. Whitney Cunningham, “South Carolina Architecture,” Maverick and Van Wycke Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.


150 Olmsted, Kingdom, p. 528.
CHAPTER THREE: GREEK REVIVAL PLANTATION HOMES IN UPCOUNTRY GEORGIA AND NORTH CAROLINA

South Carolina was not alone in featuring cotton planters and their Greek Revival plantation homes. Georgia was home to both plantation and town houses of this chosen architectural style. Though North Carolina was never renowned for its cotton cultivation, those who did take the risk to grow this crop there and were successful also embraced the Greek Revival architecture. The planters of these states were not unlike those of South Carolina. Each man sought to display his power and wealth through possessions. Every slave, horse, piece of art and building was a testament to this. However, it was the ownership of a Greek Revival plantation house that was symbolic of the power generated through a slave driven market of production and sale of cotton.

Within the state of Georgia, as in many states of similar socioeconomic structure, slaveholders had great influence on the government. Political leaders gave audience to the influential landowners as well as to those who traded the resources. On all levels of the government, those who owned chattel property and the extensive plantations upon which they toiled had a powerful voice.\(^1\) However, there were in fact a relative few who had vast holdings. In the decades preceding the

---

outbreak of the war, fewer than three thousand individuals counted at least a hundred slaves on their rosters throughout the entire South.

Although not all lands within the state were fertile enough for cotton production, there were regions of Georgia that allowed these planters to produce the bountiful crops that would propel them into positions of wealth and power. This crop proved to be one of the dominant goods produced within the state.\(^2\) J. T. Trowbridge wrote in his *The South: A Tour of Its Battlefields and Ruined Cities, A Journey Through the Desolated States, And Talks with the People* (1866) that “the southwestern part of Georgia is one of the most fertile sections of the South; it is the region of larges plantations and rich planters. The northern half of the State is practically unproductive: it is the region of small planters…”\(^3\) This is not entirely true however. Planters were prosperous in the upcountry region where they grew cotton and built their Greek Revival homes.

It was from the successful production of the cotton crop that certain planters began to build testaments to their power and lasting legacies via the Greek Revival house. During the 1820s through the 1850s, Greek Revival plantation homes began springing up throughout Georgia. Though Georgia planters tended to maintain a more humble lifestyle, those who embarked on building in the grand manner stood out. Greek Revival held a special meaning to these men of power, for it was symbolic of the majestic mien of Periclean Athens. Whereas architectural styling in the North evolved


earlier out of Greek Revival, the antebellum South held to the features of this design for a lengthier period.⁴

Georgia’s population changed in 1790 when people left the state.⁵ In time, this changed and more individuals relocated to the state. Few, however, cultivated cotton and thus it was claimed that Georgia “…had ceased to be the “First Cotton State in the Union.”⁶ Lands acquired from the Cherokee allowed planters to expand their plantation assets.⁷ It was the terrain in the central region of the state that was the most conducive to the cultivation of the cotton crop. Here the men who held these lands enjoyed the benefits of their slaves’ labor and gained wealth from the production of cotton.⁸ It was in the antebellum time that the piedmont cotton planters built their Greek Revival homes, making a mark of permanency.

Georgia had plantations of many varieties. However, like most Southern states, those who maintained the vast estates with the pillared mansions were among a select few. In his noted work, Plantation Slavery in Georgia (1933), Ralph Betts Flanders

---

⁴Flanders, Slavery, p.126.; Linley, Catalog, pp. 96 and 97.; Perkerson, Columns, pp. 5-6.
⁶Memorial Of The Cotton Planters’ Convention To The Honorable The Senate And House Of Representatives Of The State Of Georgia, In General Assembly Met (Augusta, GA: Steam Press Chronicle & Sentinel, 1860), Georgia Department of Archives and History, Rare Books.
⁸Jones, First, p. XIII.
emphasized that though there was an adequate number of people living in this high
standard, “…they were the exception rather than the rule.”

Those who had the wealth and status in the upcountry built or remodeled their
homes accordingly, to use the Greek Revival architectural style. Samuel Lowther was
one of these men. With his marriage to the wealthy, twice widowed Elisabeth Slatter
Bunkley Billingslea, attorney and planter Samuel Lowther brought changes to his
home in Clinton, Georgia in multiple ways. Not only did he introduce a new wife to the
homestead but he also made modifications to the structure itself to conform it into the
popular upcountry cotton planter’s style. Lowther Hall, built by Samuel Lowther
between 1822 and 1823, became a Greek Revival home with the addition of a portico
and columns. The house featured a wide center hall that was highlighted by
freestanding, gradual-spiral staircase. This grand stairwell completed the hall. Curving
to the second floor, each step was carved with elegant detail. The staircase
accentuated the room. Upon entering the house, one was drawn to the dominating
structure. The plantation owners, Samuel and Elisabeth Lowther, descended the
curvature of the stairs to welcome guests to their home. Visitors were immersed in the

---

9Flanders, Slavery, p. 94.

10Rev. George White, Historical Collections of Georgia Containing the Most Interesting Facts, Traditions,
Biographical Sketches, Anecdotes, Etc., Relating to its History and Antiquities, From Its First Settlement to the
Present Time; Compiled from Original Records and Official Documents (New York: Pudney & Rusesell,

11Marriages, The Macon Georgia Telegraph, 4 February 1832.

12Photographs of the Historic American Buildings Survey, Interiors-Lowther Hall, Georgia Tech online
in this moment. As the first glimpse into the life of the planter and his house, it left a powerful impression.

Samuel Lowther was not alone in making additions to transform the architectural style of his house. The Oaks, which was built on the plantation lands just on the
outskirts of the town of Madison, was modified into a Greek Revival structure in 1832. Though initially constructed in the Federal style, the Greek Revival trend led the house’s owners to modify the structure to conform to the Greek Revival trends of the day. The
simple addition of a pillared porch transformed the style of the house. Although it is not known who the original owners of this house were, it is recognized that William Jones was in possession of this plantation when the alterations took place. Cotton was a primary crop grown on the 12,500 acres surrounding the big house. The Oaks was eventually sold by Jones, though apparently he maintained a piece of land. Once William Cousins took possession in 1840, he proceeded to add more land, which in turn

---

13Gleason, Homes, p. 44.; Williams, “Documentary,” Morgan County Records Archives, Madison, Georgia.

14Baldwin County, Georgia, Deed Book J, p. 502.
required more labor, hence he increased the number of slaves to work the fields.\textsuperscript{15} More lands and slaves equated to more production and income, which allowed Cousins to purchase more furnishings and decorations for the home.

Some of the upcountry Georgia cotton planters opted not to build their Greek Revival mansions on their actual plantation lands. In some instances the changing landscape of Georgia altered the geographic positioning of some of the plantation homes. The further development of the town of Covington is one such instance, and it transformed the setting of Judge John Harris’ Greek Revival home, which once stood in the midst of cotton fields. Gradually these lands were built upon, transitioning this plantation home into a town house.\textsuperscript{16} According to records, “…Harris owned 32 slaves and close to 2300 acres of land in Newton County.”\textsuperscript{17}

Harris’ cotton lands graced the Ulcofauhachee River, whereupon he built his testament to his status as a planter. White Hall, as the plantation house came to be known, rivaled the beauty of the other pillared mansions of the state.\textsuperscript{18} The name White Hall, however, seemed to be a popular name among the planter class in Georgia. One such plantation was also of the Greek Revival architectural style and actually located not all that far from Harris’ home.\textsuperscript{19} Another noted plantation bearing the same name

\textsuperscript{15}“A Summary of the Tax Records for The Oaks Plantation For the Years 1838 through 1883” in Williams, “Documentary,” Morgan County Records Archives, Madison, Georgia.

\textsuperscript{16}Annie Hornady Howard, ed., Georgia Homes And Landmarks (Atlanta, GA: Southern Features Syndicate, 1929), p. 94.

\textsuperscript{17}Newton County Historical Society, History of NEWTON COUNTY Georgia (Covington, Ga: Newton County Historical Society, 1988), p. 59.

\textsuperscript{18}Gleason, Homes, p. 37.

\textsuperscript{19}Linley, Catalog, p. 102.
was constructed in the vicinity of the Savannah River. Conversely, the master of this property opted never to reside there but instead use it during the course of his journeys. The significance and symbolism of the name White Hall, however, is unknown.

Another six-columned home that rested slightly off the lands themselves was Rose Hill (Tucker-Hatcher House / Lockerly Hall). Judge Daniel R. Tucker, owner of this house and property, originated from Richland County in South Carolina which was home to the Wade Hampton family. He moved when he was in his late twenties to try his fortunes in Georgia and commence his life as a cotton planter there. The first floor windows are floor to ceiling and the rooms are opened (or separated) via pocket doors to create a great open aired ballroom. Mahogany was used extensively for the woodworking throughout the house. This majestic Greek Revival home stood only slightly off the cotton lands that were just two miles away. In the 1860 census, Rose


21Cook, Baldwin, p. 457.

22Historic American Buildings Survey, Milledgeville Vicinity, Baldwin County, Tucker, Daniel R. House (Lockerly), Survey No. GA-1151, Data Sheet #2.; Bonner, Milledgeville, p. 123.; Gleason, Homes, p. 50.; Linley, Middle, pp. 79-80.; personal observations of Lockerly, August 2003, as well as discussions with Lockerly/local historian Murali Thirumal and Rick Mayfield.
Hill owner Daniel Tucker was categorized as a planter with property valued between $52,000 and $95,000.23

James C. Bonner contended in his *Milledgeville: Georgia’s Antebellum Capitol* (1978) that Rose Hill would be “…considered to be a perfect example of the plantation house…”24 Other historians have echoed this sentiment as well. For example, David King Gleason proclaimed in *Antebellum Homes Of Georgia* that “…Lockerly remains one of the most outstanding examples of the class Greek Revival

---

23 Frances T. Ingmire, “Citizens of Baldwin County” (n.d., n.p.), Georgia Department of Archives and History, p. 32. This work is merely a copy of the 1860 census.

Frederick Doveton Nichols echoed this analysis in *The Early Architecture of Georgia* (1957). Nichols' research led him to the conclusion of "in the development of the temple form, the next step was taken at Lockerly, 1839, near Milledgeville, which has academic plan and an heroic Doric portico without a pediment." Although geographically this plantation house pushed the lower borders of the upcountry, it highlighted the ambiance and the potency of this architectural design.

Daniel Tucker was clearly a planter of means, as indicated not only by his plantation earnings also by the grandeur of this house. Designs featured in Lockerly (Rose Hill) were taken from Minard Lafever's * Beauties of Modern Architecture* (1835). Lafever had written this book as well as others to help builders create or transition homes into Greek Revival. Daniel D. Reiff claimed in *Houses from Books: Treatises, Pattern Books, and Catalogs in American Architecture, 1738-1950: A History and Guide* (2000) that Lafever's books, along with others like Asher Benjamin's *The Practical House Carpenter: Being a Complete Development of the Grecian Order of Architecture* (1830) “…were of immense importance for the spread of Greek Revival.”

In addition to the Greek Revival plantations found in the upcountry of Georgia, there were also ones located further north in North Carolina. The agricultural practices of North Carolina revolved around timber and tobacco. Cotton was grown in the state,

---


27Ingmire, “Citizens,” p. 32.

28Nichols, *Early*, p. 139.

however, it was never cultivated in the same proportions as was in South Carolina and Georgia. North Carolina was almost viewed in a derogatory manner. Frederick Law Olmsted, during the course of his voyage throughout the state, reflected that "North Carolina has a proverbial reputation for the ignorance and torpidity of her people..."³⁰

North Carolina planters as a whole, did not appear to accumulate the vast wealth of those of South Carolina or the other surrounding cotton states. Viewed as “a valley of humiliation between two mountains of conceit,” the state lagged behind economically.³¹ To some, North Carolina was merely a region to be passed through en route between South Carolina and Virginia.³² Few of the plantations in North Carolina matched the grandeur found in South Carolina and Georgia. Farmers of the state had concentrated their efforts more on the production of crops like tobacco and corn, with climatic conditions not always suited for the cultivation of cotton. Profits generated from coastal rice production and piedmont cotton and tobacco did, however, push some planters into the upper echelons of the planter ranks.³³ Most in North Carolina, though, were seen as never to meet the same prestige as the planters in their neighboring states.

Exceptions, however, were found. One of these plantations was located in Warren County, among the most prosperous counties in the state due both to the

---

³⁰Olmsted, Kingdom, p. 190.


thriving town of Warrenton and the plantation culture.\textsuperscript{34} Warren County, in the northern part of the state, geographically borders Virginia, inheriting some of her traditions as well.\textsuperscript{35} It was in this county that William Williams had Montmorenci constructed, a plantation that was heralded for its beauty and presentation, exuding grandeur that was readily imitated in the local surroundings. Catherine W. Bishir, in her \textit{Southern Built: American Architecture, Regional Practice} (2006), wrote that “a half dozen major houses bespeak Montmorenci connections clearly and abundantly; as many more houses employ some of the same motifs. All are within thirty miles of Montmorenci…”\textsuperscript{36} Others sought to emulate Williams’ home, which added to the aura of this planter’s image and power.

Warren County was created in 1779, having been assembled from the northern portion of the larger Bute County.\textsuperscript{37} Soon after its founding, this county held the distinction of being one with more slaves than whites.\textsuperscript{38} In fact in 1820, there were 6,754 slaves out of a total population of 11,158. Of the 4,404 whites, 3,265 of them


\textsuperscript{35}\textit{State Records of North Carolina}, XXIV, p. 227.


\textsuperscript{38}Bishir and Southern, \textit{Guide}, p. 146.; Catherine Bishir, “The Montmorenci-Prospect Hill School: A study of High-Style Vernacular Architecture in the Roanoke Valley” in \textit{Carolina Dwelling}, ed. Doug Swain (North Carolina: The Student Publication of the School of Design: Volume 26, North Carolina State University, 1978), p. 86.; These sources differ slightly as to if it was the only county or one of three North Carolina counties that had more African-Americans than whites. In \textit{The County of Warren North Carolina 1586-1917} (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1959). Manly Wade Wellman supports the notion that Warren was the only one in the state with these population proportions. (p. 67)
were involved in cultivation and crop raising.\textsuperscript{39} Referred to as “…that well establishment…” which resided near to Shocco Springs, Montmorenci had a land holding of approximately seventeen hundred acres.\textsuperscript{40}

Williams had a financial status that exceeded others in his social class, making him one of the most preeminent North Carolina planters. His decision to build Montmorenci on his lands was one made to help affirm his status and place.\textsuperscript{41} His family had long resided in this area of North Carolina and Montmorenci was to be a testament to this family, to their power, as well as their overall ranking at the top of the planter elite.

Building Montmorenci was an enterprising undertaking. Williams employed architects (although there are no clear records as to whom those individuals were) that were most likely from Philadelphia. He also purchased furnishings from Philadelphia traditions for his masterpiece home which was on, at its zenith, approximately 1,700 acres.\textsuperscript{42} Montmorenci was not the only plantation that Williams owned. He held other

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{39}1820 Federal Census of North Carolina, Volume LII, Warren County (Tullahoma, N.Y.: Dorothy Williams Potter, 1973), pp. 32-33.
\item \textsuperscript{40}Roanoke Advocate, 8 November 1832; Roanoke Advocate, 22 November 1832.
\item \textsuperscript{41}Bishir, “Montmorenci,” p. 85.
\item \textsuperscript{42}Bishir, “Montmorenci,” pp. 85 and 88.; Bishir, Built, p. 166.; Kennedy, Men, p. 271.; “Land And Negroes For Sale,” Roanoke Advocate, 8 November 1832, 15 November 1832 and 22 November 1832.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
great land holdings, many of which came from inheritance. William Williams also owned over ninety slaves.\textsuperscript{43} But it was on the Montmorenci lands that he chose to build his great house.

The façade of Montmorenci was graced with eight slim columns, paired into four separate entities.\textsuperscript{44} Certain features of the interior made this house memorable. One was the fireplace mantle that was found in the main drawing room. The detail of the work on this piece includes a representation of the famous Battle of Lake Erie in the

\textsuperscript{43}William Williams, Warren County Record of Taxable Property, 1824-1828, North Carolina Division of Archives and History.

\textsuperscript{44}Artistic rendering of Montmorenci (IJ-10), Winterthur Library, Winterthur Archives.; Photographs, Montmorenci, Winterthur Library, Winterthur Archives.
Montmorenci Fireplace IJ-14 (before the house was torn down) by Denmark Raleigh, Winterthur Library, Winterthur Archives.

War of 1812. This was most likely in recognition to his service in this war.

Undoubtedly, it was the staircase which held the greatest place of prominence in the plantation house. The stairwell spiraled up to the next level. What was especially

---

45Denmark Raleigh photographs, fireplace – Montmorenci (IJ-14), (IJ-15) and (IJ-16), Winterthur Library, Winterthur Archives.; Figure 3, Bishir, “Montmorenci,” p.88.; McFarland, Warren, p. 114.; It is not clear who the designer of the mantle was, although Robert Wellford has been credited. The mantle appears to follow one of Owen Biddle’s plates in his Young Carpenter’s Assistant (1805), which was designated to be sold in cities like Philadelphia, where Williams obtained much of his workers and furniture.
Montmorenci Staircase (reproduced version) at Winterthur; photograph by Heidi Amelia-Anne Weber.

unique was the free standing design, detailed with elaborate motifs on the side. The staircase was the first thing seen upon entering a home, a location from which the family descended in order to receive their guests.

---

46 Denmark Raleigh photograph, staircase – Montmorenci (1J-11), Winterthur Library, Winterthur Archives.; Bishir, “Montmorenci,” p. 90.; McFarland, Warren, p.119.; Henry DuPont purchased the staircase, as well as the façade and pieces of molding of Montmorenci at the time of its demolition. During the course of transporting the staircase to Delaware, it fell off the truck and was destroyed. It has been reproduced with just a slight variation in the curve and it is a central feature of Winterthur.
In 1825, the Marquis de Lafayette visited Montmorenci during his tour of the United States. Williams was one of the representatives who reported to the state government on the overall conditions and activities of Lafayette's visit.\textsuperscript{47} Montmorenci was the grandest plantation of the region, symbolic of the powerful elite in America.

The Cameron family also held a place of distinction in North Carolina. In the late 18\textsuperscript{th} century when Richard Bennehan left his Virginia home behind to commence his life as a North Carolina planter, Bennehan-Cameron families began their rise to power.\textsuperscript{48} With the acquisition of lands from a variety of sources, inclusive of the Indians, Bennehan rapidly moved into the planter ranks.\textsuperscript{49} Meanwhile, Duncan Cameron had come to North Carolina and met with great success as a lawyer.\textsuperscript{50} It was then he began courting Rebecca Bennehan, an act that led him to a victorious duel with another one of her suitors.\textsuperscript{51} In the end, Duncan Cameron married the young lady, whose family was actively engaged in the plantation culture.\textsuperscript{52} Cameron successfully built up his land

\textsuperscript{47}Raleigh Register And North Carolina State Gazette, 13 March 1825, North Carolina Division of Archives and History, microfilm.

\textsuperscript{48}Anderson, Piedmont, p. 1

\textsuperscript{49}Letter, William Johnston to Richard Bennehan, 5 November 1778, Richard Bennhan Letters Miscellaneous, North Carolina Division of Archives and History.


\textsuperscript{51}Letter, Duncan Cameron to Thomas Dudley Bennhan, 21 April 1803, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.

\textsuperscript{52}Letter, Mary Bennehan to Duncan Cameron, 5 December 1802, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.
holdings to become one of the greatest landowners in the state, aided by his affiliation and collaborations with the Bennehans.53

It was Cameron's son Paul, however, who truly embraced the life of the planter. Although he attempted to make his living in other pursuits, he found his way back to being a planter.54 Paul and Anne Ruffin Cameron took up residence at one of the family's plantations, Fairntosh.55 Although he had inherited plantations and would continue to do so with the demise of various family members, Fairntosh did not officially come into his possession until the passing of his father.56 During the course of his residence there, Paul Cameron made many alterations to both the land and to the overall appearance of the house.

While Duncan Cameron resided in this house that he had built "he…made Fairntosh a little city..."57 The plantation, first under Duncan Cameron's leadership then under his son Paul, became a self-contained world with the main house and various outer structures operating collectively. Initially built in the Federal style, Fairntosh was transformed into the upcountry cotton planters' favored architectural style, that of Greek

53 "Table Showing Some Land Purchases of The Bennehans and Camerons" in Sanders, Cameron, p. 70.

54 Letter, William E. Anderson to Paul C. Cameron with notes written on by Paul Cameron, November 1837, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.

55 Letter, Thomas Bennehan to Anne Cameron, 14 May 1836, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.


57 Letter, Paul Cameron to his sister, 17 February 1829, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.
Revival, after his son Paul Cameron took possession.\textsuperscript{58} The renovations began in 1827.\textsuperscript{59} The front of the house was marked by its six pillars, all in the most simplistic and oldest column order.\textsuperscript{60} These renovations were done because of the money earned from the cultivation of crops on the property. Although cotton was a major crop grown on the plantation lands, other commodities like tobacco and foodstuffs were cultivated as well by at least one thousand slaves. It was estimated that this was “…the largest landed estate in the Carolinas…”\textsuperscript{61} Cameron grew cotton in North Carolina as well as on his deep South lands. He was, however, cognizant of the fact that it was a risky venture to grow cotton in North Carolina.\textsuperscript{62}

Paul C. Cameron was recognized by his fellow North Carolinians as being “…the best practical farmer and the best manager of servants…”\textsuperscript{63} His holdings were vast. Even one of his slaves, Abner Jordan, was almost awestruck by his master’s

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{58}Letter, Jean Cameron Syme to Mary Anderson, 31 May 1827, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.
\item \textsuperscript{59}Letter, Jean Cameron Syme to Mary Anderson, 31 May 1827, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.
\item \textsuperscript{60}Fairntosh Plantation, National Register Of Historic Places Inventory-Nomination Form, Durham County, North Carolina Division of Archives and History.; Fairntosh Plantation photograph, North Carolina Division of Archives and History.
\item \textsuperscript{62}Letter, Paul Cameron to Joseph Roulhac, May 1854, Bennehan Cameron Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.
\item \textsuperscript{63}T J Swain, “Petition for Amnesty,” Paul C. Cameron Papers, Civil War Collection, Orange County, North Carolina Division of Archives and History.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
possessions, estimating that he held “…five thousan’ [sic]” people in bondage.\(^{64}\) His plantations were all renowned for their layouts as well as their production capacities.\(^{65}\)

As a further testament to the fact that these plantation houses were designated for permanent ownership by the family that constructed each individual one, Paul C. Cameron clarified this for any who doubted it was part of the planter’s intent. Though the house had been built under the guidance of his father and then was inherited and modified by the younger Cameron, he specified his desire to keep all the plantations in the family’s possession. “…Fairntosh… I hope,” will “long be held and owned by the heirs of Richard Bennehan and Duncan Cameron.”\(^{66}\) The name of the plantation manor house was of significance to the planter and his family. Although there were not records for all of the homes, the Cameron family named their house Fairntosh “…after the ancestral manor of…” their “…Scottish forebearers [sic].”\(^{67}\)

---


\(^{66}\)Will of Paul C. Cameron, 1881, Northampton County, Wills, 1764-1950, Calvert-Clemens, North Carolina Division of Archives and History.

\(^{67}\)Nathans, Free, p. 17.
Through the Greek Revival plantation house, these upcountry planters were truly able to reflect their status. The house symbolized all that these men were – planter, master and leader. Built by slave labor as well as by the profits generated from their chattel slave laborers toils, the big house was a representation of the world of slavery. Though the household pediment did not have slaves carved into it, the essence of slave ownership was projected through the imposing pillars and the majestic pediment. This was the world of the upcountry cotton slave owner. The planter’s power and wealth were displayed through his home, its contents and his property. The Greek Revival plantation house filled with its furnishings and art were all possible because of the slaves who toiled in the fields. Although the house was emblematic of the planter himself, a man who was a pillar in the community as well as in the nation, it was also a reflection of the institution of slavery.
CHAPTER FOUR: THE UPCOUNTRY COTTON PLANTER AND THE PLANTATION DESIGN

Antebellum residences were expressions of stature as well as functional, convivial and livable quarters.1 The upcountry dwelling represented the family and embodied all that was “genteel” about the South. Family also stood as a representation of the planter and his actions were indicators of the master’s moral fiber with the plantation manor as a testament to the owner’s gentility and refinement.2 Nevertheless, the upcountry cotton plantation was composed of various buildings that helped to define the operations of the plantation. Landscape design and the variety of exterior structures also helped display the status of the planter in addition to being functional.

Even though the house was but one feature of the plantation unit, the greatest efforts were concentrated on its construction. Most could not afford to erect mansions of legendary status. However, the main house, regardless of its appearance, was a central feature of this self-contained community. Richard Malcolm Johnston reflected upon growing up on a plantation, commenting that “some of the very best and greatest men of the South were planters, who were fonder of their homes then [sic] the most

---


ambitious could possibly be in public office.”³ The house was in fact a symbol of wealth, power and control maintained by this class; it was the embodiment of the planter and his life. As was proclaimed about the Cameron’s Fairntosh plantation, “…this House was built on ‘Honor!’”⁴ The house and the lands upon which it stood were a source of great pride to these cotton planters.

Cotton was the 19th century’s primary crop. James Henry Hammond proclaimed “Cotton is king.”⁵ The consummate politician John C. Calhoun expressed the pride he felt in his cotton lands and the outcome of those who toiled to produce these crops. His proclamation of “I am a planter—a cotton planter” was very telling of the man, for it emphasized the importance of this world to an individual who wore many hats in the political arena.⁶ Calhoun found great satisfaction in his plantation home as well. He extended invitations to those he held in fond regard to visit his home. To Charles Lanman, author/editor of the Dictionary of the United States Congress (1866) as well as “A Summer in the Wilderness,” Calhoun wrote stating that [I] “…will expect you to make my residence a resting place in your tour. There is not part of the chain,

---
⁴Comment by William Lougee, quoted in Letter, Paul Cameron to Duncan Cameron, 3 October 1850, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.
⁵Hammond, James Henry. “Speech on the Admission of Kansas.”/“Mud-Sill.” in Defended, ed. McKitrick: 121-125.
which I have ever seen more wild and picturesque than that in my vicinity.”

Calhoun was even insistent to some that they lodge at Fort Hill. He vigorously proclaimed to the Honorable Ingersoll that “…you must not pass without calling me & spending with me, what time you can. I will take no excuse.” John Calhoun clearly wished to show his Fort Hill to his acquaintances and friends. The Greek Revival plantation house was a representation of him as a planter. Calhoun’s home was a precise definition of his being. By allowing a select few into this world, that of the upcountry cotton planter, these individuals took a glimpse of a life that readily sought after. The realities of these upcountry cotton planters’ lives as slave masters and farmers were rarely ever seen. Calhoun did see himself as a cotton planter, as previously stated, and wanted this legacy to be remembered via his Fort Hill plantation home.

The outlying region of the property was also set up in accordance with the owner’s desires. Immediately surrounding the planter’s house were the gardens. Filled with different flowering bushes and various forms of shrubbery, along with

---

7Letter, John C. Calhoun to Charles Lanman, 1 April 1848, John Caldwell Calhoun Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Letter of Introduction for Mr. Charles Lanman, Hon. Thompson to John C. Calhoun, 1 April 1848, John Caldwell Calhoun Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

8Letter, John C. Calhoun to Honorable Ingersoll, 14 August 1847, John Caldwell Calhoun Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
majestic trees, the paths leading to the home were meticulously cultivated.\textsuperscript{9} Many of the large plantation houses and their cultivated grounds evoked responses such as “...Southern beauty reposing upon a luxurious bed of flowers in a nectarine grove...who...bring to her the most precious fruits and ornaments.”\textsuperscript{10}

Common among the great Georgia and South Carolina plantations was the entranceway. Plantations contained pathways described as “...broad and lengthy avenues leading to the house...” centered amidst “...the trees.”\textsuperscript{11} The driveway, which created the path for anyone approaching the main house, was carefully laid out. It was a statement, a means to impress. A lengthy path, slightly curved, took the visitor to the steps where the planter would await. Slaves held torches while standing along the borders of the trail to illuminate the night traveler’s route to the home.\textsuperscript{12} Large and imposing oaks, some draped with Spanish moss, led the visitor to the splendor of this southern world. Multifunctional, the mighty oak trees provided shade from the potent sun, masked portions of the property as well as created an ornamental presentation


\textsuperscript{10}Bremer, Impressions, p. 268. Frederika Bremer, of Stockholm, Sweden, visited the United States on a ‘Grand Tour,’ traveling throughout both North and South. She detested the institution of slavery but was fond of the South and her plantations.


leading to the magnificent structure.\textsuperscript{13} Splendor was thus exuded. Oak trees were frequently found among the Georgia and Carolina plantations. Londoner Charles Mackay noted that the “…melancholy trees form the most conspicuous feature of the landscape of the two Carolinas and Georgia.”\textsuperscript{14} Massive oaks, with their branches drooping from the weight of the tyllindria, almost masked the slave cabins from the sight of the main grounds.\textsuperscript{15}

Wade Hampton II placed great consideration in the overall design of the property as well as the house itself at Millwood. The pathway leading to the plantation house was lined by the towering evergreen trees that shaded the trail, opening into an exposed green. Here the vegetation was more sporadic but the area was filled with grass and strategically positioned bushes. The colors of the variety of plants gradually deepened in the approach to the summit of the house itself.\textsuperscript{16} One newspaper reporter, John B. Irving, described the entranceway and landscape of Millwood in his 1844 article, “Sporting Epistle From South Carolina,” expounding that it gave “…the place an appearance of eternal summer.”\textsuperscript{17} About the house, he wrote it “…stands on a

\textsuperscript{13}Riley, “Sycamore,” p. 370. Mrs. Riley reflected upon the gardens and tree lined entranceways of her family’s South Carolina plantations.; Rosser H. Taylor, Ante-bellum South Carolina: A Social And Cultural History (New York: Da Capo Press, 1970), p. 9.; Personal observations made of plantation entrances at Redcliffe and Millwood (although I have never been able to gain permission to walk on the property where Millwood once stood, even though I have made many attempts.)


\textsuperscript{15}Olmsted, Journeys, vol. I, p. 234.

\textsuperscript{16}Irving, “Sporting.”

\textsuperscript{17}--, “Visit.”
ground of which every advantage has been taken.” Irving furthered his description, incorporating that “the carriage road bordered by ever greens [sic], traces its way thro’ [sic] an open lawn with here and there a shrub, or tree, contrasting agreeably with the dark verdue [sic] of the thicker groups of foliage immediately above the mansion.”

Flanking the house were the dwellings for those who handled the horses in addition to the facilities for exercising and conditioning the animals. On the opposite side stood many of the other structures necessary for the operation of the plantation, along with areas for food cultivation and growth. Additional stables for the working and general use horses were placed in this vicinity as well.

---

18 Irving, “Sporting.”
19 Irving, “Sporting.”
20 Irving, “Sporting.”
Most of these plantations featured detailed landscape architecture leading up to and surrounding the big house. Interestingly, James Henry Hammond was somewhat in a quandary as to what best suited Redcliffe. Upon seeking assistance in the framing of his property, since Hammond was “…not much inclined to go to the trouble of an extensive pleasure ground…” T. Berkman advised Hammond to plant a minimal variety of decorative vegetation if only to enhance the structure.21

Though the fruits of his efforts were not entirely seen until later years, perhaps not until even modern day, the plan that James Henry Hammond made for the entranceway to Redcliffe provided an air of mystique. The massive trees that stand line the entranceway, tucking the mansion house away from the mere passerby’s observation, created a sense of anticipation in what great structure lay ahead.22 Hammond sought also to have Redcliffe’s landscaping perfectly manicured. He inquired friends about the best suggestions as to add to the appearance of the property. After designing his own proposal, he forwarded it on the friends and acquaintances in order to solicit assistance. One such response gave Hammond the accolades he desired. “Your splendid house, is a Lordly residence, and requires…a park.”23 Upon visiting Redcliffe, a reporter for the Charleston Daily Courier described the layout and design of the property. In this article, the reporter equated the yards as ones of Roman mythology.

---

21Letter, T. (or L.) Berkman to James Henry Hammond, 16 April 1859, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

22Personal observations of Redcliffe.

23Letter, T. (or L.) Berkman to James Henry Hammond, 16 April 1859, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
The grounds about the mansion of Redcliffe, are handsomely laid out and adorned with floral charm; and are also enriched with the treasures of Ceres and Pomona, the vegetable garden and the orchard, yielding a wealth of luscious fruits and marrowy esculents.24

The abundant vegetation that filled the surrounding yard almost completely obscured Fort Hill from sight. But Calhoun did not plant these massive trees.25 He, however, oversaw a good deal of the landscaping that took place on Fort Hill. Though trees were already plentiful on the property, Calhoun designed the layout and placement of the more decorative trees and various bushes. Among the favorites were the fruit trees, most likely because they had beautiful flowers and also because they provided food.26 Calhoun carefully selected the plants and trees that were placed on the property. He called upon his mother-in-law, Floride Bonneau Colhoun, who was the initial owner of the property, for some of her low country vegetation. He asked her to “…bring up a few small orange plants…as I feel confident that with a little attention and care they will succeed on the south side of our house…”27 Calhoun also requested “some blue grass seed for the yard in the fall, two or three pomgenet [sic] plants in a box, and a few real yam potatoes to obtain seed from another year…”28

24“Editorial Correspondence,” Charleston Courier.
27Letter, John C. Calhoun to Mother (Floride Bonneau Colhoun), 9 April 1827, John C. Calhoun Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
28Letter, John C. Calhoun to Mother (Floride Bonneau Colhoun), 9 April 1827, John C. Calhoun Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
Among the scores of trees at Fort Hill were ones that had been gifts from the other two members of the “Great Triumvirate,” Daniel Webster and Henry Clay. Though much of the landscape design of Fort Hill reflected John C. Calhoun’s persona, other portions were symbolic of his absences. His wife Floride Calhoun took great pains in modifying the landscape of the plantation as well, particularly during her times of loneliness as an almost therapeutic manner while her husband was away. Though Calhoun was the master statesman, some friends and acquaintances presupposed that it was his wife who was the domineering force in his life. Clara Walton Alger recorded in her travel journal, upon her visit to Fort Hill years after John C. Calhoun’s death, regarding Mrs. Calhoun, that she “…is said to have ruled her husband.” This statement, in essence, goes beyond Floride Calhoun’s directives of her husband in the “Pettycoat Affair” and helps to indicate that her efforts in designing the landscape of Fort Hill were certainly made of her own accord, not to be challenged or altered at the whims of John C. Calhoun.

In essence, cotton was what was most relevant on the property. Vast fields surrounded the plantation house. The cotton crop defined the aesthetic appearance of Milford. In times of bloom, the property adjacent to the home “…became white.”

These upcountry cotton planters placed emphasis on the landscape design of their plantations. When Paul and Anne Cameron took up permanent residence at

---

29National Register of Historic Places Inventory – Nomination Form, Fort Hill, Pickens County File, South Carolina Department of Archives & History, pp. 1, 2 and 4.

30Clara Walton Adger Journal, entry 26 March 1854, Adger and Bowen Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

31Kennedy, Revival, p. 12.
Fairntosh, they were determined to alter the appearance of the land as well as that of the house. They began acquiring various types of vegetation from their acquaintances in order to enhance the outlying area of their homestead. Though Paul Cameron’s parents had done some planting on the property previously, it was rather sparse. In actuality, they had spent most of their time clearing away the unruly brush instead. In turn, this basically left Paul Cameron to modify the land to his own accord. A “…cedar hedge…” was laid out from “…the piazza down to the enclosure around the grove…” A variety of flowering fruit trees as well as other flora, many of which were provided from the Ruffin family (Anne’s family), were arranged in an artistic impression throughout the property. The Camerons also constructed a greenhouse in order to cultivate various forms of vegetation. Though it took years to plant and cultivate all the trees, bushes and flowers, the Camerons designed an aesthetically appealing setting for the outside of their plantation home.

Each planter had his own ideas as to the landscaping for his property. Every plant, flower and tree was carefully selected and placement was done with precision. Judge John Harris’ home Whitehall was framed by a variety of different trees. The entranceway and surrounding lawn were carefully designed and decorated with

---

32 Accounts, dated 11 February 1811, 25 November 1811, 17 April 1817 and 10 April 1816, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.

33 Letter, Margaret B. Cameron to Paul C. Cameron, 18 June 1845, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.

34 Accounts, dated 22 January 1854 and 9 March 1854, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.; Letter, Annie Cameron to Paul C. Cameron, 12 April 1854, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.
“…spruce pines; deodars and cedars…” along with the native “…boxwood…”

Though these trees were aesthetically appealing, they were functional as well, providing cover from sun.

Of all the flora and vegetation used for ornamentation, as well as those used for foodstuffs, at Redcliffe, it was the plethora of grape vines that took precedence. Hammond hoped this homestead would not be one of extensive laborious efforts, but more for pleasurable enterprises, which included the growth of grapes for wine production. The vines were spread across the property, where they prospered from the ideal soil for such agricultural pursuits. An acquaintance of James Henry Hammond’s noted “…that he had never seen any thing to compare with it in Europe or America.”

Trees and flowering bushes were frequently used for the aesthetic appeal but also served functional purposes. Technically the house and surrounding structures at Paul Cameron’s Fairntosh were built on the land whereupon they resided. The trees not only provided building wood but incendiary material which was used to fire the kiln. Though not always in use, the kiln produced the much needed brick on the plantation. When the major renovations were undertaken at Fairntosh, inclusive of the construction

---


36 “Editorial Correspondence,” *Charleston Courier*.

37 Letter, James Henry Hammond to Major (Col. M. C. Hammond), 24 June 1859, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
of new buildings as well as alterations to the house itself, the equipment and work buildings of the plantation produced the bricks that were used.\(^{38}\)

Fairntosh was not alone in being constructed of the materials available on the property. In the “Articles of Agreement” signed for the building of Milford, it was clearly specified that John Manning was responsible for providing all of the materials necessary for the construction of his house. It can be assessed that “…the bricks…” were forged either on the property or nearby and “…the yellow pine lumber…” was felled there, since the region was renowned for these type of tree.\(^{39}\) Logically, for financial reasoning alone, the planter wanted to manufacture many of the production materials to help defray the cost of the transportation of materials. In addition, this reduced the overall expenditure for the construction of the plantation house.

In addition to the vegetation enhancements to the residential quarters, there were other buildings necessary in creating the plantation community. With chattel slaves as a significant element of the plantation system, residences were set up for these individuals within range of the main house. Various types of bungalows housed the slaves. Typically whitewashed structures, these buildings were aligned in row form in varying proximities from the owner’s home. The tendency was to build these cabins to the rear of the master’s house but on certain properties they were placed in the forefront, as a means to impress outsiders. The planter’s estate also contained the

\(^{38}\)Paul C. Cameron, Journal entry, 19 September 1850, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.

\(^{39}\)“Articles of Agreement,” signed by Jos. Fenney, C. L. Hampton, Nathaniel Potter and Jn. L. Manning, 6 May 1839, Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
appropriate facilities that accommodated successful working operations and self-reliance.\textsuperscript{40}

The construction of all these buildings was normally done with consideration, for each structure on the plantation was a reflection upon the owner. These buildings were functional but had aesthetic appeal as well. Slave cabins were necessary yet were not as attractive. Although slave quarters were far from comfortable, they were usually functional.\textsuperscript{41} A medical doctor pointed out “…that the slave, who built our mansions, buys our fine clothes, and supplies our tables with delicacies, has a right to a comfortable house, and sufficient food and clothing.”\textsuperscript{42} In many ways this is ironic. This doctor recognized that these slaves were the reason why the men of means maintained their status. However he asserted “rights” entitled to slaves. Slaves lacked any real rights. It was not clear as to whom this doctor was, but his words were idealistic in nature.

It was the slave who toiled in the other outer buildings, making this self-contained world a prosperous one. Planters associated the growth of these staple crops with the


\textsuperscript{41}Vlach, Back, pp. 153, 155 and 158.

laborious efforts of the chattel. The institution of holding men and women in bondage was the key to prosperity that was found in the cultivation of cotton as well as other agricultural goods, thus allowing these planters to build their Greek Revival homes.\textsuperscript{43} As Edward E. Baptist attested in his \textit{The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery And The Making Of American Capitalism} (2014) that “cotton was the most important raw material of the industrial revolution that created our modern world economy.”\textsuperscript{44} He furthered this idea, pointing out that “enslaved African Americans were the world’s most efficient producers of cotton.”\textsuperscript{45} The market economy, cotton and slavery were interwoven together. The profits generated as a result enabled the planters to build these plantation houses.

The positioning of the slave cabins was done in accordance to the planter’s desires. However, it was fairly standard to have the fields where the crops were cultivated immediately adjacent to all structures on the plantation, so that time would not be wasted in moving the laborers to their work.\textsuperscript{46}

At Fairntosh, there were two homes just on the outskirts of the main portion of the property. These were the closest in proximity to the main house. Although it is


\textsuperscript{44}Baptist, \textit{Half}, p. 113.

\textsuperscript{45}Baptist, \textit{Half}, p. 113.

unclear as to who resided in these structures, it has been assessed that the “…cook and…male attendants” lived there.\textsuperscript{47} At Redcliffe, the slaves resided out of sight. They lived behind the home itself.\textsuperscript{48}

Constructed of various materials, the slave cabins ranged in level of adequacy and comfort from plantation to plantation. Stone was used for the construction of the slaves’ housing at Fort Hill. These structures were described as being “…of stone of superior masonry, two hundred and ten feet in length, divided into apartments, with separate fire-places, sufficiently large for all the purposes of comfort and healthiful [sic] ventilation.”\textsuperscript{49} The slave homes were also strategically positioned near all the fields, much like they were at other plantations. Those cotton and corn lands were so deemed as having been “…grand beyond description.”\textsuperscript{50} Separate from the slave cabins was a house for the overseer. However, all planters did not use overseers; in fact some found them more troublesome than useful, like James Henry Hammond who proclaimed “if there were no overseers at all planters would get on far better.”\textsuperscript{51}

Although the slave cabins were very important structures on the upcountry cotton plantation, various other buildings were necessary as well. The risk of fire was always great in a time when homes, constructed of wood, were heated solely through
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\bibitem{50} Scoville, “Visit,” p. 530.
\bibitem{51} Letter, James Henry Hammond to My Dear Wife (Catherine), 8 August 1845, James Henry Hammond Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.
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fireplaces, illuminated by candlelight and food preparation was done by open flame either in fireplaces or crude ovens. Although most of these needs could only be met through the use of open fire, to help elevate the burden of potential cooking fires, kitchens were commonly built in separate structures. Common among the larger nineteenth century homes, kitchens were constructed in close proximity to the main house, particularly to the dining room, but were situated just far enough away for some added safety. The contract between John L. Manning and his architect, Nathaniel F. Potter, signed 6 May 1839, provided for the construction of both Milford as well as a separate kitchen facility.52

---

Nathaniel F. Potter, Architectural Design of Milford showing separate kitchen, May 1839, Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
The kitchen building was of great importance to the planter as well as to the plantation as a whole. In his initial designs for Milford’s kitchen, Nathaniel Potter planned the structure to be “twenty feet by fifty feet two stories high the first story 10 feet.” What Potter erected matched the modernism found in this plantation house, for

---

it included not only the sizeable fireplace but an apparatus that cooked the food through the use of “…fire boxes underneath…”54

The detached kitchen was primarily for safety precautions. On the other hand, it also provided a separation of the family from the slaves who were involved in the meal preparation. Fort Hill was constructed in this manner as well. The area used for the readying and cooking of the family meals was built from trees felled on the property. The wooden structure was kept partially masked from plain sight by an avenue of coniferous cedars.55

Fort Hill contained a variety of structures as well as landscaping features which filled both functional and aesthetic purposes. During his many absences from the plantation, John Calhoun kept abreast of the conditions of the property by his wife Floride. In one such letter, in attempt to provide him with imagery of his property, she wrote “…we went by the mill and returned by the millpond.”56 Meanwhile, his son-in-law wrote more of the business aspects. Calhoun, even in his absence, wanted all aspects of his property to be under constant surveillance, as to ensure its productivity.

Redcliffe also featured an external kitchen building in addition to a variety of other structures necessary for the favorable operations of a plantation.57 One distinctive

54---, “Milford,” p. 4.
building that was found on the grounds of Redcliffe that was built in correlation with the
growing of the vine was the “…subterranean wine cellar…” was built separate from the
house and was “…excavated twenty feet below the surface and covered by a wooden
building, is admirably constructed, and all necessary machinery and preparations are
ready for the manufacture of wine on an extensive scale.”58 This was “…covered by a
wooden building…”59 Although the building was obscured from sight and protected by
another structure, it was a prominent and well known feature. Wade Hampton’s
Millwood featured a “winehouse” [sic]. This structure differed greatly from Hammond’s
wine cellar, not only being above ground, but also built in the Greek Revival
architectural style.60

Ensuring the effective operations of a vast upcountry cotton plantation required
great cooperation, a tremendous amount of work and a variety of buildings to help it be
relatively self-sufficient. It was a delicate balance that was never easily attained. John
Townsend Trowbridge astutely assessed this during the course of his visit to the South,
stating that “the life of the planter is one of care and uncertainty.”61

Most of these upcountry planters included mills as well as cotton presses and
cotton gins on their plantations.62 Many different buildings were needed to house
equipment, animals as well as people. Redcliffe, for example, was in many ways a self-

59 “Editorial Correspondence,” Charleston Courier.
60 Triad, “Millwood.”
contained world. “On the plantation was a large grist-mill,…” as well as “…the sawmill, which had turned out all the lumber used in the building of “Redcliffe.” In addition to these structures, “…the blacksmith was to be found at his forge, the wheelwright in his shop, and the stock-minder guarding the welfare of his charges.”

In contrast, Paul C. Cameron was reliant upon his overseer. In fact, Samuel Piper (overseer) was such a trustworthy employee that Cameron relocated him to Fairntosh and constructed a home there for him. John Manning had individual homes erected for the gardeners as well as the porter. The same was done for those Manning considered were on the staff, who held a different classification than those who were slaves. These individuals were viewed more like servants as they were more visible on the property since they were not in the fields.

In order to house and care for the vast number of animals which grazed the Fort Hill lands, various structures were built. Many barns, stables, milk houses, chicken coops and carriage houses, which all proved to be readily accessible, graced the landscape. The buildings were constructed with a sense of permanency in mind and were accommodating for the work which was to be conducted within them. For the Milford plantation, Potter designed an animal barn that was done in the same

---

63Clay-Copton, Belle, p. 214.

64Clay-Copton, Belle, p. 214.

65Letter, Anne R. Cameron to Paul Cameron, December 1850, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

66John L. Manning Account Book, Cost of Construction of Milford, Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

architectural style as the main house. Designing and building additional buildings in Greek Revival, which followed the architectural plan of the main house, was very symbolic. It certainly was an indicator of the planter who owned this property. This showed how precise his attention to detail was as well as his concern for how the overall presentation of the property reflected him.

Cotton was what was most essential to these planters. Acreage allowed for these men to grow enough of this crop in order to live as planters. Fort Hill, for example, had “…400 improved acres and 950 unimproved acres of land…” on which, among other crops, “…64 bales of cotton at 400 pounds per bale…” were cultivated. By the early part of the nineteenth century, there were “…over 8,000…” acres on Fairntosh plantation. Statistics show that Paul Cameron had 470 people enslaved on this property in 1860. It is unclear, however, how much cotton was actually cultivated.

Each plantation was built to represent both the needs of the planter as well as the image of the man himself. Though many plantations featured some commonalities, each one was inherently a representation of the man who owned the individual property. These upcountry Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina cotton planters took great pains to modify their plantations to fit their needs, their operations and their personalities. So much of their lifestyle as slave masters was found in their Greek

---


69 Wilson, ed., Volume XVI, pp. xxix and xxx.


Revival homes, as well as the entire operations and structures of the plantation. Every aspect, from the tree lined entranceways to the overall layout of the outer buildings, was done with great precision and were representatives of the planter himself. As important as the furnishings and décor of the plantation house were to the upcountry cotton planter, the outside of the home was equally significant. Most would only get a glimpse of his world through a visual contact of the surrounding grounds of the big house. For those not permitted into the inner sanctuary of the upcountry cotton planter, this had to be a lasting impression. It was a reminder of why this man was dominant in society and politics. One was to be overawed by the magnitude of this impressive architectural structure. Those welcomed into the house got an even greater glimpse into this world, so all of the decorations, art work and furniture had meaning. Each piece of furniture and works of art within the plantation house were positioned with painstaking detail. It projected the image of the caliber and character of the man who owned them. Every facet of the Greek Revival as well as its overall appearance represented these upcountry slaveholding cotton planters.

CHAPTER FIVE: POSSESSIONS, HOUSE CONTENTS, AND DECORATIONS
Expressions of gentility and refinement were carefully revealed within the structure and furnishings of the big house. Along with the massive trees and flowers that decorated the property, displays of wealth and power were evident through the diversity of outer plantation buildings. Individual rooms within the big house also served as mediums of expression. They helped to foster the imagery of power that the planter was striving to project. A proper gentleman who prided himself on his honor would display his power and status with his home. The house was a tangible entity, one that the planter could nurture and reflect upon with great pride.¹

Steadily increasing, albeit sometimes fluctuating, cotton prices afforded those who prospered the opportunity to indulge in finer quality possessions for the interior of the home. The most minor of detail within the confines of the house as well as on the property stood to show the magnitude of the planter. A variety of exterior structures which displayed the diversity of the plantation's operations, complemented by the decorative adornment of trees and flowers, presented a precise image of who the planter was as a man to outsiders who caught a glimpse of this magnificent display. Within the interior of the big house, the careful placement of fresh floral arrangements in artisan crafted vases, the availability of great works of literature, Greek texts, as well as a lexicon and a Christian Bible were symbolic of the type of person that the planter

wished to present himself.\textsuperscript{2} He was powerful and wealthy yet he embodied the traits of Christian charity.

The role of women as plantation mistresses should not be overlooked here. Her various duties on the plantation were inclusive of maintenance of the household. As Elizabeth Fox-Genovese assessed in \textit{Within the Plantation Household: Black and White Women of the Old South} (1988) that “the mistress of the household…assumed the mantle of ruling lady…”\textsuperscript{3} Fox-Genovese continued her analysis regarding the plantation mistress and stated that “she oversaw the house and its natural extensions, notable flower and vegetable gardens…” among other domestic duties.\textsuperscript{4} In essence, the woman of the house was responsible for its overall appearance and upkeep. Although these planters often did not mention their wives’ influence in the décor and design of the home, it is clear they had an influential role.

Much of the life of the upcountry cotton planter was found in various manifestations within the house, property and other possessions. Through this medium of the home, the planter was trying to represent to the outside world how he wished to be perceived. The actual plantation house was one means of doing this. However, the planter could also express his character, his honor, his prestige as well as his wealth through many other assets. This was done through the appearance and facilities on the plantation as well various forms of property. The design and décor of the house as well


\textsuperscript{4}Fox-Genovese, \textit{Within}, p. 116.
as possessions like art and blood horses, two entities that were frequently intertwined, were interpretations of the planter’s self-depiction.

The interior design of the Greek Revival plantation house was planned so as to incorporate necessary rooms but also to provide for circulation of air in the warm climate. Many of these homes shared somewhat similar patterns although were modified in accordance with the specific desires of each individual. The layout of Lowther Hall entailed a standard pairing of rooms on each side of the wide center hall, capped by the grand spiral stairwell in the rear. The parlor was placed on the immediate left, which connected with the sitting room. On the right side of the first floor was the formal dinner area as well as the planter’s sleeping quarters. The four rooms on the second floor were designated as bed rooms, and occasionally were used for other multipurpose functions.5

---

Rose Hill’s (Lockerly) interior design was that of the standard two by two room pattern. The dual parlors on the right side of the house could be kept separate by the closing of the mahogany pocket doors or expanded into one large ballroom setting. Immediately to the left of the center hall was the dining room, which was backed by the master bedroom. All four rooms of the second floor were used as sleeping quarters. Italian marble had been incorporated for the fireplaces, but was used on the first floor only, where it could be seen. What was placed in the private quarters on the next level of the house was merely a facsimile.  

---

6Personal observations of Lockerly Hall and discussion with Lockerly’s historian Murali Thirumal.
Whereas in Rose Hill (Lockerly) reproductions were used on the second floor in the areas that would be out of sight of the passing visitor, the same was not true for Millwood. No expense was spared in the decoration and furnishings of the bedrooms found on the second level of Millwood.⁷

⁷Irving, “Sporting.”
Millwood underwent dramatic transformations and renovations. Initially the house was simple in design with a large center hall flanked by twenty by twenty feet rooms on each side. With Nathaniel F. Potter's renovations, the house was enlarged. The original plan was altered so that the first floor then contained eight rooms, four on each side of the wide center hall. Among the rooms featured on the entrance level were “the drawing room…the dining room…a business room…” and “…a music room.” “The second floor contains sleeping apartments of various sizes, also handsomely furnished.” John B. Irving shared the details of these extensive renovations in his 1844 article “Sporting Epistle From South Carolina.” The people of South Carolina were interested in the actions and lifestyle of the elite, much like people of the modern era. This brought insight into a world that most never saw or attained.

There was an openness in the design and structure of Millwood that created a sense of space. Sally Baxter Hampton, who had but recently married into the Hampton family, wrote to her sister back home in New York detailing her new life in South Carolina, especially her time at Millwood. “We sat on the piazza all the afternoon & evening & dined with windows wide open…” This account set the tone of the

---

8House design, Millwood c. 1817, Millwood –Richland County Research File, South Carolina Division of Archives and History.
9William Seale, “Diagram of Interior Sketch; Conjectural Diagram at Millwood as it was Prior to its Destruction in February 1865,” Millwood-Richland County Research File, South Carolina Division of Archives and History.
10Irving, “Sporting.”
11Irving, “Sporting.”
12Irving, “Sporting.”.
encompassing openness of the house which was magnified with the opening of the windows to extend the floorplan on to the porch.

Milford had two main floors as well as an attic floor. The main level of the house featured a wide center hall with two large rooms on each side. In the rear portion of the first floor, the grand spiral staircase began its climb to the next level. There were four rooms on each side of the second floor while the “attic floor” had six rooms in all.14

James Henry Hammond’s Redcliffe followed the four rooms to a floor plan, with a grand center hall dividing the rooms.15 Unique to this mansion was the stairwell. Instead of the typical stairway which ascends facing the hall, the stairs faced the back entrance, which helped for better movement of the air.16 Faced with the intense heat and humidity of the region, Hammond attempted to alleviate these conditions with this alternate architectural plan.

Although each planter had his home constructed to his individual specifications, there was a tendency toward certain commonalities. Each home contained an area for receiving guests on the first floor. This locale was important for it would grant the

---

14Nathaniel F. Potter, House plans for Milford, May 1839, Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

15“Editorial Correspondence,” Charleston Courier.

16Personal observations of Redcliffe Plantation.
first impression of the homestead to the outsider.¹⁷ A formal dining room was usually found on this floor as well. Frequently the plantation owners selected the finest china and silver place settings. Paul C. Cameron carefully selected his silver purchases from the most exclusive stores like Bailey & Co. in Philadelphia. Sitting rooms or a sort of study

¹⁷Thomas, Secret, ed. Burr, p. 95.
was another universal component of a planter’s household. This was an area for conducting business; it was also a location for social receptions.

The foyer and the parlor were the two most important rooms within the plantation home and by far the most impressive. Upon walking through the main entrance, one would be awestruck by the stairwell, found either in the center or to the right of the vestibule. Common among the Greek Revival Revival plantations were the freestanding spiral wooden staircases. Parts that supported the handrails tended to be sturdier that those found in earlier stairwells. Owners descended down these stairs to receive their guests in a scene that created a lasting impression. More detail was etched in the wood, providing for a more curvilinear form. The lobia granted one the first impression of the home and its contents. It was to present a “sense of quality of the house.”

White was a color that usually was avoided in the vestibule, for white was a color deficient of character, distinction and dignity. This color had been used prominently during the colonial years due to its minimal cost. In the antebellum period, slave cabins and residences of poor whites tended to be whitewashed, and it was common to find


the same for the interiors since it was readily affordable. Plantation owners sought to set a line of demarcation between themselves and the masses. Use of color for wall decoration added depth, warmth and a sense of quality.21 However, if the planters used white for the shading of their walls, they were greatly adorned with artwork as well as other decorations. In some instances, white was the selected color for the walls of the house. Nathaniel F. Potter detailed clearly in his “Specifications for a House to be built in Sumpter [sic] district, South Carolina, for John L. Manning, Esq.” that “all the wood work…except, the floors…” was “…to be painted…white…”22

Contrary to his stance on the tariffs on foreign goods, John C. Calhoun adorned his walls with trendy wallpapers designed in France.23 This, in turn, reflected his desire to maintain a home that was kept with the current trends in both architectural and interior designs, as well as setting standards among his upcountry peers. As Candace M. Volz stated in her “An Analysis of the Interiors of Fort Hill, The John C. Calhoun House,” which was conducted in 2002, that the “…high style wallpaper selections for their time periods…” are “…further evidence of the Calhoun’s “stylish” household.”24 This further designated how the upcountry planter set to define himself to a unique standard.

---


22 Nathaniel F. Potter, “Specifications for a House to be built in Sumpter district, South Carolina, for John L. Manning, Esq.,” May 1839, Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.


The parlor was in fact a paragon of the planter and his family. All guests passed through this room, hence the greatest efforts were placed into its furnishing and decoration. Visitors were received in this room. It was also the locale for entertainment and displays of proper social graces, such as the European tradition of high tea. A small table with matching chairs was central to the room to accommodate such events. The entertainment value of the room was critical since plantations were self-sufficient units, located far from the city. Musical instruments such as the harp or a piano were placed within the parlor, as were books, especially if there was not a separate library. The Camerons not only included their multiple pianos in the parlor but instruments like violins and flutes so that they could be used as well. In addition to the parlor, Millwood had “…a music room.” These components all designated wealth, status and culture.

Upon occupying the house, Paul and Anne Cameron took great pains, as well as many years, to furnish Fairntosh to their liking. Seeking to use styles that reflected the popular trends of the day, like the ornate Rococo Revival, the Camerons carefully positioned these pieces of furniture where they would have the greatest


27Anderson, Piedmont, p. 54.

28Irving, “Sporting.”

29Joseph T. Butler, on page 69 of his Field Guide to American Antique Furniture: A Unique Visual System for Identifying the Style of Virtually Any Piece of American Antique Furniture (New York: Holt Paperbacks, 1986), stated that “from the 1840s through the end of the century, Rococo was the most popular furniture style in the United States.”
visibility, in the parlor. As a token of affection for his daughter-in-law Anne, Duncan Cameron obtained a variety of seating “…for her parlour [sic].”

Furniture was placed strategically within the parlor. Frequently, the mistress was responsible for the task of properly placing and arranging the furnishings in order to promote a proper home. Each plantation home was distinct, for there was no set style for the interiors. However, furniture pieces were usually family heirlooms, in addition to those of Empire styles and in the Greek Revival trends. There was a strong trend towards classical themes. With the numerous intermarriages of plantation families, many furnishings were carry-over pieces from bygone eras. Although this generation of upcountry cotton planter sought to distinguish himself from his predecessors, he in fact embraced his heritage through means as simple as incorporating familial furniture into his Greek Revival plantation home.

Chairs placed in the parlor were neither bulky nor cumbersome, so as to allow for arrangement to accommodate more guests. The Empire style chair was most commonly found in this room. Charleston furniture makers did produce many of these particular pieces. Similar in style to models produced in the northeast, their southern counterparts were made with abbreviated arm lengths. Acanthus leaves were

---

30Letter, Duncan Cameron to Paul and Anne Cameron, 13 May 1845, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.


commonly found etched into the chair backs. In addition to the armchairs, there were sofas or settees, as well as a matching set of seating pieces. Grandfather clocks, etageres and gaming tables were also used to furnish the parlor.

Windows were a powerful expression of prestige. A majority of the early homes in Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina, including plantations, were deficient of glass panes. Most only had gaps between the wooden logs to serve as a means of light and air circulation. With the construction of these permanent residences, windows became more commonplace. Windows in the parlor were frequently floor to ceiling, thus permitting a greater flow of air on the milder days. They also served a secondary purpose as doors, providing an exit to the front portico. Embroidered portieres were selected, done in color combinations, which complemented the wall shades.

John L. Manning carefully approved of the windows selected for Milford. In order to affect the best possible illumination for the second level of the home, particularly for “…the dressing [sic] rooms,” he opted to place “…fine windows on each side…” Manning made it clear his preference for the type of glass, particularly the tint, for the

---


34 Horton, Museum, n. p.; Jones and Williams, Beautiful, p. 111.


37 Letter, Nathaniel F. Potter to John L. Manning, 12 May 1839, Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
household windows. He carefully altered the original selection as to best illuminate his home. “As regards the window Mirror glass I prefer [torn section – missing] to the green. I think that all the glass was to be the [torn section – missing] brown glass except some small portio [sic] [torn section – missing]…”

Wade Hampton II added an even more elaborate touch in Millwood by having stained glass windows placed on the wall behind the stairwell, illuminating the stairs in a graceful and delicate manner. The entrance hall thus was elegantly complemented by “…a staircase of much beauty of proportion, lighted from above by richly stained glass, producing a mellow and most agreeable tone of light.” This conjured up the imagery of a church or temple, with the higher authority figure descending down from above.

In keeping with the theme of Greek Revival architecture, the classics were transcended through both art and furniture. People deemed ancient Athens as the zenith of beauty in regards to the arts, styles and structures. By copying, or creating an American version of the works, the planters were paying their own form of homage to this ancient era and its poignant legacy. In turn, they were making these works their own and equating themselves to the ancient rulers, or perhaps gods.

---

38Letter, John Manning to Nathaniel F. Potter [partial – letter is torn], 22 September 1839, Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

39Irving, “Sporting.”

40Irving, “Sporting.”

But clearly not all furnishings were of this style. Each planter maintained a variety of different furniture pieces for their homes. Some specifics, though, remain unknown, whether it is due to a lack of adequate record keeping, document obscurity or loss and destruction of familial papers. For example, specifics of the contents and furnishings of Millwood are relatively unknown, for most possessions and some familial papers were destroyed during the Union Army’s occupation of Columbia, South Carolina, in February 1865. There is, however, one noteworthy chair that survived the grand conflagration that engulfed the plantation home. A “…wicker, semi-arm chair…” that had actually been the location where Wade Hampton II expired in 1858, is one of the few furnishings that was left as a record from this plantation home.\textsuperscript{42} The list of items sold from William Williams estate shows that there were many pieces of furniture. However, the inventory is relatively vague; for example a “dozen chairs” were specified but no further details were provided. The most detailed account were for items like the “writing desk” and the “candlestick snuffers.” Also the list does not specify in which rooms he had placed these objects.\textsuperscript{43} This leads the historian to really only speculate as to the design as well as the placement of these furnishings.

These upcountry Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina cotton planters sought to differentiate themselves from their predecessors or ancestors by building more permanent homes in the Greek Revival style, as opposed to the previously dominant Federal form. Although they were distinguishing themselves from their

\textsuperscript{42}Harry R. E. Hampton, “The Second Wade,” Virginia Gurley Meynard Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

\textsuperscript{43}The Estate of Genl. William Williams, Court 1835, Warren County Estate Records 1772-1940, n.d. (Williams, W.K.A. – Wise), North Carolina Division of Archives and History.
predecessors, many of these men did retain various components of the past. For example at Fort Hill, John C. Calhoun embraced America’s revolutionary history through his possession of a specific chair. General George Washington used this piece of furniture at his headquarters during the battle of Trenton, New Jersey, in 1776. This prized chair was featured on the first floor in Calhoun’s sitting room. The bond with the past represented the planter’s acknowledgement of his, or at least his nation’s, heritage. In many ways it was perhaps fitting that Calhoun, the so-called “Father of Secession,” held on to an article that was used by the military leader of the American revolutionary cause. This chair was symbolic of the bond he held with Washington, who was a fellow southern planter but who had led the rebellion against the unjust legislation of Great Britain.

Certain types of wood were particularly suited for southern plantation parlors. Mahogany was commonly used in seating furniture and tables. A reasonably sturdy wood, it generated the best-polished finish. The pocket doors which sectioned off the rooms at Rose Hill (Lockerly) were made of mahogany. A sturdy but beautiful wood, these elegant mahogany doors, when drawn from their pockets, blended with the adorned, covered walls. Throughout Manning’s Milford, mahogany was the chosen wood for the doors. It was specified that the doors would follow the patterns drawn by Minard Lafever in his *Modern Architecture*; the favored plates were seven, fourteen and

---


46Discussions with Lockerly’s historian Murali Thirumal as well as personal observations made at Lockerly.
Pine was native to the Carolinas, hence it was used in furniture making as well as in the overall construction of the house. Yellow pine, specifically, was used to frame many of the furnishings. In fact, the “Articles of Agreement” that was signed between John L. Manning and architect Nathaniel F. Potter explicitly included that the timber to be used in the construction of Milford was to be “…yellow pine…” The wood from the indigenous sycamore trees at Redcliffe was used extensively in the decorative framing and railings of the household as well as the shelving to hold Hammond’s extensive book collection.

Walls of the Greek Revival parlor and entrance halls were used to display paintings done by both American and European artists. Hung near the windows and mantle over the fireplace, each work of art was appropriately positioned. Paintings were of family members, landscape scenes, prize animals as well as artistic renditions of their magnificent estates, inclusive of the entire property, and of the great classics. Fort Hill’s parlor walls were filled with paintings of various Calhouns, three specifically of the


49 “Articles of Agreement,” between John L. Manning and Nathaniel F. Potter, 6 May 1839, Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

50 Editorial Correspondence,” Charleston Courier.

statesman. In moving into the dining room, there was also of painting of Calhoun, which had been composed in his early career.\textsuperscript{52} Walls were either covered with fine papers or painted in various shades, as to complement the artistic works as well as the draperies. White paint, however, was not commonly used on the walls. Ceilings frequently had little adornment. The most elaborate of ceiling decorations was inclusive of a foliage derived center medallion.\textsuperscript{53}

Part of the décor of Milford was left to the fancies of John L. Manning’s wife, Susan Frances Hampton Manning. He clearly specified that she was more adept to select “…the mantle mirrors…” for two of the main rooms of the first level of the house.\textsuperscript{54} Manning did clarify to the architect though that they were to be made from “…the richest gilt for the drawing room and bronze for the dining room.”\textsuperscript{55} This showed that Manning wanted his home to fit the desires, as well as the expectations, of the impressions of the ladies of high society who were privileged to see them. These women were also the ones who made comments about them to others. Their remarks generated a great source of information that spread to people who would never set foot in the plantation house.

\textsuperscript{52}Clara Walton Adger Journal, 26 March 1854, Adger and Bowen Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.


\textsuperscript{54}Letter, John Manning to Nathaniel F. Potter [partial letter – portions torn], 22 September 1839, Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

\textsuperscript{55} Letter, John Manning to Nathaniel F. Potter [partial letter – portions torn], 22 September 1839, Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
Many other interior features were essential but also were used as displays of wealth. Fireplaces were necessary within the household, serving as the principal mode of heating. Although their primary purpose was functional, they served an aesthetic role as well. For example, the fireplace mantels of Montmorenci were unique in their own right. In the two foremost rooms on the first floor, where the mantels would have been seen by all who entered the residence, the fireplaces featured designs honoring the War of 1812. Though these mantles incorporated Americana themes, the doorway moldings reflected a classical Greek element. A fireplace mantle on the main floor of Lowther Hall featured a detailed center emblem. The mantle was white, which stood in sharp contrast to the brick interior.

Milford’s fireplace mantels were made of marble, much like those in Millwood. They were chosen by John L. Manning as per the “Articles of Agreement” he signed with his architect. By selecting his own mantels, Manning not only had a greater input into the overall design of the furnishings of the house but also personally ensured the highest quality for what was being placed in the plantation house.

It was the slave who was emblematic of the planter’s prosperity. They cultivated his cotton, which enabled him to have all these possessions. The planters used the

---


57 Photographs, Montmorenci doorway mantles, Winterthur Library, Winterthur Archives.


slaves as symbols of status. As Thavolia Glymph noted in her *Out Of The House Of Bondage: The Transformation Of The Plantation Household* (2008) that:

slaves, like English china, conveyed household wealth and standing in the community; the greater number of slaves on display, the greater the household's wealth and reputation. Slaveholders themselves were generally eager to give this impression.\(^{60}\)

Slaves were visible measurers of social standing. Continuing in this similar ideology, Walter Johnson asserted in his *Soul By Soul: Life Inside the Antebellum Slave Market* (1999) that “the outward face of a slaveholding household—the driver of the carriage, the greeting given at the door, the supervision of the child, the service at the table—was often a slave.”\(^{61}\) Ownership of slaves was the most poignant means for planters to display their power and authority.

Among other pleasures that life afforded them, a horse of fine breeding was a favorite of the planter. Though farm animals were usually plentiful, among them the draft horse, an exquisitely bred equine held a place of distinction on the plantation.\(^{62}\)

---

\(^{60}\)Glymph, *Bondage*, p. 151.

\(^{61}\)Johnson, *Soul*, p. 89.

Many planters maintained “…strong stables…” recognizing the lineage of the horse.\textsuperscript{63} Horses were brought to the American South from all over the world with planters giving great credence to the highest quality stock, particularly those that were English.\textsuperscript{64} John C. Calhoun was noted for his fine line of horses, which were offspring of the greatest racing studs found in Great Britain and America.\textsuperscript{65} Thomas Greene Clemson, John C. Calhoun’s son-in-law, upheld the tradition of maintaining these finely bred horses at Fort Hill.\textsuperscript{66}

These prize animals held a prominent place in the world of the planter. They were in many ways reflections of the man himself. In fact, Bertram Wyatt- Brown contended in his \textit{Southern Honor: Ethics & Behavior in the Old South} (1983) that familial pedigree was essential for both people and their equines. “Like horses, human beings were supposed to exhibit traits of lineage.”\textsuperscript{67}

Not all planters readily embraced the horse race, though overall they did seem to be the greatest patrons. North Carolina planter Richard Bennehan regularly attended the races and made many purchases of fine blood horses, especially in a joint venture

\textsuperscript{63}Irving, “Sporting.”


with his partner Duncan Cameron. On the contrary Paul Cameron, Duncan’s son who followed his father’s example and was engaged in planting, held a drastically different view on the sport. “For myself” he proclaimed in a letter to his father “I want nothing to do with the race horse…” Though he held the preeminent equine in high regard, his loyalty did not lay with the pageantry of the sport. In ways, this seemed ironic. One can only speculate as to the reason but it appeared as though he viewed it as an unnecessary and pompous display of one’s status. Paul Cameron seemed more concerned with the practical aspects of planting rather than constant adoration of his social standing.

Stables for these esteemed treasures were carefully constructed and maintained. Paul Cameron took great pains in composing the architectural design for the elaborate barn, which served mostly as a stable, which graced one of his other plantation properties. Its immense space was further complemented by the overall beauty of its planning. In certain instances, like that on the grounds of Governor John Laurence Manning’s plantation Milford, the structures for the horses as well as their equipment matched the architectural style of the house itself. The designs for the plantation house as well as all exterior structures, inclusive of the barn, as done by architect

---

68 Tax lists (1791, 1796, 1797, 1798, 1802 and 1824), Richard Bennehan, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.

69 Letter, Paul C. Cameron to Duncan Cameron, 28 August 1847, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.

70 Anderson, Piedmont, pp. 57-58.

71 Nathaniel F. Potter, “Specifications for a Barn for John L. Manning Esq. to be Erected on his Plantation in Claredon So Ca [sic],” Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Jenrette, Adventures, p. 208. Mr. Jenrette had purchased and restored many historic houses, one of which is Milford (Millford).
Nathaniel F. Potter, carefully included colonnades. In the “Specifications for a Barn for John L. Manning,” it was detailed that “…columns…” were to be “…fluted in the most approved manner.”

The pairing of the Greek Revival format of house and stable seemed to symbolize the symmetry of the entire operation.

Since blood horses were an important component of the planter’s life as well as another measure of definition of his character, stables were carefully positioned on the property. At Millwood, the horses were kept in close proximity to the great house, as to be readily accessible and visible to the planter himself, yet hidden from the public eye. This was also done for the benefit of guests, who were granted their choice of steed by Wade Hampton II during the course of their stay. Having visited Millwood and enjoying the hospitality of his host, John B. Irving wrote that “…for no man can be fonder of fine horses than Col. Hampton.”

This planter was known for many things in his life, but many knew him for his active participation in the import, breeding, racing and stud services of his pedigreed horses. It was another measure of control as well as a display of status.
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72 Nathaniel F. Potter, “Specifications for a Barn for John L. Manning, Esq to be Erected on his Plantation in Claredon So Ca [sic],” Williams-Chesnut-Manning Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.


74 Irving, Jockey, p. 177.

For the exquisite stock at Millwood, they were afforded with the greatest of quarters. Horses found at this plantation were of established bloodlines, inclusive of Monarch, Pocahontas and Argyle. Their master, Wade Hampton II, held these horses in the highest esteem. Based upon their usage and purpose, all of the equine stock was placed in their appropriate stables. Those of breeding as well as those used for racing were placed in “…the eastern stable…” which was positioned next to the housing for those who labored as well as raced these horses. Racing was a popular pastime for the planter class, especially in South Carolina. The city of Charleston was filled with the planter elite as well as many other residents, at the time when the races were taking place.

This sport had deep roots in America. The first official contest of running horses against each other occurred at the Newmarket track in Nassau County, New York, in 1665. The sport gained attention all over and quickly found popularity in the South. Turf races gave the planter elite, along with others of societal ranking, an opportunity to
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77 Hampton, Divided, p. 31.

78 Triad, “Millwood.”


194
display their wealth in another fashion. Though participation in this pastime had dwindled greatly in the post-Revolutionary era in South Carolina, as well as in other regions, those of large holdings, plus military rank, sought to infuse new life into the sport.\footnote{Irving, Jockey, p. 163.; Letter, 17 February 1822, Robert M. Cahusac to William Porcher, Robert M. Cahusac Papers, South Carolina Historical Society, Manuscripts Division.} This activity gained interest as planters purchased and readied their horses. These animals became common possessions among this social class.\footnote{W. W. Dixon, “Eli Harrison: Ex-Slave 87 Years” in The American Slave: A Composite Autobiography Volume 2 South Carolina Narratives Parts 1 and 2, ed. George P. Rawick (Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Co., 1972): 244-246, p. 245.; William E. Dodd, Statesmen Of The Old South Or From Radicalism To Conservative Revolt (New York: The Book League of America, 1929) [reprint], p. 98.} A horse of fine breeding was symbolic of victory and power. With their financial support and continued backing, turf gaming again became the popular gentlemen’s recreation. Much like the style of architecture they selected for their plantation homes, their main pastime, the race, had its roots firmly based in Greek tradition.\footnote{Easterby, “Three.”} Racing was a featured event in the ancient Greek Olympics.\footnote{Tony Perrottet, The Naked Olympics: The True Story of the Ancient Games (New York: Random House Trade Paperback, 2004), pp. 93 and 194.; Waldo E. Sweet, Sport And Recreation In Ancient Greece: A Sourcebook with Translations (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1987), p. 89.} Horse racing of ancient times held a common tie with the antebellum era regarding the status of the owners. Waldo E. Sweet noted in his Sport And Recreation In Ancient Greece: A Sourcebook with Translations (1987) that “Greek horse racing…participation was confined to those of great wealth.”\footnote{Sweet, Sport, p. 89.} It was a sport for men of means.

In his article “Horses and Gentlemen: the Cultural Significance of Gambling Among the Gentry of Virginia” (1977) T. H. Breen stated “...gentlemen laid wagers
on...horses simply because they enjoyed the excitement of competition. Gambling was a recreation...a pleasant pastime when hard-working planters got together.\textsuperscript{86} Though he is specifically speaking of Virginia planters, this ideology was certainly shared among the planter class of the South.

In her 2014 book \textit{Race Horse Men: How Slavery And Freedom Were Made At The Racetrack}, Katherine C. Mooney wrote that “the nineteenth-century track became a proving ground for the powerful and aspiring...”\textsuperscript{87} Racehorses and their performances also defined the planters. Mooney followed up this thought and stated “from the beginning of American racing, some of nature’s most prominent turfmen were Southerners, and at the track they practiced sophisticated and complex forms of human bondage...”\textsuperscript{88} These planters owned both the horse who raced as well as the slave who was the jockey. An efficacious turfman and a fast-moving horse displayed power and most importantly control.

Even if prize money and glory were readily sought after, it was the ownership of the great horse that was the true aspiration. Turf races all over the South sported high stakes, some of which were even provided by the planter entrants themselves.\textsuperscript{89} In his historical account \textit{The South Carolina Jockey Club} (1857), J. B. Irving assessed the planters’ affinity for their noble beasts, recognizing the importance of a great horse.


\textsuperscript{87}Mooney, \textit{Race}, p. 5.

\textsuperscript{88}Mooney, \textit{Race}, p. 6.

\textsuperscript{89}Irving, \textit{Jockey}, p. 181.; Irving, “Sporting.”; In the “Sporting,” author J. B. Irving mentions that “…the winner of the Great Peyton Stakes of $34,000 at Nashville…” would be at the next major South Carolina race – an example of the size of the purses available.
“The gentlemen of the Turf…never ran their horses for the pecuniary value of the prize to be won, but solely for the honor that a horse of their own breeding and training should distinguish himself.”90 As treasured as the possession of a magnificent horse was, the display of a formal painting of the animal in the homestead was of equal value.

Art was very important in the décor of the Greek Revival upcountry cotton plantation. The favored pieces of this planter class were representations of their assets, particularly that of their race horses. In the antebellum era, there were many artists who specialized in landscape and portrait paintings; however, there were relatively few who stood out in the painting of animals. Edward Troye was one who excelled in his art, ranking among the foremost artists of animals, an art form that had gained much popularity during this time period.91 Troye’s budding reputation brought him to the South, where many sought to have their prize steeds painted by him. The display of tangible possessions, such as the homestead and the grounds, took a background place, though still significant, in these oil paintings. Yet the representation of the horse served multiple purposes. Though the piece of art showed those visitors to the planter’s house of his ownership of a majestic beast, it also served as a chronicle of the steed’s bloodline. Edward Troye’s works, though at times done with artistic liberty and enhancement, served as solid representations to suit those multiple needs.92

90Irving, Jockey, pp. 11-12.


Having been commissioned to paint one of the greatest fillies found on the turf, Trifle, Edward Troye gained a notable reputation for himself. 93 On his first lengthy visit to the South, Troye made the acquaintance of Colonel Wade Hampton II, who contracted him to paint some of his prize steeds. This was to be the first of many stays at Millwood, for Hampton would use his services to capture the likenesses of his prominent bloodline horses. 94 This planter was a great patron of the arts and frequently commissioned painters as well as sculptors for various pieces over the years. Troye was but one of many who visited Millwood as a commissioned artist. 95 Troye’s production, however, found very special and prominent places of display in the big house. 96

The initial paintings that Troye composed at Millwood were of two of the colonel’s finest bred horses, Argyle and Pocahontas. Both were of great racing bloodlines that had proven themselves on the turf. They were painted majestically in the forefront of the house that had been built as a wedding present for Wade II and his bride. 97 Upon the completion of these works, Hampton sought the perfect locale in which to display

97 Alexander Mackay-Smith, “Comments on Letitia Adams “Wade Hampton II’s Patronage of Edward Troye,” Virginia Gurley Meynard Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Mackay-Smith, Race, pp. 69, 70 and 416.; Meynard, “Portraits,” p.3.; Meynard, Venturers, p. 158.; Edward Troye’s paintings of Argyle, Pocahontas, Sovereign and Trifle that had been commissioned by Wade Hampton II are owned by the Yale University Art Gallery. On contacting them, I was told that they did not know the location of Sovereign and that the other three paintings were in storage and are not available to be viewed by the public. The American Sporting Gallery contains a collection of engravings of famous racehorses done in the early 19th century for The American Sporting Gallery newspaper, among them is the engraving of Monarch with Millwood in the background, which was based mostly on Troye’s painting, as well as others.
them so that all visitors could be engulfed in the beauty and elegance of his prize animals. Appropriately positioned, these two Troye paintings held a place of honor and graced the walls of the vestibule. This further exemplified the planter’s power and served as representations of the fine breeding of both the man and the animals.

Many other members of the South Carolina Jockey Club as well as planters all over the South, employed Troye to paint their horses, as well as other animals. But it was really the horse that was the desired subject. The homestead, the occasional jockey astride or along side his mount, the stable attendant or valet were always overshadowed by the presence of the equine in the painting. This was especially important to the upcountry cotton planters because it drew attention to their social ranking.

Between 1836, when Troye painted Argyle and Pocahontas, and 1840, when he returned to Millwood, he had traveled throughout the South to plantations and turf racing

---


99Hollingsworth, “Equine,” pp. 3949 and 3950.; Smith, “Best,” pp. 41 and 47.; Harry Worcester Smith, “Edward Troye (1808-1874) The Painter of American Blood Horses,” The Field, The Country Gentleman’s Newspaper, 21 January 1926: 96-98, pp. 96-97. The last section in Mackay-Smith’s Race Horses book, he has an index of the known Troye paintings and for whom they were painted. The list is rife with the names of planters. Many of his paintings were not signed, so the total number is not known.
yards to perform his art.\textsuperscript{100} In that time period, changes had been conducted at Millwood and the dramatic renovations that had taken place transformed the house into a masterpiece of the Greek Revival design.

Few houses could rival its magnificence and beauty.\textsuperscript{101} Though the plantation was truly “a social center for notables of the day,” Hampton opted for Troye not to include it in the background of the next series of paintings.\textsuperscript{102} In fact when the painting of the renowned horse Argyle was done for the colonel, he had Troye include his

\textsuperscript{100}Mackay-Smith, Race, pp. 416-421.; Smith, “Best,” pp. 41 and 47.; Smith, “Troye,” p. 96.


Argyle by Edward Troye (1836). Whitney Collections of Sporting Arts, Yale University Art Gallery. http://artgallery.yale.edu/collections/objects/argyle

father’s home The Woodlands. The artist went on to paint Monach, Bay Maria and Foal, and Maria West and Foal during that visit as well as others in subsequent visits, including American Eclipse, a forefather of the racing legend Man O’War.  

Edward Troye, though having gained the reputation as the greatest horse painter of his day, was not the only artist brought to Hampton’s attention. Henri de Lattre also placed his brush to the canvas and captured the images of another mare and her offspring at the Millwood breeding farm. Troye and de Lattre were not the only artists to be patronized to paint the great Hampton blood horses. In fact, the legendary Monarch


commanded many different artists, the two aforementioned as well as men like James De Veaux, whose career had been aided in various means by the colonel as well as his brother-in-law John L. Manning.  

Ownership of this horse, much like so many of the other truly greats, was the source of tremendous pride for his owner.  The master of the track Monarch received much attention racing as well as in his off time. In fact, when it came time for Wade Hampton II’s equine to again be the subject of a piece of art for his owner’s homestead, the news reported “Monarch is ‘sitting’ for his portrait at Columbia.” The paintings of these horses were of great importance to Wade Hampton II. Their speed, beauty and laurels added a different dimension of definition of their owner’s character as well as to the house, with their images hanging in proud display upon the oft-viewed walls. John B. Irving clearly noted in his 1844 article that on the first floor of Millwood, “…the walls…are adorned by highly finished colored portraits taken from life of some of the favorite horses of the proprietor…”

There were many planters who owned thoroughbreds who did not participate in the well-regarded races or commission paintings. The mere ownership of the animal was adequate enough. James Henry Hammond went to great pains to take possession, or in some instances partial ownership, of some fine blood horses. In
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107Spirit of the Times, 23 March 1839, p. 309.

108Irving, “Sportsing.”
1835, for example, he purchased “3/5ths of Argyle.” Horses were treasured possessions that enhanced the status of the planter. They symbolized money and power.

South Carolina and her planters were not alone in their affinity for the great bloodlines of these masterful beasts. The state of North Carolina was home to many of the revered equines as well who competed in the contests of speed. The noted planter William Williams of Warrenton, North Carolina, maintained a track on his estate, which drew some of the best horses for competition. Impressive horses also stood stud within Warren and the nearby Chatham counties, as well as in some other parts of the state. Legendary equines like Hambletonian, Washington, Escape, and Uncle Sam were offered for their stud at various plantations. These services were placed for sale in newsprint alongside advertisements for the opportunities to purchase commodities like The American Race Turf Register, Sportsman’s Herald and General Stud Book, slaves, medicines and estates. It should be noted that both the sale of stud horses’ services and human slaves were incorporated in these particular sources. Slaves technically were put on equal priority of the sperm of prize horses. This is very telling of the vantage point of the priorities of these men, what was significant regarding possession and ownership; in essence, the ultimate value of life. The relevance of the great horse


111 Raleigh Register And North Carolina State Gazette, 18 February 1825 and 25 March 1825.; Warrenton (North-Carolina) Reporter, 2 March 1827 and 9 May 1835.
was of high priority to members of the planter class. They were representations of class and fine breeding and were recognized by their lineage. In many ways, the horse was defined like the planter was, not only through his familial line, also his ability to take the lead and dominate.

Accommodations and articles of use surrounding the ownership and significance of a horse too found a special place in the domain of the planter. Necessaries, such as that as the bridle or saddle were common items presented for purchase.\(^{112}\) The carriage, though a familiar item, could also foretell the nature of the individual in whose possession it was maintained. William Williams indulged in the commissioning of a somewhat extravagant and flashy carriage. It was “…Cromic [sic] yellow and when varnished a light orange.”\(^{113}\) The extraordinary quality of the appearance of Williams’ carriage helped evince his status, wealth and power. Concern over the welfare of the carriages as well as the fine steeds were of interest to the planter, for he wanted them to be properly maintained following his passing. Williams carefully specified into whose custody they were remanded in his will.\(^{114}\) This gentleman was not alone in performing this action, for many placed great consideration as to where their prized possession would find their homes after the days of those particular men had ended.

Fine thoroughbreds on the turf represented the planter and his ability to dominate in yet another realm. Upcountry planters once again found themselves in the upper

\(^{112}\)The Raleigh Register, 28 July 1806, North Carolina Division of Archives and History, microfilm.

\(^{113}\)Letter, S. H. Williams to Melissa T. Williams, 13 April 1819, Polk Papers, North Carolina Division of Archives and History.

\(^{114}\)William Williams Will 1832, Warren County Wills, North Carolina Division of Archives and History.; William Williams Will 1838, Warren County Wills, North Carolina Division of Archives and History.
echelons of the social ladder. The luxury of owning these animals, providing elaborate structures for their stables as well as the ability to have their likenesses painted and displayed on their walls added an additional dimension of the master’s power. As much as these great horses, their beautiful stables and the art works that represented their images found places of honor in the world of the southern planter, art in general held a position of prominence as well.

Artwork was essential to the definition of the cotton planter and while portraits of his noble steeds were important, the planter was also a patron of other types of art. James Henry Hammond was a great collector of art, which he used to adorn his Beech Island plantation. During the course of his European travels, Hammond commissioned notable artists to paint their original works as well as many of the classic pieces. Many of these works of art were used initially to adorn his other properties but they eventually made their way to Redcliffe. Paintings like Raffaello’s Fornarina and Leonardo da Vinci’s Vanity And Modesty were flawlessly reproduced and prominently hanged in his dining room. While he was in Rome on a grand European tour, Hammond acquired many pieces of art. One such purchase was that of the famous Transfiguration, which was painted by Italian artist August Temmel. Hammond commissioned copies of other Raffaello and Dominechino paintings, like Transfiguration and Hunt Of Diana, for his parlor but also purchased original pieces like Anyder’s Game
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115 “Editorial Correspondence,” Charleston Courier.

116 Hammond Traveling Account, May 1836 - November 1837, 12 February 1837, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
Piece and Werstappen’s Falls Of Tivoli for this room as well.117  Many of these paintings embodied the rich historical tradition of the glorious ancient empires. Drew Gilpin Faust assessed in her James Henry Hammond and the Old South: A Design for Mastery (1985) that Hammond “…as connoisseur and collector, he could achieve the more practical and worldly advantages accruing to the upward mobile from profitable investment and tasteful conspicuous consumption.”118

In addition to all of the portraits of his esteemed steeds, Wade Hampton II sponsored the works of many other artists like Hiram Powers and William H. Scarborough, among many others. Powers sculpted various works, inclusive of a bust of the planter himself, and Scarborough painted Wade Hampton II. The Hampton-Preston-Manning families sent artist James DeVeaux to Europe on a few occasions to recreate some of the old classic paintings.119  Other artists were also commissioned to paint various scenes from abroad as well.120  Many of the works that graced Hampton’s walls represented various aspects of the planter’s life.121

Along with masterpieces, original or copied, and the paintings of the prize animals, art also featured family members as well as other representations of the

117“Editorial Correspondence,” Charleston Courier.; List of Paintings Collected By James Henry Hammond 1807-1864, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Prices in Rome of Art, 21 February 1837, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

118 Faust, Mastery, p. 195.


120Letter, Chapman to Madam, 22 May 1858, Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

121Charleston Courier, 27 September 1844.
property. The William Williams family commissioned noted painter Charles Wilson Peale to paint a likeness of one of the female family members.\footnote{Kennedy, Men, p. 271.} The parlor walls of Fort Hill were filled with various paintings of Calhoun family members at all stages of their lives. Of note were the mountings and edging which encased the images.\footnote{Ingersoll, “Summer,” p. 894.}

Paul Cameron acquired the painting of his father that was the commissioned work of William Garl Browne and hung it in one of the most prominent areas of the plantation home.\footnote{Letter, Paul C. Cameron to Duncan Cameron, 1 January 1852, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.} Paul C. Cameron carefully designated that the “…furniture…books, portraits…” were to stay with his spouse and then passed on to his daughter following her mother’s demise.\footnote{Will of Paul C. Cameron, 1881, Northampton County Wills, 1764-1950: Calvert –Clements, North Carolina Division of Archives and History, p. 5.}

The big house was a common feature in paintings that adorned the household walls, particularly those of the entrance hall and the parlor. Other paintings, however, featured the homesteads as mere background subjects. In the famed Edwin Troye paintings of Wade Hampton II’s race horses, three of the works of art integrated plantation homes in the background; one has his father’s homestead while the other two show Millwood before its renovations. In all of the paintings, the horse is the primary subject and the house is merely a secondary image.\footnote{Mackay-Smith, “Comments,” Virginia Gurley Meynard Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Mackay-Smith, Race, pp. 416 and 421}

\[\text{207}\]
planters commissioned paintings, the intent was to show the homestead in all its glory. However, that was not always the case.

Not all historians agree that the planter’s commissioning of an artistic rendering of his plantation house was done for posterity. John Michael Vlach contends in *The Planter’s Prospect: Privilege & Slavery In Plantation Paintings* (2002) that the planter’s goal was more to have the painting be his own personal source of reflection upon which he could gaze. It was to be for him to look upon his homestead, not to be a documentary account. He further ascertained that those paintings that were to be a sort of record revealed the landscape more than the homestead.127 The paintings serve as a glimpse into the life of the planter. They show what these men valued and what they deemed as important.

In addition to all the adornments that helped to define the status of, as well as decorate, the plantation, there were certain features that were critical to its overall operation. One important aspect of the plantation was the master’s library. Though not always found within the big house itself, for it frequently was a completely separate structure, the library was a place for business but also for reflection. The library was also a place of family activity. Wade Hampton II used this room to bring his children together to recount great tales of the past.128

Library contents were specific to their owner but certain commonalities were found among the planter elite. Monographs of both a legal and historical nature graced these shelves along with many masterpieces. Cotton planters tended to be fond of the
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127Vlach, Privilege, pp. 20 and 23.
128Account, Wade II, Hampton Family Papers, South Carolina Library, Manuscripts Division.
“…Greek and Latin classics” thus enhancing their appreciation and understanding of the ancient societies which they found themselves so entwined.129 Regarding planters and their tendency to embrace the classics, Joseph P. Reidy noted in his From Slavery To Agrarian Capitalism In The Cotton Plantation South: Central Georgia, 1800-1880 (1992) that “planters’ estates routinely contained individual volumes, if not entire libraries, of ancient classics.”130

Wade Hampton II’s library, built within the structure of Millwood itself, matched the greatness of the building. Unable to confine the plentitude of volumes within a single space, the library spread across the structural borders and filled the walls of two adjoining spaces. An estimated 10,000 books were found here, which covered many different subjects. Many of these works were on the subject of the United States, thus reflecting Hampton’s affinity for his country. Also of note within this collection were monographs that bore the signature of King George III.131 Edward G. Longacre noted in his book Gentleman And Soldier: A Biography Of Wade Hampton III (2003) that Wade Hampton III, the aforementioned planter’s son, “…had benefitted from daily exposure to the ten thousand volumes in the library at Millwood…”132

129Dodd, Kingdom, p. 79.; -, “Home Life,” The Anderson Daily Mail.; Letter, James Henry Hammond to M. C. Hammond, 15 May 1832, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; General exploration of the library shelves of some of these plantations, like Redcliffe and Rose Hill (Lockerly), along with a now missing official list from Fort Hill, produced these findings.


John Manning also had his library built within confines of the actual house. Upon entrance through the front door, the library was positioned immediately to the right. Mahogany was used for the shelves that housed these books and the room itself was adorned with a majestic mirror that was placed above the mantle.

Milford’s library adjoined the dining room. Similar to Milford’s design, the library at Fairntosh was also adjacent to the dining room. The library here was the first room to the right of the great center hall.

The library at Fort Hill was in fact an edifice that was detached from the main residence. Calhoun positioned this structure south of the big house. Built in the Greek Revival style, the building followed the model of his main residence. This was a private sanctuary for the very public man. Calhoun alone, and no one else, opened his library door, which was frequently a place for reflection. Though not grand in size, it was filled with many of the ancient classics as well as the works of great Americana. Calhoun included his own writings in his library collection. His possession of all of these books, all in all, was clearly denoted by his inscriptions which he placed within them. John C. Calhoun also included a sculpture of his facial likeness, which helped to illuminate the cumbersome impression of the subdued room burdened with its heavy furnishings and

---


drab coloring.\textsuperscript{136} In many ways, this building was a memorial as well as an attestation to his career and persona.

Calhoun’s library also served another purpose on the special occasion when artist William Scarborough arrived to paint the planter’s portrait. John C. Calhoun opened his private sanctuary to be used by Scarborough as his painting
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area. In assessment of the fact that Calhoun permitted Scarborough to reside within his personal library seemed to indicate that Calhoun felt his library was a significant feature of his life. Thus, the artist was able to completely embrace the true essence of the man by residing within his private sanctuary in addition to visiting his home.

James Henry Hammond too maintained an extensive library at Redcliffe. As he had advocated in his letter to John Hammond, “read history chiefly…” in addition to encouraging him to also purchase a “…French book…”, he felt that books were essential to one’s life and character. Hammond learned much from reading and kept his library full of a variety of reference works so that he could continue to further educate himself on a variety of subjects. In fact, in order to supplement the contents of his collection of written texts, Hammond secured a vast collection of monographs from the estate auction of the original owner of the property whereupon he constructed Redcliffe. The author of the “Editorial Correspondence if the Courier,” who visited Redcliffe on 6 July 1862, detailed his impressions of the house and property. He described this specific room writing that “…the library, well stored, as an intellectual larder, with handsomely bound books of varied character and great value, where both mind and heart may be richly feasted and greatly improved.”
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137 Charleston Courier, 19 September 1859.
139 “Editorial Correspondence,” Charleston Courier.; Perry, Reminiscences, p. 108.
141 “Editorial Correspondence,” Charleston Courier.
North Carolina planter William Williams also had a collection of books at Montmorenci. Most treasured among the works was *Lafayette’s Travels*.\(^{142}\) The Marquis de Lafayette had visited Montmorenci during of his 19\(^{th}\) century travels through the United States. While revisiting the nation, this time as an honored guest and not for military service, Lafayette received numerous requests for his company while in the Carolinas and Georgia.\(^{143}\) Books and the library in which they were held were important to the planter. Paul C. Cameron designated in his will who would obtain his books following his death.\(^{144}\)

The interior and the contents within the upcountry cotton plantation Greek Revival house helped to further this distinction of this separate social class. These Georgia and Carolina planters used architectural and aesthetic design within the house to present an image of their social standing, as much as they did through their art and other possessions. Each item was carefully selected and positioned within the household as a means to display power, authority and wealth. Even though they made efforts to differentiate themselves from their predecessors, they maintained items from them, emphasizing the importance of lineage. These factors, in concert with the Greek Revival architectural design of the plantation house, fused together to serve as a representation of the status of the upcountry cotton planter.


\(^{143}\)General Lafayette, *Memoirs Of General Lafayette With An Account Of His Visit To America And Of His Reception By The People Of The United States From His Arrival August 15th To The Celebration At Yorktown October 19th*, 1824 (Kessinger Publications, n.d.) [reprint], p. 128.

\(^{144}\)Will of Paul C. Cameron, 1881, Northampton County Wills, 1764-1950: Calvert-Clements, North Carolina Division of Archives and History, p. 5.
There were many factors that helped define the planter; among them were the big house, its contents and the outer buildings of the plantation. In addition, the upcountry cotton planter needed to cultivate his crop successfully as well as own other plantations. On these lands, his slaves generated his wealth, thus enabling him to be powerful. As these men expanded their holdings within their states and beyond, they built in their favored Greek Revival architectural style. However, it was the slaves who cultivated the cotton that generated their wealth. Without their slaves, they could not have built their homes. These Greek Revival plantation homes and the power maintained by these men were all done on the backs of their slaves. Possessions and structures within the confines of the plantation itself told much of the story of the planter’s life.

However, the Greek Revival home was not the only indicator. Those of the upcountry plantation elite maintained not only their formal home that graced the lands upon which their wealth was generated but also additional residences for vacation, escapes from the weather, and town houses for ball season. These homes served as a measure of status. In ways, these additional houses set the standards to which other planters strove to outdo. There was a sort of unsaid competition among the planter ranks as to who made the greatest expenditure on a house that was not a primary homestead. James Henry Hammond went as far as to boast that his Columbia house set the standards of extravagance and opulence. In his diary entry of 28 June 1841, he proclaimed “…There is a great rage for building fine houses here now. I believe I set
Hammond’s Columbia house was also built as a Greek Revival home, with pillars encircling the entire structure. Lavish decorative wood working filled the home. He took the same great pains to furnish this Greek Revival town house as he did his others. Always striving to maintain his image of a member of the wealthy cotton planter elite, he wanted to make sure that his homes reflected this status. During his ventures to New York City, Hammond acquired various furnishing to enhance the appearance of this homes as well.

Hammond placed great emphasis in furnishing the Columbia house to better solidify his place as a leader in planter society in the state capitol. He wrote his wife Catherine on one such shopping trip in New York that “…I shall find great perplexity in making purchases,” continuing “I contracted to day [sic] for 4 marble mantels. 1 Egyptian & 3 white.” He carefully selected the furnishings and was sure to include in his report to his spouse of his cautious efforts. For example, he purchased chairs “1 doz. handsome mahogany new French pattern of the best quality.”

Although Hammond wanted to stay in style, he did show some discretion in spending, remarking that he bought some seating at a lesser price and noted that “the

---

1James Henry Hammond diary entry, 28 June 1841 in Secret, ed. Bleser, p. 62. Amid scandals of later years, Hammond sold this town house and concentrated on his plantation holdings. The Columbia house was completely destroyed, sans some columns, during the course of Federal occupation of the city in February 1865.

2“The Hammonds,” Hammond, Bryan and Cumming Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division, pp. 11 and 12.

3Letter, James Henry Hammond to Kate, 30 July 1840, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

4Letter, James Henry Hammond, to My Dear Wife (Catherine), 25 August 1840, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.

5Letter, James Henry Hammond to My Dear Wife (Catherine), 25 August 1840, James Henry Hammond Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolin
same articles from Phyfe’s would have cost $6 or 700.”6 Duncan Phyfe was among the premier furniture makers in New York. His pieces incorporated “…the ancient traditions…”7 and his “…artistic expression…tended towards delicacy, refinement, and attenuation.”8 Hammond went on to justify this, however, by claiming that “Phyfe who is as much behind the times in style as he is in price. He thinks it is still 1836 – French Bedstands [sic] are decidly [sic] going out. They tell me no one buys them South now at all…”9 Hammond normally did not use discretion when spending his wife’s money. However in this letter to her, he attempted to legitimize his spending, claiming he was being frugal while still purchasing the most popular styles of the day.

Hammond was proud of his acquisitions for the Columbia house. “I have nearly completed all my purchases & have shipped the greater portion…I have purchased all the furniture.”10 Although he made all of the selections, clearly with the goal of solidifying his reputation and status, he hinted at being concerned as to his wife’s opinion. “I hope they will please you” he wrote to Catherine Hammond, continuing on stating “…you will be satisfied I think.”11 Once Hammond was in the town house, he

---

6Letter, James Henry Hammond to My Dear Wife (Catherine), 25 August 1840, James Henry Hammond Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.; Hammond meant that the price would have been six hundred or seven hundred dollars.


8Cornelius, Furniture, p. 52.

9James Henry Hammond to My Dear Wife (Catherine), 25 August 1840, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.

10Letter, James Henry Hammond to Dear Wife (Catherine), 4 September 1840, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.

11Letter, James Henry Hammond to Dear Wife (Catherine), 4 September 1840, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.
had each article set up swiftly. By the end of November 1840, he wrote his wife that “the drawing room is finished…Nothing hardly to be done now but hang the picture & put the new shelf on the mantel.”¹² Though this was not this cotton planter’s main residence, it was a symbol of his wealth and power. It was clearly a depiction of the man and his ability to not only own multiple properties, particularly Greek Revival houses, but his capacity to furnish them all as if they were the only residence.

When choosing to build other houses many upcountry planters continued followed the same favored architectural tradition as the plantation house. This was their architectural style. Each home owned by the upcountry cotton planter was built in this same manner. In addition to all of his families’ plantation homes, Paul C. Cameron built his town house in Raleigh in the Greek Revival format as well.¹³ Hammond’s aforementioned Columbia house was also in this architectural style.

Planters also built homes in areas that served as locations of rest and as a means to escape the heat. In addition, these supplemental houses were a retreat where they could mingle with members of their social class. One such popular location was White Sulpher Springs, Virginia. The arrangement of all different sized bungalows was done in a neatly organized pattern for comfort as well as representation of status.¹⁴ The Hamptons were but one of the many upcountry planter families who enjoyed their time here so much that they even owned a home.¹⁵

¹²Letter, James Henry Hammond to My Dear Wife (Catherine), 27 November 1840, James Henry Hammond Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.
¹³Photograph in Sanders, Cameron, p. 59.
¹⁴Letter, Wade Hampton to Rosa Schulz, 9 December 1840, Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; G. W. Featherstonehaugh, “Excursions Through The Slave States” (1854) in The
The Calhouns maintained a cottage here as well. In August of 1846, for example, John C. Calhoun wrote to Thomas Clemson, stating “I leave here in the morning tomorrow for the White Sulphur Springs where Mrs. Calhoun and Cornelia are waiting me [sic] to join them.” The vacation home apparently also served as a place in which to spend time with family.

In addition to these other homes, many planters owned supplementary plantations in other parts of the South. The Cameron family, under the auspices of Paul Cameron, expanded their holdings into Alabama as well. Paul Cameron’s abilities as a cotton planter were well known, both in the state of North Carolina as well as throughout the South. Others, in fact, kept him apprised when plantation lands became available so that he could continue to enlarge his land holdings. In January 1860, W. A. Jones of E. M. Apperson & Co. of Memphis, Tennessee, wrote Cameron while he was in Greensboro, Alabama, about such an opportunity. “We know of a plantation about 150 or 160 miles below here which can he bought at $60 per acre, 960 acres 600 acres


18 Anderson, Piedmont, pp. 53 and 97.
cleared, good houses, fine gin house and every thing in complete running order.” The letter included an additional opportunity for the Camerons for there were “…48 negroes on this place, which probably could be bought.” Jones also presented Paul Cameron with the opportunity to expand this particular plantation as well, advising that “adjoining the place is a tract of 600 acres…” Clearly the reputation and status of this upcountry cotton planter was well known. Even the deep South planters desired to incorporate Cameron into their realm.

The Hamptons and the Mannings were also included in this classification. Louisiana was one of the other areas where they cultivated the land and built Greek Revival homes. Although Millwood met with a drastic fate, having been burned to the ground during the Civil War, a sort of visual record was left behind from another Hampton plantation. Houmas, built in Louisiana, apparently featured many architectural similarities as well as shared landscape ideas with Millwood. Houmas featured “an avenue lined with trees…” which “…led to the house…” which was graced with “…pillars supporting the veranda.” The Louisiana plantation was also filled with an array of outer buildings, inclusive of “…the white lines of negro cottages and the plantation offices…” The familial ties with John L. Manning were clearly represented in Louisiana too, for their plantations were nearby and were described by visitor William

---

19 Letter, W. A. Jones to Paul Cameron, 18 January 1860, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina,


21 Russel, “Hampton,” Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
Russel as “one plantation is as like another as two peas. He had the same paths…” It was this plantation, however, where Manning generated much of his wealth.

John C. Calhoun also held plantation lands in the deep South. Trying his luck in Alabama to maximize his cotton output, he opted not to supervise the property himself and placed it under the guidance of one of his children. Calhoun’s duties in the nation’s capital often guided his time frame for personal property management and often prevented him from traveling that great a distance, although he was so inclined. In November 1839, for example, he wrote to politician and journalist Duff Green, and proclaimed:

Andrew and Margaret left us for Alabama…I intended to accompany them to look at my interest in that quarter, but the weather remained too warm and dry till [sic] it was too late to make the visit in time to return and be at my post at Washington at the commencement of the session…

Calhoun was always concerned and cognizant as to the productive capabilities of all of his plantation lands. In the time of “…the most remarkable drought ever known…” around the vicinity of Fort Hill, he had to look to his other lands for good cotton production. He continued on in this 12 August 1845 letter to proclaim that “my cotton

---

22Russel, “Hampton,” Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.


24Letter, John C. Calhoun to Duff Green, from Fort Hill, 2 November 1839 in Year 1899, ed. Jameson: 432-433, p. 433.; Andrew Calhoun was John C. Calhoun’s eldest son.
crop with the exception of the part in the fort [sic] Hill field, is surprisingly good…the last account from Alabama was good. 25

The deep South plantation was always important even if Calhoun himself could not oversee operations. But when the occasion arose for Calhoun during his break from public service, he took the opportunity to travel to view his other holdings. Writing to his son-in-law Thomas G. Clemson, he expressed a hint of hesitancy about leaving his properties to return to public office.

You will have seen, that I have again been elected to the Senate much against my inclination, but under such circumstances that I could not with propriety decline accepting. I am now on my way to Washington with Mrs. Calhoun and Cornelia, after remaining a few days at Fort Hill on my return from Alabama… 26

Thomas Clemson apparently thought highly of his father-in-law’s Alabama lands. Although Clemson claimed of his South Carolina property that “my plantation [in Edgefield District] is the most valuable I know in the State” he went on in the same 1845 letter to praise Calhoun for the number of slaves he accorded his deep South estate. “If my place had equal force to what you have put upon your place in Alabama, my place would give a greater interest, (considering the cost) than yours.” 27


plantation was not “home” but it was a means of generating, as well as displaying, the wealth of the planter. But clearly it was not as relevant as Fort Hill was to Calhoun. In reading through his countless letters, John C. Calhoun never referred to the Alabama plantation by name.

In essence, the productivity of the cotton crop was always critical to the fundamental operations of the plantation, at both the main homestead as well as on the properties of the other states. John C. Calhoun included the status of his crops in his familial letters. Writing from Fort Hill to his son Patrick, who was serving in the United States Army in Arkansas, he reported as to the yield of cotton he anticipated. “My crop here & in Alabama is very fine, both corn & cotton. We expect to make in Alabama nearly 200,000 pounds of clean cotton, but, I fear, we shall get but little for it, so low is the price.”

Wealth for these planters, however, was never accumulated on a continual basis. Factors far beyond the control of these men, such as droughts and floods, impacted cotton cultivation and yield while tariffs regulated prices and profits. As the upcountry regions did not maintain the consistent heat in which cotton crops flourished, the owners of these estates commonly expanded their land holdings beyond their familial property. As W. J. Megginson asserted in his African-American Life in South Carolina Upper Piedmont, 1770-1900 (2006), “yearly fluctuations occurred in weather and the resulting

---
yields..."²⁹ Megginson continued the point by specifying the resulting impact on John C. Calhoun.

...in 1837, Calhoun produced 65,000 pounds of cotton, 75,000 in 1842, but 53,000 in 1844. Families such as The Calhouns who owned lands in several areas—Pickens, Abbeville and Alabama—might have a successful crop on one plantation when another suffered from unfavorable weather. Few farmers had this advantage.³⁰

This separated these upcountry planters once again from their low country counterparts.

The ability to own additional plantations signified the wealth and prosperity of the planter. At times, it was done as an attempt to reclaim financial resources as the cotton market dipped or as their lands on the east coast showed signs of wear. Sometimes, they owned supplementary plantations within the same state in which they resided. A majority of the planters studied here owned numerous properties. William Williams and Paul Cameron both maintained multiple plantations in their home state of North Carolina.³¹ James Henry Hammond also profited from the several plantations that he owned in South Carolina. Although his first

²⁹ Megginson, Upper, p. 47.
³⁰ Megginson, Upper, p. 47.
plantations came through marriage, he expanded on that wealth and built Redcliffe with the profits. Wade Hampton II possessed plantations in South Carolina as well as in other regions of the South.

The upcountry cotton planter was a master of his world but was also a paternal figure for those who resided in the vicinity of his plantation. John C. Calhoun, albeit a man of various political offices, was not only a public servant but a paternal figure for his neighbors of lesser social and financial standings. George W. Featherstonhaugh observed that of Calhoun,

all looked up to him as the first man in South Carolina; and many who were embarrassed in their circumstances came to him for advice...he always listened to their stories, gave them the most friendly advice, and frequently referred them to men of business who could assist them if their affairs were retrievable. By persevering

31Duncan Cameron Will 1835, Wake County Record of Wills, Inventories, Settlement of Estates 1850-1855, Vols. 27, 28, North Carolina Division of Archives and History.; Letter, P. C. Cameron to Duncan Cameron, 6 May 1847, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.; Mordecai Land Survey, Wake County Survey for Duncan Cameron, 15 January 1828, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.; Obituary of Paul C. Cameron, The News and Observer, 7 January 1891.; Paul C. Cameron Will 1881, Northampton County Wills 1763-1950 (Calver-Clements), North Carolina Division of Archives and History.; William Williams Will 1832, Warren County Wills, n.d., 1780-1931 (Williams, Samuel T. – Yeargin), North Carolina Division of Archives and History.


33Abstract of Title To All That Tract Of Land…, Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Harry R. E. Hampton, “Hampton Houses,” Virginia Gurley Meynard Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division, p. 1.; Letter, Wade Hampton to Col. Singleton, 22 August 1842, Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Map of Hampton Family Plantations, Inside Cover of Meynard, Venturers.; --, “Visit.”
in this wise conduct, he was enabled to do good
to all, and keep himself free from embarrassment.\textsuperscript{34}

James Henry Hammond too permitted outsiders into his upcountry cotton planter
world at Redcliffe.

The hospitality of the owner of “Redcliffe” was well
known…once a year, like a great feudal landlord,
he gave fete or grand dinner to all the country
people about, at which he always contrived to have
some distinguished guests present.\textsuperscript{35}

At these annual affairs, Hammond proceeded to have “…every neighbour [sic], poor or
rich, for miles about was present.”\textsuperscript{36}

Nevertheless, it was the ownership of slaves that defined his paternalism.
Without slavery, cotton could not have been cultivated to the extent that it was in the
upcountry or the American South.\textsuperscript{37} Planters advocated that the holding of men in
bondage was an act that had been practiced throughout human existence.\textsuperscript{38} Men like
James Henry Hammond contended that while the markets sought cotton, all that was
needed were the slaves to get it to that point for their masters.\textsuperscript{39} The slaves furnished

\textsuperscript{34} Featherstonehaugh, \textit{Canoe}, pp. 270-271.
\textsuperscript{35} Clay-Copton, \textit{Belle}, p. 217.
\textsuperscript{36} Clay-Copton, \textit{Belle}, p. 217.
\textsuperscript{37} Dodd, \textit{Kingdom}, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{38} Robert Collins, “Essay on the Treatment and Management of Slaves,” \textit{Southern Cultivator}, 12 (July
\textsuperscript{39} Letter, James Henry Hammond to William May Wightman, 7 June 1840, William May Wightman Papers,
South Carolina Historical Society.
the planters with their social status. It was “the slaves, who enable them to be aristocratic…” who “…stand to them in the relation of vassals to their lords.”  

The institution of chattel slavery was deeply rooted in the Greek tradition, much like their favored architectural style, thus further tying the planters to the heritage of this ancient civilization. The upper echelons of ancient Greek society accorded those deemed inferior the status of slaves. However, ironically, the Southern planter considered the Greek system of enslavement to be far harsher and more cruel. The men of both eras believed that they were helping the slave survive in a world he would be unable to do so on his own. Hammond proclaimed in his “Mud-sill” speech that Southerners had enslaved those who had “…a low order of intellect and but little skill” in order to give them a chance “…to perform the drudgery of life.” John C. Calhoun went as far as to proclaim that slavery was a “positive good.”

These upcountry cotton planters were clearly committed to protecting the institution of slavery. Although a rift had grown between the sections, these planters voiced their concern about protecting this institution. John C. Calhoun recognized the need for Northern merchants to purchase Southern cotton; an economic relationship that secession would destroy. He presented nullification as a different means by which

---


they could protest the high tariffs. Edward E. Baptist addressed John C. Calhoun’s doctrine of nullification in his monograph *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery And The Making Of American Capitalism* (2014). He stated that:

…Calhoun offered a viable alternative to the claim that Southern political bullying was protecting an economically backward institution. Southern politicians could now claim that constitutional rights mandated political solutions to their own decline in relative political power. And at the moment when Calhoun made this move, the vision of perpetually expanding slavery as an alternative but still modern economy was once again becoming plausible.44

As committed to the institution of slavery as these upcountry planters were, they comprehended all the economic variables associated with it in the market economy.

Two of these upcountry cotton planters delivered among the most famous speeches regarding the need for slavery, thus demonstrating their personal commitment to this institution, but through their professional political careers. When John C. Calhoun delivered his "Speech on the Reception of Abolition Petitions, Delivered in the Senate, February 6th, 1837," through his carefully articulated words, he emphasized that "the peculiar institution of the South--that, on the maintenance of which the very existence of the slaveholding States depends, is pronounced to be sinful and odious…“ Calhoun furthered his beliefs and stated that he was in fact “…the friend of the

One must think in terms of both the economic and political motivations in this statement. Clearly these planters needed the Northern industrial machine to purchase their cotton, so there needed to be a relationship. However, Calhoun emphasized his region's commitment to slavery when he proclaimed that “we of the South will not, cannot surrender our institutions.” In the context of this speech, the cotton planter, John C. Calhoun, who stood before the Senate illuminated the opinion of his class, as he had the power and ability to have audience before this governing body. Calhoun proclaimed:

I hold it to be a good, as it has thus far proved itself to be to both, and will continue to probe so if not disturbed by the fell spirit of abolition. I appeal to facts. Never before has the black race of Central Africa, from the dawn of history to the present day, attained a condition so civilized and so improved, not only physically, but morally and intellectually. It came among us in a low, degraded, and savage condition, and in the course of a few generations it has grown up under the fostering care of our institutions, reviled as they have been, to its present comparatively civilized condition. This, with the rapid increase of numbers, is conclusive proof of the general happiness of the race, in spite of all the exaggerated tales to the contrary.
Thus the position of the American South was made clear by an upcountry cotton planter. As John C. Calhoun proclaimed, slavery was “positive good.” The significance of his is clear. The upcountry cotton planter had risen in such stature that he voiced the opinion of the American South. Slavery was essential. In this speech, John C. Calhoun made his commitment to this institution clear.

James Henry Hammond also made a poignant speech to the American Senate regarding the need for slavery in the South. As an upcountry planter Hammond was reliant on this institution. With the situation in Kansas becoming volatile, he shared his viewpoint in the “Speech of Hon. James H. Hammond, of South Carolina, on the admission of Kansas, under the Lecompton Constitution: delivered in the Senate of the United States, March 4, 1858.” He proclaimed that slavery was in fact natural and essential. “In all social systems there must be a class to do the menial duties, to perform the drudgery of life. That is, a class requiring but a low order of intellect and but little skill.” Hammond asserted that one “…class which leads…it constitutes the very mud-sill of society…” In these words, he advocated white supremacy and the inferiority of the American-American slave. He declared that “the status in which we have placed them is an elevation…from the condition in which God first created them, by being made our slaves.”


ideological concept of white supremacy. He made himself the voice for the South. This upcountry cotton planter evoked the passion of those who sought to cling on to the institution of slavery.

Paul E. Johnson, in The Early American Republic: 1789-1829 (2007), astutely discusses that planters had ultimate control over all aspects of their slaves’ livelihoods. Yet at the same time, they were cognizant that they needed to facilitate their slaves’ productive capabilities.

In law, in census, and in the minds of planters, slaves members of a plantation household over which the overseer exercised absolute authority not only as owner but also as paternal protector and lawgiver. Yet both slaveholder and slaves knew that slaves could not be treated like farm animals or little children. Wise slaveholders learned that the success of a plantation depended less on terror and draconian discipline (though whippings-and worse-were common)...51

Theoretically, Johnson made a valid point, that planters needed to foster cordial relations with their chattel in order to get the utmost productivity. Planters ultimately kept economics foremost in their minds. Mistreatment of their slaves was bad economic practice. Yet, practicality did not always prevail.

The overall importance of the slaves was clear and management was essential to the profitable operation of these plantations. Due to vast holdings, many planters were reliant upon others to oversee the day to day field activities. But many planters,

51Johnson, Early, p. 98.
much like John C. Calhoun, tried to be as directly immersed in the roles and usages of slaves.\textsuperscript{52} In fact at times the planters recognized the slaves in an almost familial way which indicated that to some, they were more than just property. In a letter reporting on the status of the cotton crop to his father, Paul C. Cameron clearly mentioned “…the black family…” in the opening of this note and continued on to report on their health.\textsuperscript{53} This type of designation was an indicator that these slaves were of some significance or value, beyond just being chattel. This master of many plantation lands appeared to be concerned for the overall welfare for his slaves. Essentially, it was an economic necessity that these slaves were healthy. Paul Cameron placed great emphasis on the proper nutrition as well as adequate attire for all of his servants.\textsuperscript{54} He also accounted for his slaves in a personal manner, for most of his slave lists were inventoried by their names along with their occupations or categorized his servants by age ranges.\textsuperscript{55} However, one must take into account this acknowledgement on the part of Paul Cameron. He did not want his slaves to run away. The slaves’ viewpoints regarding their master are really unknown. As Jean Bradley Anderson attested in her book \textit{Piedmont Plantations: The Bennehan-Cameron Family and Lands in North Carolina} (1985) that “how the slaves felt towards the…Camerons is harder to discover.”\textsuperscript{56} In

\textsuperscript{52}Megginson, \textit{Upper}, p. 48.

\textsuperscript{53}Letter, Paul C. Cameron to Duncan Cameron, 6 May 1847, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.

\textsuperscript{54}Letter, Paul C. Cameron to Mildred and Margaret Cameron, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.

\textsuperscript{55}Lists of Negroes of P. C. Cameron, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.; Undated Slave Lists, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.

\textsuperscript{56}Anderson, \textit{Piedmont}, p. 111.
essence, the reality was that Paul Cameron was a master whose success was dependent upon the labor of these people.

The issue of slaves and their emancipation was perpetually under consideration by the Cameron family. In fact, Duncan Cameron served a one year as president of the North Carolina’s Colonization Society.\(^{57}\) His son Paul C. Cameron, a decade after the cessation of the Civil War, granted 1600 acres of land in Alabama to African Americans whom he had once held in bondage.\(^{58}\) In regard to concern for the overall welfare of his slaves, William Williams explicitly stated in his will that his slaves were to be handled benevolently. He specifically solicited his son to construct new homes for the slaves and to provide them with adequate sustenance and supplies.\(^{59}\) Perhaps this helped differentiate the upcountry planter from those of the low country and deep South. Most of these planters discussed were present on their upcountry plantations whereas in the deep South, absenteeism was common. These upcountry planters tended to send family members to manage these other plantations that were not located in their native states. For example, Paul C. Cameron had his son-in-law George P. Collins supervise operations in Mississippi\(^{60}\) and John C. Calhoun had his son Andrew run the Alabama


\(^{58}\)Orange County Deed Book, Paul Cameron #3623, North Carolina Division of Archives and History.

\(^{59}\)William Williams Will, 1832, Warren County Wills, no date, 1780-1931: Williams, Samuel T. – Yeargin, North Carolina Division of Archives and History.

\(^{60}\)Abstract, Anne Cameron Collins Papers, 1849-1909, The Southern Historical Collections, University of North Carolina.
property.61 But as a whole, these upcountry men followed suit of the deep South planters and were in absentia.

Cruelty expressed by these masters was perhaps not always apparent. However, in essence, the ownership of human beings was its own innate cruelty. Duncan Cameron, the paternal master of Fairntosh, allegedly became more violent. One of his slaves accounted for his transition in behavior in 1850. This slave proclaimed that “he did more whipping in two or three days than he had done in eighteen months I am sure.”62

In essence, the life of a slave was always one lived in cruelty. Regardless of reports of slaves being treated kindly or with consideration, they were in fact always property who had been denied their freedom. Even slaves who were thought to be loyal did not want to be held in bondage. For example, the story of Mary Walker was one of the quintessential stories that dealt with this dynamic. As a house slave of Duncan Cameron, the patriarch of the Fairntosh plantation, “…Mary Walker…” was “…a member of the most favored slave-family in his possession…”63 She served in a variety of intimate capacities and was clearly among the favored and trusted slaves.64 Although Mary Walker was allegedly “close” to the Cameron family members, the bond was not enough to keep her enslaved. Events are unclear but most likely, the threat of being sold to the deep South led her to escape. With leniency accorded her while they


62Nathans, Free, p. 41.

63Nathans, Free, pp. 11-12.

64 Nathans, Free, pp. 17, 23 and 25.
were in Philadelphia, Mary Walker escaped the clutches of the Cameron family’s bondage.65 Ultimately a slave sought freedom; she obtained that independence by sacrificing a life with her own children.

The institution of slavery, barbaric by its very nature, was integral in the accumulation of wealth that these upcountry cotton planters obtained. What is known of the lives of the slaves on these plantations was primarily recorded by the slaveocracy class not the slaves themselves, leaving much room for much speculation. Some other slave accounts were recorded by the Works Projects Administration in *The American Slave: A Composite Autobiography* collection decades after slavery was abolished. Of course, the accuracy of these narratives must be called into question, not only from the passing of time and memory lapses, but to whom the former slaves were speaking. In many instances, former slaves tried to tell their mostly white interviewers what they thought they wanted to hear. In the wake of the war and Reconstruction, with the tumultuous nature of the South, the recording of slave accounts or just the preservation of their experiences was a low priority. Unknown pressures, leading questions by the interviewers and just the passing of time perhaps altered some of their accounts. However, they are one of the few compilations of slave narratives. As a result, they are incorporated into this dissertation. One must look at these accounts with a discerning eye. The true experiences of these upcountry slaves will never be known. In one statistical report conducted about slavery at Calhoun’s plantation, the researcher noted

---

65 Nathans, *Free*, pp. 27 and 30.
that “…since slaves at Fort Hill left no written record, their perspective is unavoidably voiceless…”\textsuperscript{66} As a result, scholars must try to present their stories.

In reading these slave narratives, it was not always clear as to who owned these individuals. However, some referenced their specific masters, i.e. Wade Hampton.\textsuperscript{67} In other instances, one can only deduce from the minimal information provided in the account as to who owned them.


\begin{quote}
the fact that most of the participants of the Federal Writers’ Project were young children when freedom came has been cited by scholars as one of the major weaknesses of the narratives for understanding slavery, along with their advanced age at the time of the interviews.\textsuperscript{68}
\end{quote}

Glymph continued with this assessment, writing that “these factors are said to account for the sentimentalism in the narratives, the expressions of devotion and love for masters and mistresses.”\textsuperscript{69} One must really look with a discerning eye at these accounts.

\textsuperscript{66}Angela Snyder Nixon, “V.P. John C. Calhoun Plantation Slaves.” \textit{http://files.usgwarchives.net/sc/oconee/history/h-53.txt}.

\textsuperscript{67}In these narratives, the slaves did not clearly designate which of the three Wade Hamptons are being discussed and it is left to interpretation and assessment of reference points in the accounts to make that determination.

\textsuperscript{68}Glymph, \textit{Bondage}, p. 15.

\textsuperscript{69}Glymph, \textit{Bondage}, p. 15.
Walter Johnson also addressed the questionable accuracy of these accounts in his *Soul By Soul: Life Inside The Antebellum Slave Market* (1999). He contended that “…taking slave narratives for transparent account of reality can be as misleading as dismissing them entirely.” Johnson also accounted for the influence of the era in which they were recorded.

The narratives, like all histories, were shaped by the conditions of their own production—the conditions of both Southern slavery and organized antislavery. He furthered this point, emphasizing that “the narratives are by definition incomplete accounts.”

In accordance with the W.P.A. collection of stories, many of these slaves held their masters in fond regard. Hence, their stories and the ones included in the following paragraphs must be read with some discrimination as to their overall validity. Two of Paul Cameron’s slaves who were interviewed, expressed awe regarding how many he held in bondage and spoke of him in kind terms. Former slave Doc Edwards remained on the Cameron plantation after his emancipation and proclaimed that he

---


would spend the remainder of his days there “…‘till [sic] de [sic] good Lawd [sic] calls me home, den [sic] I will see Marse [sic] Paul once more.”74

A slave who had been brought to James Henry Hammond acknowledged that he rarely saw him but held that he had been of age at the time of the Civil War, he “…would surely have gone to the front wid [sic] my white master.”75  Hammond personally held another specific interest in his slaves, one that was not all that uncommon with a master’s treatment of his female slaves.  James Henry Hammond and his son Harry debated over the paternity of certain slaves born at Redcliffe as well as on his other plantations.  In a letter, Hammond left this son a certain slave and her offspring, contending that “her second child I believe is mine.  Take care of her & her children who are both your blood if not of mine…”76  As a whole, however, Hammond did not think the slaves were competent without the assistance of their masters and overseers.  “…The negro race differ as much from our own or that of swine from dog, to say the least – that they are Baboons on two legs gifted with speech – that no faith can be properly placed in any one of them.”77

---


76 Letter, James Henry Hammond to Harry Hammond, 19 February 1856, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

Wade Hampton II was referred to as being “…the kindest of masters…” In response to this treatment “…to the slave the love returned…” This must in fact be called into question as there were no clear interviews conducted with slaves and it was most likely a romanticized assessment. One of the Millwood house slaves called Uncle Washington reflected that Wade Hampton II “…taught me how to read and to write.” He also “…didn't believe in whipping slaves.” Uncle Washington went on to proclaim that “he treated me like I was one of the family and not a servant.” Assessment of these observations, however, must be taken into consideration as to when they were stated. One must question if these accounts, which were taken from the former slaves in their twilight years, were an embellishment or perhaps a fabrication of what their lives were truly like. This is not to say that there was not the possibility of Wade Hampton II being a “good master.” However, one must look at how many years later these comments were made and the context in which they were recorded. In researching these planters, however, provisions for slaves were commonly made within the planters’ wills. But to many planters, the slaves were mere possessions. The slaves gave them their cotton, their mansions, their lifestyle. All in all it was the slaves who provided the basis for their definition as the masters of this antebellum world.

It was the ownership of human life that ultimately gave these men their status, their homes and their way of life. The number of slaves owned by these planters certainly correlated to the production of cotton. Sale of cotton provided them with the financial means to maintain the lifestyle equated with that of a planter. In 1840, John C.

---

Account, Wade II, Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

"Uncle Washington Boasts of Celebrating 104 Birthdays,” The State, 1 September 1935, Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

239
Calhoun owned 75 slaves, who resided on his South Carolina plantation. In order to effect successful operations on the plantations, planters and their overseers implemented discipline. In one such instance, one of Calhoun’s slaves who not only attempted to escape but also tried “…to kill our overseer…” This type of behavior threatened the successful operations of the plantations; it also served as inspiration to other slaves who wanted their freedom. Accordingly, the planter deemed that punishment was necessary; yet Floride and John Calhoun did not share the same opinion as to what type. Floride Calhoun shared that “…Mr. Calhoun, writes me to have him sent out in chains to Andrew, but I think he ought to be sold, or he will do more mischief.”

In exploring the experiences and accounts of slaves, Theodore Dwight Weld’s *American Slavery As It Is: Testimony of a Thousand Witnesses* (1839) contains an account about Wade Hampton I’s slaves. This was an observation made by a female visitor, who discussed what the slaves were fed. There were no further records about this family and their slaves in Weld’s book. Edward E. Baptist incorporated the account of a slave, Charles Ball, who was purchased by Wade Hampton I in his *The Half Has Never Been Told: Slavery And The Making Of American Capitalism* (2014). Ball

---

80 U.S. Sixth Census (1840): Pickens District, South Carolina, p. 23.

81 Letter, Floride Calhoun to Margaret M. Calhoun, 8 February 1842, John C. Calhoun Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

82 Letter, Floride Calhoun to Margaret M. Calhoun, 8 February 1842, John C. Calhoun Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.


84 Baptist, *Half*, pp. 37 and 111.
experienced the brutality of life on a cotton plantation. His words were not of fondness for the operations at Wade I’s plantation. He recalled that abuse of the slaves became “practised [sic] with…order, regularity and system.”

In his own personal letters, Wade Hampton II appeared to be concerned about his slaves’ overall well-being. In a letter he wrote to Andrew Jackson in 1810, he mentioned that a couple of his slaves were potential jockeys and why he kept them at his plantation. “They are family Negroes, &…the distance would create great affliction amongst their relations.” However, although this letter seemed to be empathetic to the welfare of these slaves, Hampton was most likely taking a practical and financial, albeit selfish, approach. In this letter, Hampton revealed that these men were not skilled riders and would not produce the desired victories at the race track. In essence, the value in the slave was in his ability to generate profits.

The planter class of the upcountry American South was distinct. Various elements helped to account for these differences from their Northern counterparts, among the greatest, slavery. However, while visiting John C. Calhoun at Fort Hill, George W. Featherstonhaugh recorded his feelings and observations on these points. “What an immense difference there is in the manners of the southern gentlemen, and

---

85Baptist, Half, p. 140.
most of those who are at the head of society in the middle and Northern States.\textsuperscript{88} He furthered these explanations by delving into the nature of the relationship of the upcountry cotton planter to his chattel. “I observed a great solicitude here for the welfare of their slaves…there was evidently a great deal of humanity and tenderness exercised to all who were born on the family plantation.”\textsuperscript{89} Perhaps this was merely looked at this world in the proverbial “rose colored glasses.” Maybe Featherstonhaugh only saw what he wanted to see, a distorted perception of reality.

As the nineteenth century progressed, the main concentrations of slave holdings shifted. By 1860, South Carolina ranked second in the number of slaves, just behind Louisiana. Seventy years earlier the Palmetto state had the highest slave population of any state in the nation. Though the state still remained in the upper tier of the slave population, she had technically only increased her slave holdings by 2.7%. Georgia and North Carolina had considerably smaller slave populations, ranking sixth and eighth respectively on a national level.\textsuperscript{90} The trend of slave holdings had followed the patterns of migration to the deep South, as planters searched for stable, unworn cotton lands. Many of the planters discussed in this study expanded their holdings and purchased lands in the deep South. But their hearts were in the eastern seaboard states. Perhaps they constructed other homes, but their main residences remained in the Greek Revival plantation houses in the upcountry regions of Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina.

\textsuperscript{88} Featherstonhaugh, \textit{Canoe}, p. 270.

\textsuperscript{89} Featherstonhaugh, \textit{Canoe}, p. 270.

To these upcountry planters, their slaves were in many ways the foundation stones upon which they built their Greek Revival plantation homes. Without their forced labor to produce the cotton crops, the planters would not have gained the necessary wealth to attain and maintain their status. Though they never gave their slaves the credit or recognition they deserved, it was truly their labor that generated their wealth.

The world of the cotton plantation, outfitted with its Greek Revival house with all of its decorative furnishings and details, along with its stables, work buildings and slave cabins was relatively short lived. Thus the realm of the upcountry cotton planter, who was so defined by his possessions, inclusive of his slaves, was to come to a crashing halt. These upcountry planters in Georgia, North Carolina and South Carolina strove for generations to attain and surpass the reputation of the low country planters. Their climb in status was not permanently maintained as they had hoped. Disunion and the ensuing war cast the final decision on bringing the demise of this lifestyle. As the Union armies under Major General William Tecumseh Sherman’s command passed through Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina in 1864-1865, one of his officers reflected upon the status of the wealthy upcountry planters and their fine homes. “These old planters were kings in a way…”91 Aptly stated, these individuals were the targets of their total warfare.

CHAPTER SEVEN: THE END OF THE UPCOUNTRY COTTON PLANTERS' WORLD

In 1888, Lucy Hampton, a member of the Wade Hampton family proclaimed years after the Civil War, “I think it is queer so many people at the north dont [sic] know the broad line of destruction that was left in the south.”¹ But the swath that had been cut throughout Dixie was a deep one. The passing of the Union armies under Major

¹Letter, Lucy Hampton to Lucy Baxter, 13 February 1888, Sarah (Sally) Strong Baxter Hampton Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
General William Tecumseh Sherman brought the war to the home front, especially to these planters and their majestic estates. Sherman was not alone in this destruction, for once his troops had passed through South Carolina and moved on to North Carolina, Brevet Major General Edward Elmer Potter took up where he had left off. Potter’s men exacted even greater vengeance.²

As the tide of the Civil War started to turn, Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina were exposed to the brunt of the fray. These upcountry planters, who had been reasonably free from the physical destruction of warfare, experienced the gravest of hardships. As the Federal troops trod across these states, battle was not always foremost in their minds. Occasionally the men were caught in the fray, especially in the early stages of their first Georgia campaign.³ Yet as they plunged deeper into the enemy’s homeland, vengeance crept into their thoughts, which in time, for some, became all encompassing.⁴ In later years, Sherman reflected on his campaigns in Georgia, asserting “I made them feel the consequences of war, so they will never again


³Narrative, 20 August 1861-17 July 1865, Edward Moore, 10th Illinois Infantry Regiment, Civil War Miscellaneous Collection, Military History Institute, Carlisle Barracks.

⁴Stephen F. Fleharty, Our Regiment, A History Of The 102d Illinois Infantry Volunteers With Sketches Of The Atlanta Campaign, The Georgia Raid, And The Campaign Of The Carolinas (Chicago: Brewster & Hanscom, Printers, 1865), p. 135.; Letter, George Shuman to Fannie Shuman, Major George Shuman, 8 January 1865, 9th Pennsylvania Cavalry Papers, Harrisburg Civil War Round Table, Military History Institute, Carlisle Barracks.; Memoirs, William H. H. Tallman, 66th Ohio Infantry Regiment, Charles Rhodes Collection, Military History Institute, Carlisle Barracks.; Charles A. Willison, Reminiscences Of A Boy’s Service With The 76th Ohio (Huntington, West Virginia: Blue Acorn Press, 1995) (reprint), p. 116.; Many soldiers wrote of their destruction of plantations in Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina but did not include the property names or the owners, since perhaps they probably did not even know.
invite an invading army."5 This logic he carried on with greater intensity into the next phase.

The invading forces readily sought the prize possessions of the planter class. Plantation animals, especially the esteemed race horses were removed from the lands.6 These animals were used in the service of the Union armies or many times, wastefully slaughtered and left to rot.7 But all in all, it was the plantation house, the Greek Revival plantation house and its valuable contents which were frequently on the minds of the invading armies. In the soldiers’ minds punishment for secession equated to destruction.

In her most recent scholarship, Anne Sarah Rubin took a new approach in looking at Sherman’s campaigns. She asserted that “rather than retell the story…” her book “…explores the myriad ways in which Americans retold and reimagined Sherman’s March…from a range of perspectives…”8 Rubin pointed out that his “…army faced little opposition on its inexorable movement through Georgia and the Carolinas…the devastation wrought along the March’s route was extraordinary…”9 In this scholarship,

---


9Rubin, Dixie, pp. 3-4.
she acknowledged that there was destruction, albeit “…localized and inconsistent…”\textsuperscript{10} and that “…many homes survived Sherman’s march, many more than were destroyed.”\textsuperscript{11} However, she asserted that there had been intensification of the actual impact of these military maneuvers as soldiers waxed nostalgic in the years after the end of hostilities.\textsuperscript{12} Much like the slave narratives must be questioned for their validity, one must look with a discerning eye at the accounts, and scholarship, about Sherman’s campaigns.

\textbf{“War is a stern teacher…”} proclaimed a soldier from General Joseph Hardee’s Signal Corps in Dalton, Georgia, in a piece of correspondence to a Georgian resident as Sherman’s armies began their harsh campaign in the state.\textsuperscript{13} Once the campaign began, however, Georgians found themselves quickly learning this lesson. As the “…formidable invasion” of Georgia by the enemy…” commenced the people soon experienced even greater hardships.\textsuperscript{14} The Georgians had believed, even held hope, that their state would be left unscathed. The Confederate forces were prepared to die before permitting “…the enemy to occupy one foot of Georgia soil.”\textsuperscript{15}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{10}Rubin, Dixie, p. 23.
\textsuperscript{11}Rubin, Dixie, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{12}Rubin, Dixie, p. 98.
\textsuperscript{13}Letter, J. H. Pope to Mr. Barrow, 20 February 1864, Col. David C. Barrow Papers, Hargrett Rare Books and Manuscripts Library, University of Georgia Libraries.
\textsuperscript{14}Letter, Hon. James A. Seddon to His Excellency J. E. Brown, 8 October 1864, Telamon Cuyler Collection, Hargrett Rare Books and Manuscripts Library, University of Georgia Libraries.
\textsuperscript{15}Army Correspondence (25 March 1864) copied from Southern Watchman, 30 March 1864, Ellis Merton Coulter Historical Manuscripts, Confederate States of America, Hargrett Rare Books and Manuscripts Library, University of Georgia Libraries.
\end{flushright}
En route to the Georgia capital of Milledgeville, Sherman’s armies had fair chance to partake in the delights of the land. “…We reveled in the splendid homes and palatial residences of some of the wealthy planters.”\(^\text{16}\) Not too long into the March to the Sea did portions of the army come into the town of Covington.\(^\text{17}\) Here the soldiers started to inflict damage sans orders, to which Sherman decided to designate specific individuals to handle the acquisition of necessities. The beautiful city was the recipient of some devastating retribution.\(^\text{18}\) White Hall was not burned and there was no clear reason as to why the house was saved. Having been spared of destruction, the house has gone on to be used in television shows, such as “In The Heat of The Night” as well as in the cinema.

Among the areas that the Army columns passed through was Madison, where The Oaks sat just on the edge of town. Though damage was inflicted on the region in general, particularly to the rail line, the plantation house itself was not destroyed.\(^\text{19}\) Some of the structures on the land met with the torch but the big house remained relatively unscathed.\(^\text{20}\) The house still stands along a county road. Soldiers recognized the beauty that was found in the homes of Madison and the outlying region but there


\(^{18}\)Sherman, Memoirs, pp. 657 and 658.

\(^{19}\)Jacob B. Cox, The March To The Sea; Franklin And Nashville (Edison, N.J.: Castle Books, 2002) [reprint of 1882 edition], p. 27.

\(^{20}\)Conyngham, March, p. 150.; Gleason, Homes, p. 44.
was only speculation as to why they were spared. A member of the 102nd Illinois Infantry Volunteers made a record of these “…elegant” structures and that it was clear the people here exquisitely displayed their “…taste and refinement…”

Lowther Hall was located south of Madison. For unknown reasons, the house survived the war only to succumb to flames in the next century.

Great devastation befell the people, property, and the homes in portions of Georgia. As the forces continued, passing through what a soldier referred to as “…a perfect garden…” on their way to the state capital, they relished in living off the land and destroying the plantation structures in particular.

Once in Milledgeville, the soldiers took great delight in raising the Union flag once again over the state house. The Union troops derived pleasure in antagonizing the residents as well as inflicting damage. Cavalry leader Major General Hugh Judson Kilpatrick reveled in his success of purging the liquor supply from a local plantation. Rose Hill survived the Union occupation of the state capital, perhaps due to the fact that the armies withdrew from the city soon after coming to the plantation. Today, under the

---

21 Fleharty, Our Regiment, p. 111.
22 Nichols, Early, p. 124.
24 Conyngham, March, pp. 150 and 152.
25 Davis, Sherman’s, pp. 62 and 63.
26 Davis, Sherman’s, p. 63.; It is possible that he was referring to Rose Hill (Lockerly) but is not certain. Based upon Kilpatrick’s direct comments as quoted in this book, it seems as though it would be this plantation house.
name Lockerly, the house is preserved and open for tours in conjunction with the Lockerly Arboretum.

As the March to the Sea started to come to a close, reports about Savannah noted that “Sherman is besieging the place without an attack.” Savannah fell into Union hands, thus marking an end to Sherman’s campaign in Georgia. With this, both the Union and the Confederacy awaited the next move. South Carolina, of course, was the next logical step.

In many respects, the secession of South Carolina gave impetus to starting the war. Anne Sarah Rubin addressed this concept in her book, stating “…Sherman’s men blamed South Carolina for starting the war, and they were determined to punish the citizens for that transgression.” Even though most residents’ interests were not compatible with the visions of the fire-eaters and disunionists, the people of South Carolina seceded. As a result, all who resided there were seen as having caused the war. The concept of punishing the state’s citizens extended far beyond just the beliefs held by Northerners. Sherman and his men encountered numerous pleas from Georgians during their campaigns to treat the state with acrimony for causing all the

---


29 William H. H. Tallman, 66th Ohio Infantry, Regiment Memoirs, Charles Rhodes Collection, Military History Institute, Carlisle Barracks, pp. 79 and 87.

30 Rubin, Dixie, p. 29.
hostilities. “...Well, if you will make those people feel the severities of war, we will pardon you for your desolation of Georgia.”\(^{31}\)

Before setting off on this campaign, Sherman wrote to Chief of Staff Major General Henry Halleck in an almost antagonistic manner proclaiming, “…I think before we are done, South Carolina will not be so tempestuous.” Sherman went on to relay the mindset of his troops, revealing, “…the whole army is burning with an insatiable desire to wreak vengeance upon South Carolina. I almost tremble at her fate, but feel that she deserves all that seems in store for her.”\(^{32}\)

Crossing into South Carolina was a momentous event. Soldiers recorded their feelings of this taking leave of Georgia into the “hot-bed of secession” for it was an emotional passage.\(^{33}\) One soldier’s words were almost simplistic in proclaiming his jubilation. “...for the first time, I touched South Carolina.”\(^{34}\) But others were more direct, stating they “…were therefore more determined to make themselves comfortable. It did not take long to decide how this should be accomplished – they were in South Carolina!”\(^{35}\) This was a defining moment, a time of just reward. In South Carolina, Sherman unabashedly forged a path clearly noted for its swath of destruction. “His line

\(^{31}\)Official Records of the War of the Rebellion, I, 44 (CD-Rom).

\(^{32}\)OR, I, 44 (CD-Rom).

\(^{33}\)Willison, Of A Boy’s Service, p. 116.

\(^{34}\)Journal, 28 January 1865, William W. Pritchard, 9th Pennsylvania Cavalry Regiment, Civil War Miscellaneous Collection, Military History Institute, Carlisle Barracks.

\(^{35}\)Fleharty, Our Regiment, p. 130.
of march was marked by the light of burning houses.”36 South Carolinians, particularly those who stood as the representatives of secession and the causes of war, the great cotton planters, were to feel the hardships of war. “They can never forget the day when their homes upon which they had collected many comforts and cherished remembrances, were reduced to ashes.”37

The Campaign of the Carolinas was designed in a similar fashion to the March to the Sea. Because Major General William Tecumseh Sherman planned on marching on both Columbia, South Carolina, and on to Raleigh, North Carolina, he knew he needed to employ the element of surprise.38 The columns, in the first phase, feigned on Augusta and Charleston but in actuality, converged on Columbia.39 In actuality, Charleston held no strategic value at this point of the war even though it was the birthplace of secession. Due to the course chosen for these two columns of Union armies, certain areas, that happened to house particular cotton plantations, escaped the wrath of these soldiers. A Union officer spoke of the upcoming campaign quite candidly. “You think the people of Georgia are fairing [sic] badly and they are, but God pity the people of South Carolina when this army gets there, for we have orders to lay

---


everything in ashes.” He went on to proclaim that this “…State will be made to feel the fearful sin of Secession before our army gets through.”

The great cotton plantations were actively sought by the invading Union armies. Redcliffe, Millwood, Milford and Fort Hill were great conquests of war, as these were the plantation homes of not only the great upcountry cotton planters but also of the men who directly or indirectly helped to lead South Carolina out of the Union. South Carolina held a special challenge to the Union armies. It had been South Carolina that had taken the lead in seceding from the Union. John L. Manning was in attendance at the secession convention.

By the time of the secession convention both John C. Calhoun and Wade Hampton II had died, but their legacies lived on. Calhoun, however, has been referred to as the “Father of Secession.” It was advocated that the Fort Hill Address was from where “the secession doctrine was first openly promulgated by CALHOUN…” In essence, for those who believed that Calhoun desired secession, then his “spirit” was


41“A Suffering South Carolina Poet,” The New York Herald, 23 February 1865, Civil War Collection, North Carolina Division of Archives and History.


43Epitaph, South Carolina Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Ordinance of Secession, South Carolina Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; “South Carolina, A Patriotic Ode,” South Carolina Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

44Ordinance of Secession, South Carolina Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Col. Wyndham Manning, “Sketch of Manning Family,” Manning Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

present at the convention. Although John C. Calhoun had advocated some alternatives to secession and proclaimed the notion of “…masterly inactivity”, the people of the state chose to leave the Union and there was no longer any talk of compromise.  

Fort Hill, the home of the late John C. Calhoun, escaped destruction during the war, if only for the fact that it was out of the line of march. Sherman’s armies converged on South Carolina, neither of which reached the area of Fort Hill’s location. 

His home evaded the ravages of the war, helping to preserve his legacy as a prominent cotton planter and stands as part of Clemson University.

James Henry Hammond, living his final years out by the time of the Civil War, had long supported disunion and prophesized “…that the matter must terminate in blood…” Hammond stood clear on his belief that South Carolina should leave the Union. “We must go at once, & for good. Nothing half-way…The time has come.” When the prospect of hostilities were almost certain, Hammond wished from a far that he could partake, but his sickness (combined with his hypochondria) plagued him too greatly for any type of physical action.

---

46 Letter, William Van Wyck to Dr. S. M. Van Wyck, 20 January 1861, Maverick and Van Wyck Families Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.


48 Letter, James Henry Hammond to Cadet MCM Hammond, 22 December 1832, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

49 Letter, James Henry Hammond to Col. B. J. Watts, 29 December 1860, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

50 Letter, James Henry Hammond to Col. B. J. Watts, 28 November 1860, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
Hammond died, however, before Sherman’s troops commenced their Campaign of the Carolinas. His life ended on 13 November 1864 at the Greek Revival plantation house that was to be a testament to his status. He did not live to see the fate of his native state, that of the destruction brought on by her act of secession. His house was not attacked by Sherman’s armies. Though they were less than twenty miles from the property, the soldiers did not deviate from their course to bring ruin to Hammond’s plantation. Redcliffe was modified by later owners and was eventually taken over by the National Park Service in order to aid in its preservation. The wide oak trees that Hammond had planted along the entranceway stand large and impressive, sweeping over the drive to give that air of mystery and illusion as to the essence of the approaching Greek Revival homestead.

When the “…model of a Southern planter…” Wade Hampton II died in 1858, his son Wade Hampton III inherited his father’s great land holdings and slaves. Although Wade III had stood against disunion, he did not turn his back on his home. Wade

---


53John Billings Shaw, “Some Notes On The History Of Redcliffe,” Redcliffe, Aiken County Research File, South Carolina Division of Archives and History.

54Obituary, Col. Wade Hampton, Southern Christian Advocate, 13 February 1858, Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Abstract of Title, 1 August 1879, Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

55Speech of Hon Wade Hampton – Constitutionality of Slave Trade Laws,” 10 December 1859, Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division., p. 18.; Wade Hampton I and Wade Hampton III, Sarah (Sally) Strong Baxter Hampton Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
Hampton III seemed aware that battle would come to South Carolina and advocated during the war that he would “…like to show how Carolinians should fight on their own soil.”

By 1865 when they had their chance, South Carolinians could offer little resistance. The Hampton legacy of power, slaves and money, along with loyalty and service to the Confederacy, made the family a target. The Union soldiers actively sought to punish this family by destroying their possessions.

Though Wade Hampton II was no longer alive, his properties were actively sought out by the Union troops, especially to due their association with his son, Confederate cavalry General Wade Hampton III. Millwood, though in the possession of Wade Hampton II’s daughters, epitomized all that was the world of the upcountry slave owning cotton planter. When Sherman’s armies converged upon Columbia, this plantation just on the outskirts of the city was quickly found.

Before the Union troops arrived at Millwood and the Woodlands, most of the Edward Troye paintings of Wade II’s great race and breeding horses were torn from their frames and taken to safety. They were the few items that survived the grand

---

56 Letter, Wade Hampton III to Fisher, 17 December 1861, Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.


58 Mackay-Smith, Portraits, p. 69.
conflagration that engulfed this plantation home. Two of Troye’s paintings in particular were noted as having succumbed to the flames, that of *Monarch* and *Fanny*.

Not all of the great works of art could be preserved with the impending arrival of Union troops. Household items were stolen or destroyed and the house itself was set to the torch. Millwood did not survive the war. This once majestic plantation home was reduced to the remnants of the columns, a haunting reminder of the former world of the

---

59 Virginia Meynard, “Portraits Of Horses By Edward Troye and Henri De Lattre Owned By Col Wade Hampton II,” Virginia Gurley Meynard Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

cotton planter. Wade Hampton II’s son, although he did not reside at Millwood, wanted to restore the mansion to its previous greatness after the war, however, it was not to be. Reality in the post-bellum era was very different for those of the planter

---


62 Nelson, Ruin, p. 97.
class. As Megan Kate Nelson asserted in *Ruin Nation: Destruction in the American Civil War* (2012) that “…as Hampton’s failed plans for Millwood attests, funds were often scares and bankruptcy prevalent…” The war had brought an end to the wealth of the Hampton family. In actuality, when Wade Hampton II passed in 1858, he had already accumulated many outstanding bills. His son Wade Hampton III, after his service to the Confederacy, sought to rebuild his family’s prominence. He served as governor, in Congress and in cabinet posts, even in the wake of the financial strains of the post-

---


bellum era. Hampton was successful in keeping his family’s name and legacy prominent.

The Millwood property, which was deemed by its original owners to be a showpiece, has been eclipsed, if not hidden, in modern day. Marc R. Matrana claimed in Lost Plantations of the South (2009) that “…the site of the old plantation mansion is now open to the public.” However, as Nelson recounted “the six white columns that mark the site of Millwood…are located on private land, and any inquiries regarding their location are met with vague directions and a warning that the landowner owns a shotgun.”

Although James Henry Hammond’s plantation houses were spared during the war, his former residence in Columbia was burned in February 1865. The town house, owned by Thomas Clarkson, was destroyed by the Union troops with torches in hand. All that remained following that fateful day of the occupation of Columbia were the battered pillars and the brick foundation upon which they rested. The ruins of this town house were in many ways symbolic of

65 Longacre, Gentleman, pp. 39, 246, 252-253, 267, 271 and 274.
66 Matrana, Lost, p. 59.
67 Nelson, Ruin, p. 59.
69 Photograph by R. Wearn “Ruins of Mr. Clarkson’s House”, house at Blanding and Bull Streets, Burning of Columbia – R. Wearn Photographs, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
the end of the upcountry cotton planters’ world. Luxurious other properties were in ashes, highlighting the demise of this world.

The soldiers, as they roamed the countryside, took in all that they passed. A member of the 9th Cavalry, William Pritchard, reflected in his journal that in South Carolina, “there are some very nice cotton plantations along the road but

Photograph by R. Wearn, February 1865, House at Bull and Blanding Street, Columbia, South Carolina, R. Wearn Photographs of Burning of Columbia File, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
the houses are burned…”70 He went on at a later date to state that they were “…burning the finer residences…”71 Pritchard accounted for the great destruction they were inflicting on the people of the South, particularly those who belonged to the upcountry planter class – especially while they were in South Carolina. Clearly, he felt they were doing their duty. “I believe, if there are judgements [sic] inflicted upon men in their “latter days” that Sherman’s Army are the avengingangels, [sic] and that they “judgements” [sic] are for the fool cause of slavery.”72 Rubin challenged this depiction of total destruction in her recent book. She pointed out that “…many homes survived Sherman’s March, many more than were destroyed…”73 Regarding the passage of time accompanied by the embellishment of past actions, she mentioned that “…as the Lost Cause took root and came to define most American’s memories of the war, Sherman’s veterans actively pushed back, crafting their own stories of the March.”74

When it seemed as though a relative calm emerged with the passing of Major General William Tecumseh Sherman’s troops on to North Carolina, a new phase of total war was just on the horizon. Though Cump had moved on to the final phase of his campaign, he still harbored “an insatiable desire” to give South Carolina her just penance.75 Brevet Major General Edward E. Potter led his raiders, on directive from

70Pritchard journal entry, 5 February [1865].
71Pritchard journal entry, 8 February 1865.
72Pritchard journal entry, 20 February 1865 (which was mistakenly written as January 20th).
73Rubin, Dixie, p. 52.
74Rubin, Dixie, p. 98.
Sherman via Brevet Major General Quincy A. Gillmore, to see to the demolition of portions of a railroad.76 Taking with him both white and African-American regiments, inclusive of the well-known 54th Massachusetts, Potter’s Raid was one of vast destruction throughout Sumter County. “The torch was applied to all…with yells…of delight and pleasure.”77

Potter’s forces seemed to relish in their abilities to destroy as well. “The wreck and devastation was complete…their brutality and savage wickedness…” was apparently something to which the likes had not been seen in South Carolina, if that was even feasible at that point.78 In one such instance at the former Governor John L. Manning’s majestic residence Milford, a soldier of the 54th Massachusetts, who aimed his weapon point blank while exclaiming “you are a dead man,” halted the governor himself.79 Although Sherman’s armies spared Milford of their wrath, the men conducting Potter’s Raid would have been remiss had they too bypassed this great estate. South Carolinians had known when Potter was on his way, just as they had with Sherman, by the impending billowing clouds of smoke on the horizon.80

With all of the havoc being wreaked on the people of South Carolina, many local Sumter County ladies gathered at Milford in hopes of being protected. By 19 April 1865,

---


77 Mood, “Recollection,” p. 49.


they knew, however, their time had come to truly feel the hardships of war as the flames and smoke were gradually moving forward.\textsuperscript{81} Unverified stories of the army’s approach had been told for some time; however, this time it was a reality.\textsuperscript{82}

Fighting took place around the area of Milford’s location.\textsuperscript{83} Of great concern of course for the former governor was not only the safety of all who had sought solace and protection within the confines of his palatial home but the preservation of this plantation homestead itself.\textsuperscript{84} Upon meeting with General Potter, Manning elaborated upon how his home had been constructed by a Northern man of the same last name. He assumed it was to be demolished under the guidance of a leader who bore that name as well. The general assured Manning that Milford would not succumb to the torch.\textsuperscript{85} Though stories differ as to whether the house was saved in accordance to the surrenders of General Robert Edward Lee and General Joseph Eggleston Johnston or to just the whims of Potter, the plantation was preserved.\textsuperscript{86}

\textsuperscript{81}“Mood,” Potter’s Raid, p. 588 and 590.
\textsuperscript{83}“Continuation of James G. Ramsey account” in Illustrated, ed. Thigpen: 581-585, p. 584.
\textsuperscript{84}Mood, “Recollection,” pp. 66 and 67.
\textsuperscript{85}Mood, “Recollection,” p. 68.
John L. Manning served in the Eastern Theater of the war in the hopes of standing behind his signature on the Ordinance of Secession of South Carolina. One South Carolina regiment actually bore his name, the “Manning Guards,” as a testament to this man.87 Both the former governor and Milford survived the war. Though after the conclusion of the war he was called upon by the people of his state to serve as their senator, he was unable to assume office due to his service to the Confederacy. He went on to serve South Carolina in the senate, however. In 1889, he passed but was

---

87 Letter, S. Gaillard to Col. J. L. Manning, 23 August 1861, John Laurence Manning Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
not buried on his plantation. Manning was interred along with his Hampton relatives in the Trinity Church Yard.\textsuperscript{88} Much like he had worked to take his state out of the Union, he tirelessly worked towards her re-admittance as well.\textsuperscript{89} After Manning’s death, ownership of Milford passed through various hands.\textsuperscript{90}

Of the most recently conducted survey, the Milford plantation was divided into three land tracts, encompassing 326.84 acres, 73.16 acres and 5.00 acres respectively. Richard Hampton Jenrette purchased the lands and the buildings.\textsuperscript{91} Jenrette refurbished the house in order to maintain its original beauty.\textsuperscript{92}

The state of North Carolina escaped great damage during the initial years of war. With that, life for the Camerons and William Williams’ family went on relatively unimpeded. However, when Sherman’s armies crossed into North Carolina, the fortunes of the people of the state changed. Though not as much vengeance was exacted on the residents here as had been on South Carolinians, there was still great destruction. Sherman’s path “…was a scene of universal desolation. Along all the

\textsuperscript{88}\textit{Sketch of Manning Family,” Manning Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; observations made of Trinity Church Yard, Columbia, South Carolina.}

\textsuperscript{89}\textit{Letter, J L Manning to Henry Storm, 29 January 1877, John Laurence Manning Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.}

\textsuperscript{90}\textit{G. Thomas Harmon, “Milford Mansion,” private file of Dr. Rodger Stroup, South Carolina Division of Archives and History, p. 3.; Milford Plantation, Milford File, South Carolina Division of Archives and History, p. 10.}

\textsuperscript{91}\textit{Title To Real Estate, State of South Carolina, County of Sumter, Sumter County Records, Vol. 542, pp. 391-396.; Survey, 20 February 1992, South Carolina, Sumter County Deeds.; Real Property Characteristic Inquiry, AS1140-02, Sumter County Deeds.}

roads were the remains of burnt farm houses…”93 As the troops pressed forward, they were “…heralded by the columns of smoke which rose from the burning farm-houses…”94

With their movement towards the central part of the state, fear spread throughout the Cameron family. Before the Yankees arrived, some of General Joseph Wheeler’s troops appeared at Fairntosh, questioning the slaves as to the whereabouts of the great possessions of the house. The Confederate soldiers never found the whereabouts of most of these goods because Paul Cameron had had the foresight to hide most of the valuables.95

Paul C. Cameron lost a good portion of his fortune and lands, and of course all of his slave labor, as a result of the Civil War. Although Cameron had stood against secession, his actual role in the Confederate government is unknown aside from his purchase of bonds.96 Fearful of what might happen, Paul Cameron tossed private papers that potentially tied him to the Confederacy into the flames in the hopes that he

---


would be protected. As a result, historians are left to only speculate about his involvement.

The Union soldiers too sought the valuables that had been carefully placed out of sight on Fairntosh, particularly the silver, and forcibly questioned the slaves as to where it had been hidden. Though no physical injuries to the people and buildings occurred, they took possession of some of the foodstuffs and some equines. Before the Yankee soldiers disembarked from the plantation, they enlightened the slaves as to their emancipation.

All that Paul Cameron held dear, the life of the great planter with vast land holdings and wealth, great production and the toils of the slave labor to produce the bountiful crops was gone. Though he recovered financially, to an extent, it was in a new era with a new way of life. This was a challenge for these upcountry planters. Paul Cameron lived the remainder of his life encumbered by the antebellum planter lifestyle which he truly had embodied. Jean Bradley Anderson claimed in her book that years after the war that Paul Cameron “…bore immedicable wounds, for the world he


100Letter, Paul C. Cameron to his sister, 18 October 1881, Cameron Family Papers, Southern Historical Collection, University of North Carolina.

had loved was gone."\textsuperscript{102} This perhaps emotes poetic license. Cameron did, however, survive the war and its aftermath relatively unscathed. His house was not burned and he remained a farmer on his own lands.\textsuperscript{103} There were times of financial stress for Paul Cameron.\textsuperscript{104} Thavolia Glymph included in her \textit{Out Of The House Of Bondage: The Transformation Of The Plantation Household} (2008) a portion of a letter he wrote his daughter in which he clarified that “-I shall have no fortune to be on my children-all will have to make their own way.”\textsuperscript{105}

By the time of the Civil War, it had been decades since William Williams had died. The advertisement for the sale of his estate had been posted in the \textit{Roanoke Advocate} (Halifax, North Carolina) on 6 December 1832. It read “Land And Negroes For Sale. On Thursday the 13\textsuperscript{th} day of December, the residence of the late Gen. William Williams…will be offered for sale…”\textsuperscript{106} It is unknown what became of his descendants, if there were any. Montmorenci, which stood so close to the Virginia border, was not reached by Sherman’s armies. Confederate General Joseph E. Johnston, joined by members of his staff which included Wade Hampton III, met with Sherman on the outskirts of the North Carolina capital of Raleigh to surrender.\textsuperscript{107}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{102} Anderson, \textit{Piedmont}, p. 123.\\
\textsuperscript{103} Anderson, \textit{Piedmont}, p. 122.\\
\textsuperscript{104} Glymph, \textit{Bondage}, p. 201.\\
\textsuperscript{105} Glymph, \textit{Bondage}, p. 201.\\
With this, the ravaging of the state ceased. Montmorenci survived the war, only to be destroyed by the wrecking ball after years of neglect in the 20th century.\footnote{Catherine Bishir, “The Montmorenci-Prospect Hill School: A Study of High-Style Vernacular Architecture in the Roanoke Valley” in Dwelling, ed. Swain:84-103, p. 89.} The DuPont family purchased features of the house, such as the staircase, façade and moldings for Winterthur. Tragedy struck, however, during the relocation. The staircase fell from the truck and was destroyed. A slightly altered replica now stands in its stead.\footnote{Bishir, “Montmorenci,” p. 90.; Cantor, Winterthur, pp. 188, 189 and 192.; John A. H. Sweeney, Winterthur Illustrated (A Winterthur Book, 1963), pp. 86 and 151.; Denmark Raleigh photographs of Montmorenci moldings and structure, 1J-3 – 1J-6, 1J-9 – 1J-17, 1J-23 – 1J-24, Winterthur Library, Winterthur Archives.; personal observations and meetings with members of the Winterthur staff.}

The landscape left in the wake of the Army’s path was one of desolation. Pleas from the residents of these southern states came in, looking for assistance in the aftermath of the Georgia and Carolinas campaigns.\footnote{Appeals for Food from Destitute Families, Cumberland County 1865, Civil War Collection, North Carolina Division of Archives and History.; Letter, G. L. Quinn to His Excellency Governor Brown, 12 March 1864, Telamon Cuyler Collection, Georgia Governor’s Papers, Hargrett Rare Books and Manuscripts Library, University of Georgia Libraries.; Letter, Mrs. S. A. Spiers (?) to His Excellency Joseph E. Brown, 19 January 1865, Telamon Cuyler Collection, Georgia Governor’s Papers, Hargrett Rare Books and Manuscripts Library, University of Georgia Libraries.} Destruction had been encompassing.\footnote{Mrs. A. P. Aldrich, “In the Track of Sherman’s Army,” from The Weekly News And Courier, Charleston, S.C., “Our Women In The War,” The Lives They Lived; The Deaths They Died. (Charleston, S.C.: The News And Courier Book Presses, 1885):197-211, pp. 201 and 203.; Bryce, “Personal,” p. 11.; Canning, “Georgia,” pp. 77 and 83.; Cook, Sherman’s March, p. 7.; Correspondence, “Letter,” Weekly, Ellis Merton Coulter Historical Manuscripts, Hargrett Library, University of Georgia.; R. M. Currie, “Back in the Sixties” South Carolina,” Civil War Collection, North Carolina Division of Archives and History.; “Personal Reminiscences of the Spring of 1865,” Civil War Collection, North Carolina Division of Archives and History.; Tallman, “66th Ohio,” Charles Rhodes Collection, Military History Institute.; Daniel Heyward Trezvant, “Burning of Columbia, 1865,” Daniel Heyward Trezvant Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.} People sent appeals to the governors, the president, the military...
leaders as well as fellow citizens. This time, however, the planter could not play his
traditional role of offering financial assistance in a time of despair. It was he who had
born the brunt of the destruction. The world of the upcountry cotton planter with all its
luxurious trimmings was no more. Life would not go on as usual. Now the planter was
seeking assistance as well.

In the aftermath of the war, many southerners sought reimbursement for
destroyed properties and possessions. The key, however, in finding some success in
these petitions was the continued loyalty to the United States during the war. Claims
were made but many lacked the necessary standing to bring compensation. Some of
these planters did not even attempt to seek reimbursement for their losses. They
readily stood behind the role of the upcountry cotton planter before and during the time
of the Confederacy. Others, like Paul C. Cameron, sought amnesty after the war,
where he met with limited success. Perhaps Cameron just sought to preserve some
of his dignity or maybe he wanted to prove that he had been loyal to the United States
government; as a result, Paul C. Cameron claimed he maintained his allegiance to the
United States throughout the war and as a result, sought a reprieve. Cameron was not
alone in trying to find amnesty. On 12 September 1865, a Georgia planter named J. H.

112Letter, W. T. Sherman to Mrs. Annie Gilman Bowen, 30 June 1864, William Tecumseh Sherman Papers,
South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Letter, W. T. Sherman to Mrs. Carolina Carson, 20 January
1865, William Tecumseh Sherman Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division. Both these letters are
responses to pleas that had been sent to Sherman.
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114Views of the South Claim Commission files, National Archeives.

115“Petition for Amnesty.” Paul C. Cameron Papers, Civil War Collection, Orange County, North Carolina
Division of Archives and History.
Harris dutifully affixed his signature to the Oath of Allegiance, proclaiming his loyalty to the United States.\textsuperscript{116} The world of the grand cotton planter was gone and these men sought to find a place in this drastically changed environment.

Many losses were of a different nature and could not be compensated. These South Carolina cotton planter families suffered great losses during the conflict. These men experienced physical and mental losses. Much like so many Southern and Northern families, the Hampton and Hammond families suffered battle deaths during the war.\textsuperscript{117} The loss of family members only magnified the destruction of their properties.

For years, in the wake of the aftermath of the Campaign of the Carolinas, particularly that of the burning of Columbia, William Sherman and Wade Hampton III attacked each other’s character through written letters.\textsuperscript{118} Hampton put great emphasis in his reports and letters on the loss of Millwood and its contents.\textsuperscript{119} Though his spinster sisters were the plantation home’s actual residents, the loss of this palatial estate was a great blow to the fortune and prestige of the Hamptons. Wade Hampton III took this as a personal assault. The world of the great upcountry cotton planter crumbled with the scorching fires that brought the demise of the Millwood plantation.

\textsuperscript{116}Oath of Allegiance, Telamon Cuyler Collection, Hargrett Rare Books and Manuscripts Libraries, University of Georgia Libraries. I am not certain that this is the Harris who is the owner of the White Hall, but all the listed statistics appear to coincide with the Harris who owns the lands and house.


\textsuperscript{118}Blease, Destruction, pp. 18-19 and 22-24.; Letter, Lucy Hampton to Lucy Baxter, 13 February 1888, Sarah (Sally) Baxter Strong Hampton Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.; Letter from Genl. Wade Hampton To The Editors Of The Day Book, 14 June 1865, Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.

\textsuperscript{119}Letter, Wade Hampton to General, no date, Hampton Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
In his *Confederate Home Song*, Reverend C. S. Vedder surmised the termination of the cotton planters’ world, inclusive of the significance of the loss of the home. “When waste and ruin marked the site where ancient homesteads stood…” These lyrics emphasized the planter’s palatial residences and their overall significance, as well as the destruction, brought at the hands of the Union armies. This lost world would never rise again.

Though the world of these upcountry slaveholders with their vast tracts of cotton lands that were worked by the hands of those held in bondage came to a crashing halt with the Civil War, there were still attempts to hold on to the legacy. In the next generation that followed these upcountry planters, they still took their pride in their “…cotton fields…” and “big wooden white houses…”

The relevance of a possession, one that is tangible, such as a house, in fact a home, to an individual can be a defining entity. These planters found much of the representations of their lives in these houses, in their decorative possessions and in their slaves. With the abolition of slavery and for many, the utter destruction of their plantation homes, these men lost much of their classification. The upcountry planters who survived the war all had different lives than they had before. Many tried, or their families attempted to, rebuild but were unable. Wade Hampton III planned to rebuild his father’s destroyed Millwood but never was able. Wade III was prominent in the

---

120 Rev. C. S. Vedder, *Confederate Home Song*, Mary Amarinthia Snowden Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.


aftermath of the conflict, even in the wake of initial debt.\textsuperscript{123} He maintained the continued prominence of the Hampton family name. Some of the other planters attempted to claim that they had remained Unionists throughout the war, much like Paul Cameron and J. H. Harris. Some of these men lost their homes; but all lost their slaves. Thus they lost what they had used to define their status. However, many of these men’s legacies, much like Hammond, Hampton and Calhoun, are still focal points in scholarship.

That aura of power and prestige that was found in the antebellum world of the great upcountry cotton planter was gone forever. No matter what attempts were made by these men to reinstate their status, it was an impossible if not unattainable goal. These upcountry cotton planters’ former ambition to be recognized on a basis of equality with the low country planters in addition to attaining their own unique status through their building in the Greek Revival architectural style was done. This world that had been meticulously created by the upcountry Georgia and Carolina cotton planters was distinctive from that of other southern planters. From the start they were underestimated regarding their wealth, status and abilities to climb into the elite, low country planter ranks. By selecting one of the most elaborate and historical architectural styles, they defined themselves as the elite. Though these upcountry cotton planters are often overlooked for their contributions to the Old South by historians, their legacy endures through their Greek Revival plantation homes.

\textsuperscript{123}Longacre, \textit{Gentleman}, pp. 246, 252-253, 267, 271 and 274.
CONCLUSION
The legacy and lure of the Southern cotton plantation is deeply rooted in the American consciousness. Though the tradition had been cultivated somewhat in the mythology that was generated in the post-bellum era, during a time of both restoration and lost cause ideology, the realities of this lifestyle and operation were at one time factual. Many of the planters incorporated in this dissertation were and continue to be, recognized for their political views or contributions to government. Some were perhaps a bit obscure. But all in all, these upcountry Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina cotton planters left a dramatic mark on American, particularly Southern history. Their Greek Revival plantation houses, whether they survived the Civil War or not, were a mark of distinction. These men embraced an architectural style that they believed was tied to slave ownership and mastery over cotton lands.

There have been many conclusions drawn in this dissertation. The upcountry cotton planter of Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina was probably much like his counterparts of other regions of the South. They all sought successful crops that generated revenue allowing them to not only survive, but thrive within the community. Also, there were planters and others who also built in the Greek Revival architectural style in this era as well who did not reside in this particular region of the South. The men examined in this dissertation were not alone in their usage of the Greek Revival architectural style. However, they found that this style allowed them to both display
their status and separate them from previous generations and those who were less successful.

The plantation house, the outer buildings as well as the contents of these structures were all testaments to the men who built them. This plantation legacy was fostered in the “moonlight and magnolias” ideology as southerners tried to cope with the loss of their way of life. The idealization of the cotton planter and his home has been enhanced in mythology and memory as well as through literature and cinema. The events of, as well as the aftermath of, the Civil War helped to further attest to this commentary, as these planters and their families scrambled to preserve what they could while the Union armies were marching across their lands. Though these planters had been the representatives of the slave holding ranks, thoroughly tying themselves with their brethren of this class by building in the same architectural style, in the end when all was lost, some turned their backs on this social group. Paul C. Cameron sought to reclaim his losses by filing petitions with the Southern Claim Commission, which required the petitioner not to have been a Confederate.¹ It is known that in the wake of the impending arrival of the Union armies that Cameron attempted to destroy many of his papers.² One will never know their contents but it is most likely that they contradicted his appeal for a reprieve. Many of these men, however, did not live to see this war and its aftermath, but their families did.

¹“Petition for Amnesty,” Paul C. Cameron Papers, Civil War Collection, Orange County, North Carolina Division of Archives and History.

Greek Revival architecture was not unique to the American South. It did, however, take a certain meaning among the upcountry cotton planter class, as was a means of showing that they were just as powerful and wealthy as their low country counterparts. In Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina, the low country planters dominated. Attempting to display their sovereignty and capabilities, the upcountry planters embraced this architectural style with its ancient slave culture heritage. As they expanded into uncultivated lands in the deep South to grow cotton, here too they built Greek Revival homes. For example, Wade Hampton II, had among his many plantations, Millwood in South Carolina and Houmas in Louisiana, both homes built in the Greek Revival style.3

One assessment made within this study was that Greek Revival architecture was a representation of slave-generated cotton wealth. Although this architectural style was clearly found throughout the United States in the private, public and ecclesiastical spheres, it took on a distinct characteristic in the southern states. In an attempt to distance themselves from their fathers’ generation, who primarily built in the Federal or colonial styles, the nineteenth century upcountry cotton planter adopted Greek Revival as a trend of his generation. In a way, the Federal style was symbolic of democratic ideals whereas Greek Revival denoted the ideology of states rights. The simplistic Federalist style reflected more of the tone of the era in which it was popular. As the American nation was being forged, attention had to be focused on democratic ideals, not superfluous displays of wealth. The Greek temple-like structures were a means of

---

exhibiting an independent style. It reflected the desire to show independent ideologies as well as wealth. The upcountry cotton planters embraced the democratic ideologies of the ancient Greeks as well as the institution of slavery. These men were in fact contradictory as they promoted republican ideals yet embraced the institution of slavery. They selected this architectural style, which was far grander than the previous generations' Federal style, but also because it was symbolic of rising power. The advocates of the states rights political theory embraced this imposing architectural style and its relationship to the ancient slaveholding civilization. The massive pillars which upheld the house’s pediment gave an impressive appearance, one distinctly of power.

Through the South, large scale cotton planters embraced this architectural style. It stood as a testament to the wealth generated from the slave labor that produced their cotton crops. It had not been the architectural style of the tobacco, rice or indigo planter, for it was this generation’s style. This was also the architectural design that the upcountry cotton planters embraced. These men modified Greek Revival to conform to their ideals; but it also served as a valuable measure of who the man was that built the house.

The upcountry region of South Carolina particularly had been viewed as almost the “ugly step-sister” to the beauty of the Charleston dominated low country, which was filled with her rice-generated planter elite. But cotton helped to transform the upcountry into a land of the moneyed planter realm as well. The Greek Revival plantation homes of Fort Hill, Redcliffe, Millwood and Milford helped set the standards of magnificence. These houses were symbols of the men of power who owned them, all of whom dominated in politics/government, agriculture and society. Their plantation homes set
the standards and the patterns of the day. These planters desired to, and were successful in, creating an autocratic world in which they dominated. The likened themselves to lords of the past where their power and control were absolute.

South Carolina’s Greek Revival State house was to bear the means of her wealth within the architectural style, with plans for slaves to be carved into the pediment.\(^4\) Though war altered these designs, the upcountry cotton planters who built their homes in the Greek Revival style had enthusiastically approved these plans.\(^5\) This style was bound with many aspects of slavery, that of authority, supremacy and even breeding. Though Greek Revival was used in the North as well, there was not a single class with which it was associated.

Each home held a specific meaning to the man who owned it. Although each Greek Revival house was symbolic of the upcountry cotton planter class, its significance was more deeply entrenched. James Henry Hammond’s motivation in building Redcliffe was in fact two fold. One was to outdo John L. Manning’s Milford,\(^6\) while the other was to make Redcliffe a place of solace, even an escape from the allegations of inappropriate dalliances with his young female relatives.\(^7\) This plantation home became

---


\(^6\) Billings, “Notes,” Redcliffe, Aiken County Research File, South Carolina Division of Archives and History.; Shaffer, Gardens, p. 184.

symbolic of the man, for it was his creation and design, the enduring legacy he sought for future generations to see.

James Henry Hammond was fully dedicated to the principles of the lifestyle of the wealthy cotton planter. He married a woman for whom he held little affinity in order to advance his social rank into the planter class. Taking possession of her properties, he expanded these holdings and began his assent into high society. Building Greek Revival homes, first in Columbia and then his Redcliffe plantation, he further bound himself to this world. So dedicated to the elite planter realm, he advocated and supported disunion. “…whenever she determines to dissolve the union, I shall, without hesitation, go with her fully…”

The stories from the gentlemen of South Carolina seem to make the strongest case of the tie of Greek Revival and slave holding. Their plantation homes stood as the embodiment of the oligarchical world they created. Their plantations appear to be among the most renowned. Even though many letters, papers and documents were destroyed during the Civil War and afterwards, a fair amount of their stories survived. John C. Calhoun, James Henry Hammond, Wade Hampton II and John L. Manning are widely recognized not only because of their political stances but because of the enduring legacies of their grand Greek Revival plantation homes. Not as much detail was available on the Georgia planters who were selected for this study. Their plantations and homes fit into the model being assessed but many of these men did not leave behind written documents. Of the two planters selected from North Carolina, Paul

---

8James Henry Hammond, Speech, 1860, James Henry Hammond Papers, South Caroliniana Library, Manuscripts Division.
Cameron left a wealth of documentation whereas most information about William Williams was obtained through his multiple wills and other individuals’ written comments.

Though some of the planters used in this study, particularly the Georgia ones, did not leave behind detailed accounts of their lives, their Greek Revival homes helped to tell their stories. The magnificence of these houses have been captivated by scholars and have been included, albeit briefly, in works like Mills Lane’s *Architecture of the Old South: Georgia* (1996) and David King Gleason’s *Antebellum Homes of Georgia* (1987). North Carolina planter William Williams left behind primarily tax records and wills in part to tell his story, but the significance of Montmorenci was so great that the Dupont family sought to preserve not only the façade but moldings and the staircase. Historian Catherine Bishir has dedicated a great deal of her architectural research to this home as well, for it is featured in her chapter “The Montmorenci-Prospect Hill School: A Study of High-Style Vernacular Architecture” in *Carolina Dwellings* (1978), the chapter “The Montmorenci-Prospect Hill School: A Study of High-Style Vernacular Architecture in the Roanoke Valley” in her *Southern Built: American Architecture, Regional Practices* (2006) as well as in the book she co-authored with Michael T. Southern, *A Guide to the Historic Architecture of Piedmont North Carolina* (2003). These types of accounts further preserve the legacy of this planter, all the more affixing his place in the world for future generations.

When Frederick Law Olmsted made his famous trek from 1852 to 1857 through the South, it was his contention that as a whole “a large plantation is necessarily a
retreat from general society…”

There is truth in some aspects of this statement. Many of these planters that have been discussed did find some comfort in being at their plantations and being in their homes. James Henry Hammond clearly built Redcliffe as some form of escape. Wade Hampton II took great pleasure in being home and made his expansive plantation the center of society. His Millwood was seen as the greatest of plantation homes. Olmsted was also correct in asserting that the plantation was its own world. Here, the owner was master, a ruler over his lands and possessions. It was this that truly defined him. Perhaps the general populace never had access to the cotton lands and the grand Greek Revival mansion that was filled with possessions unattainable by the common man. But the people knew of these plantations through stories, articles and general conversation. This was not a life, a property, a house that just anyone could attain. It was created through the possession of a great number of chattel slaves who made the cotton salable. It was the slaves who generated the profits that allowed the planter to build a Greek Revival house, which in turn, stood as a symbol of this life.

The intrinsic union of this architectural style and slave ownership was ever present. The Greek Revival plantation house was a defining factor of the upcountry Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina planter. It told the tale of his power, his might and his character. These plantation houses, all grand in stature of varying

---

degrees, were a testament to the legacy of the men who owned them. Built to be lasting legacies of the greatness of the slave-owning cotton planter, they stood as perpetual reminders of the antebellum era. Though the men died, slavery was abolished and some of the houses were destroyed, these Greek Revival plantation house survived in either reality or in story, enabling them to share the legacies of these men. It was a gradual building process to get to the Greek Revival plantation home. Land was the first component, which necessitated the use of the slaves who facilitated the growth and cultivation of cotton which in turn led to greater wealth that helped to distinguish the cotton planter from the previous generation of rice, tobacco and indigo planters. John Majewski stated in his *Modernizing A Slave Economy: the Economic Vision of the Confederate Nation* (2009) that “landownership, like slavery, was one of the pillars of southern society. Land was not merely an economic asset; it was a sign of respectability and a maker of citizenship.”¹² From this wealth, social power and status increased which dictated a lasting symbol of this heightened position. A vast estate marked status. Differentiating himself from the Federal and colonial era planters, the upcountry cotton planter selected Greek Revival as his symbol, for this was his generations’ architectural style.

The outlying region of the plantation was very significant. These planters, in some instances aided by their wives, carefully determined the types of trees and bushes that were to lead one on the path to the big house. It was a means of protecting the sanctity of the private world of the cotton planter but also a way of building a sense of

---

anticipation for one who had the opportunity to travel this course. Trees and other
vegetation were in essence functional. Many of the plantations were constructed from
the wood milled on the property, which not only helped to defray the cost of construction
but also internalized the structures all the more. Although this was not unique to these
upcountry plantations, it epitomized their desire to be true representatives of their
region. The use of their own goods showed their independence.

Various outer buildings were necessary for the successful operations of the
upcountry cotton plantation, but they were also essential defining entities of the planter’s
status. Mills were functional structures that kept productivity levels high. Additional
buildings like kitchens were practical and necessary but also provided a measure of
safety. In the instance of many of the planters used in this dissertation, the kitchens
were built in the Greek Revival architectural style, much like the horse barns. All of
these structures were defining factors.

In essence it was the slaves and their labor that generated these upcountry
planters’ wealth and allowed them to build, maintain and furnish their Greek Revival
plantation houses. Slave cabins were built and positioned so as to optimize work levels.
Strategically placed on the plantation lands, these cotton planters kept their slaves
within an arm’s reach but also hidden from general view. There was clear recognition
on the part of these planters that the slaves were their source of wealth, hence the
paternal relationship that was maintained. However, there was the perpetual
acknowledgement that the upcountry cotton planter class was the master and the
slaves were just their property.
These planters were also cognizant of how their interior household design, decorations, furnishing and art were all measures of defining their status. The first floor of the plantation home had the best furniture and art, particularly in the foyer and parlor, which were the areas that would be seen by visitors. Paintings were commonly of the prized race horse, the plantation landscape, of family members as well as of classics, additional evidence of the planter’s status and possessions. Each possession was a mark of merit, a designation of his unique social class and standing.

Mindful that their upcountry lands might not continue to produce cotton at optimal level, these planters used the wealth they generated from their upcountry plantations to expand their holdings. Many purchased additional plantations within the states they resided as well as in the deep South. This signified that they were clearly looking to the future but also that they were in search of maintaining the means by which to generate their wealth and prosperity. In keeping ties to their upcountry Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina plantations, these men tended to build the houses on the other lands in their favored architectural style, Greek Revival. This helps to show that they had a bond with this architectural style. It defined this generation of planter class. With this same motivation, these planters also built their town homes in the Greek Revival format as well. There was a sense of competitiveness amid these planters for creating the perfect, elaborate and ornate houses, whether it was subliminal or intentional. In fact, James Henry Hammond asserted, regarding his Columbia, S.C. house, that “I believe I set the standard.”13 Not only did these planters desire to keep their families in

---

the finest accommodations, but there was also the aspect of a sense of trying to outdo the other.

The architectural design of the upcountry Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina plantation house, coupled with its interior décor and furnishing, stood as a distinct definition of the power of the planter. Greek Revival architecture, rooted in deep historical tradition, was adapted to a new meaning, that of cotton plantation slavery and the generation of wealth. Each aspect of the plantation, from the slaves to the floral arrangements to the external buildings all the way through the exterior and interior design of the big house, stood as representations of the planter who owned them. Each and every feature and possession was telling of the man. The upcountry Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina cotton planters who were selected in this study were all men of power, so deemed by the aforementioned criteria. They all sought to leave a lasting testament to their power and even though their world collapsed, they were successful in attaining this goal, regardless of whether the plantation houses are still standing.

Homes are in fact historical records. These Greek Revival plantation houses told the story of the men who owned them and their desire to dominate their societal world. The effort placed into the design, construction, modification, and decorations, inclusive of the outlying approach, are accounts of this self-contained oligarchical world they created. Greek Revival was the medium through which these men told their stories. It was their symbol, their essence, their being.
The Southern Greek Revival plantation houses, especially in the upcountry regions of Georgia, South Carolina and North Carolina, were a symbol of this generation’s planter class who earned their money from slaves and cotton. These upcountry planters put much of their individual stories in their Greek Revival plantation houses. Each home was a manifestation of the wealth, power and status of the planter. The house, its contents as well as the overall design, stood as representations of the man who owned the property. Though the root of their wealth, which had been generated by slave labor, became defunct, the status that each man painstakingly tried to preserve was, in the end, attained. Every aspect of the plantation house stood as a measure of the man who had it constructed. It was a testament to his legacy and power, one that was to transcend the generations. The illusion of grandeur displayed in these homes masked the reality of how they were built and maintained; it was on the backs of slaves. The beauty of these homes and their representations of the power of the planter however are forever marred by the stain of slavery.
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