2013

The Deteriorating Treatment of Slaves in the Palmetto State in the Mid-Nineteenth Century

Samuel Benke
CSUSB

The Deteriorating Treatment of Slaves in the Palmetto State in the Mid-Nineteenth Century

By Samuel Benke

Abstract: *Slavery, in and of itself, is a despicable institution. It degraded the enslaved and inflated the power of the owners to near omnipotent levels. Slavery has been portrayed in two different ways: one, as a fantasy on thinking where slavery was a benevolent institution that taught slaves how to be civil and Christian, while the other takes a more realistic approach exposing the harsh brutalities of slavery and the adverse effects that the institution had on the enslaved. This paper seeks to give the reader a more thorough understanding of slavery as it existed in the antebellum South Carolina and how the conditions of slavery worsened as the nation grew further disunited. Research for this study draws from major authors throughout the twentieth century, such as Charles W. Joyner, Ulrich B. Phillips, Herbert Aptheker, and Kenneth M. Stampp all of whom played a major role in shaping American thought on slavery. The research encompasses why slave treatment worsened, the punishments handed down upon the slaves, and the general treatment of slaves during these changing circumstances in antebellum South Carolina.*

Introduction

Slavery is an institution that has existed throughout history. This ancient practice enabled some civilizations to become dominating empires while leaving others ravaged, as their populations were carted off into enslavement. Within these slave-owning societies, the treatment of slaves varied considerably over time. Some performed light work in cooperation with their masters, while others experienced maltreatment and workloads so brutal that they died as a result. Due to slavery's extended history throughout human existence, it is often challenging to arrive at a universal definition of what constitutes being a slave. One particular definition of slavery that developed during the 19th Century, in the United States of America, was known as race based chattel slavery.[1] States in the southern part of the country took special interest in this form of slavery because of the advantages that the institution provided to large-scale, plantation style agriculture.[2] Generally, slaves in the South were treated very poorly at this time, but South Carolina, in particular, developed a reputation for excessive brutality.[3]

Before the 1850's, the most common form of punishment was the whipping of slaves, and while this treatment was brutal, the punishments usually matched the severity of the crime committed. For example, if a slave committed the same infraction multiple times, the amount of lashes put on the slaves would increase accordingly; it would take a drastic act, such as running away from the plantation, before a slave would be chained or mutilated. However, as southern states entered a path toward secession and rebellion during the 1850s, with South Carolina at

---

[1] This manifestation of bondage occurred when a white man or woman owned a black man or woman and treated the latter as if they were property. The slave's value was measured simply by how much product he/she produced.

[2] On the other hand, the northern states decided that slavery was not worth the economic cost and outlawed the institution. It is important to note that the racism that had fostered slavery did not disappear, and that blacks still had difficult lives even if they were technically free, however, this subject will not be covered in this paper.

[3] Men and women as a whole were treated horrifically as slaves; women more often than not were treated worse than men were. However, this paper will focus more on the overall treatment of both sexes and less on the individual ordeals and for each sex.

the helm of the ship, the maltreatment of black slaves worsened. As tensions rose, so too did the severity of these punishments. Debates about slavery nearly ripped the nation in two by mid-century, but the Compromise of 1850, which introduced the idea of popular sovereignty and balanced Slave and Free states, would postpone the division for another eleven years. Despite this lull, slaveholders still treated their slaves worse than earlier in the century. The ill treatment of slaves continued to escalate in South Carolina, which by this time had been fervently advocating secession from the United States. This study will highlight three factors that led to the worsening conditions of slaves in South Carolina during this time: first, the reasons as to why the treatment of slaves deteriorated; second, the general treatment of slaves in everyday life under these changing conditions; and third, the punishments handed down upon slaves as a result.

Historiography

The first major historian to write extensively about the treatment of slaves was Ulrich Bonnell Phillips. When Phillips wrote *American Negro Slavery; a Survey of the Supply, Employment and Control of Negro Labor as Determined by the Plantation Régime,* in 1918, he included a chapter titled "Plantation Management" which was about the way the plantation was run and how slaves were treated.[4] Within this chapter, Phillips explains that slaves had a good life. His main argument stems from a two different quotes, the first of which is from Virginian Richard Corbin in 1759:

> The care of negroes is the first thing to be recommended, that you give me timely notice of their wants that they may be provided with all necessarys [*sic*]. The breeding wenches more particularly you must instruct the overseers to be kind and indulgent to, and not force them with child upon any service or hardship that will be injurious to them,… and the children to be well looked after,… and that

---

[4] Ulrich Bonnell Phillips, "Plantation Management," in *American Negro Slavery: a Survey of the Supply, Employment and Control of Negro Labor as Determined by the Plantation Régime* (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1918), 261-290.

> none of them suffer in time of sickness for want of proper care.[5]

While the second is from P.C. Weston, a South Carolinian in 1856:

> The proprietor, in the first place, wishes the overseer most distinctly to understand that his first object is to be, under all circumstances, the care and wellbeing of the negroes. The proprietor is always ready to excuse such errors as may proceed from want of judgment; but he never can or will excuse any cruelty, severity, or want of care towards the negroes. For the wellbeing, however, of the negroes it is absolutely necessary to maintain obedience, order and discipline, to see that the tasks are punctually and carefully performed, and to conduct the business steadily and firmly, without weakness on the one or harshness on the other.[6]

Phillips builds upon these two men, stating that slaves had healthcare and that whenever they were sick or injured their master's would pay the bill for them. He also describes the master's generosity in giving slaves houses to live in, and states various benefits to being pregnant. For example, Phillips wrote that slave women who had become pregnant were not given the most laborious tasks and were given time to rest. The women were also given three forty-five minute periods each day after giving birth for a period of twelve months to allow for suckling and were never required to be more than half a mile from their house so they could allow their child to suckle.[7] Phillips sees the slave/master relationship as benign and patriarchal. To Phillips, slaves could be no more than children, as they were given nearly everything and cared for by the master. He also states that the sometimes-harsh punishment of slaves was only a reflection of a crime or unacceptable action.

Phillips was born in La Grange, Georgia in 1877 and was very sympathetic to the Antebellum South. This sympathy affected his writings, which painted Southern slavery in a romantic and benevolent light. Moreover, Phillips' writings would help perpetuate these views for over forty years, as a number of scholars

---

[5] Ibid., 261.
[6] Ibid., 261.
[7] Ibid., 264.

agreed with him, which in turn helped to sway public opinion. This all ended in 1956, the year Kenneth Stampp wrote *The Peculiar Institution*, which is considered a groundbreaking work in that it disagreed with Philips' views on slavery, and began the process of rescinding the foundations of his long accepted arguments.

While Stampp's work is often praised for its break from traditional analysis of slavery among scholars of his day, his work was not the first to challenge Philips' claims. In 1943, Herbert Aptheker was beginning to write his dissertation for his doctoral degree when he wrote, *American Negro Slave Revolts,* which focused on slave revolts in the South and pointed out that there were hundreds of other revolts similar to the famous Nat Turner rebellion.[8] He attacked Phillips, dismantling the idea that slaves were docile and child-like. Aptheker gives a detailed account of the revolts that occurred throughout the first half of the 19th century. He uses two chapters to detail why slaves revolted in the first place, which includes many instances where slaves were being mistreated.[9] Aptheker also delves into the types of individual resistance that slaves practiced against their masters, such as not working as hard as possible or damaging tools to get breaks.[10] Aptheker shows that slave communities were more nuanced than what the early Southern sympathizer historians would have the public believe.[11]

The evidence that Aptheker presented about slavery and the South was revolutionary for the topic, because it debased Phillips' thinking that slavery was benevolent and good for slaves. The work also helped set the foundation for works such as *The Peculiar Institution* and *Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life*, which completely dismissed earlier Southern sympathetic writings, and set a new tone for the way historians thought about slavery and the South. Kenneth Stampp published

---

[8] Herbert Aptheker, *American Negro Slave Revolts* (1943. Reprint. New York: International Publishers, 1963).

[9] Ibid., 79-139.

[10] Ibid., 140.

[11] There is an abundance of material on slave revolts in the South, however, this study will not divulge too much into them. It will look at revolts as a form of slave resistance and how those resistances affected slave treatment in South Carolina leading into the Civil War. It does not touch upon how the resistances formed or how they were put down. For further reading on Slave revolts please refer to John K. Throton's paper, "African Dimensions Of The Stono Rebellion" or Herbert Aptheker's book *American Negro Slave Revolts*

the book, *The Peculiar Institution,* to directly counter what Phillips was trying to convey. Stampp argued that slavery was not a benign, paternalistic institution, but rather a brutal, barbaric one that treated slaves horrifically and gave their masters nearly unlimited power. Stampp quotes many different slaveholders about the treatment of slaves.[12] The massive use of primary sources is seen throughout the book. For example, Stampp starts section six with a quote from an Arkansas slaveholder:

> The management of Negroes, […] now, I speak what I know, when I say it is like 'casting pearls before swine' to try to *persuade* a negro to work. He must be *made* to work, and should always be given to understand that if he fails to perform his duty he will be punished for it.[13]

Another quote from a South Carolinian states, "The overseer whose constant and only resort is to the lash […] is a brute, and deserves penitentiary."[14] Stampp uses quotes such as this throughout the chapter to point out the absurdness of Phillips' claims and attacks the notion that slavery was benevolent and passive. Stampp is thorough and broad in his attack of Phillips, which was necessary, as Phillips' version of slavery was a common point of view among Americans at the time. Stampp used rather simple points like the previous quote, as well as brutal portrayals of what slaves had to endure as punishments for not doing exactly as the master, or overseer, pleased.

The Peculiar Institution, and Stampp, ushered in a new era of historical thinking about slavery; historians began to challenge the romanticized views of Dixie sympathizing historians, as they worked to reveal the truth about American slavery. One author who stands out in this assault of the old ways of thinking was Stanley Elkins. Elkins' writings take a slightly different turn, portraying the slave as a victim rather than attacking the whole idea of paternalistic slavery itself. Elkins argument was that slaves were essentially turned into adult infants living in totalitarian

---

[12] Kenneth Stampp, "To Make Them Stand In Fear," *The Peculiar Institution* (New York: Vintage Books, 1956), 141-191.
[13] Ibid.. 171.
[14] Ibid., 179. Although this one South Carolinian seemed to believe that over punishment was a problem, it would not stop others from over extending their power over slaves with extremely harsh punishments.

environments who eventually lost the will to resist. In short, Elkins viewed slaves as equal to that of the Jews while being systematically murdered by the Nazis. He felt the environment of slavery was similar to that of Nazi concentration camps and the way the inmates were treated there.[15]

Charles Joyner was also part of the movement of historians who were determined to right the wrongs set down by their predecessors nearly a half century before. Joyner wrote the book, *Down by the Riverside,* which details life for slaves and masters in All Saints Parish in South Carolinian from the mid-eighteenth century to the Civil War. Joyner writes about the geology of All Saints Parish, as well as the chattel slave system that was set up, and how the South Carolina town's economy completely intertwined with the slave system.[16] Joyner next writes about the idea of "off time" in South Carolina, which is not necessarily leisure time, but rather time for the slaves to take care of any additional needs they might have: activities such as hunting, fishing, gardening, religious worship, or hiring oneself out for work.[17] Joyner continues his work with ideas about the "Afro-Christian" faith and how Christian ministers and evangelists were encouraged to convert slaves, the folklore that developed among slaves and whites, and the formation of the Gullah language.[18] Joyner's last chapter focuses on resistance movements and tactics by slaves in South Carolina. He suggests that even though there were few outright acts of rebellion or revolts in the region, the desire of the slaves was always to be free.[19]

Joyner wishes to communicate to the world that slavery was more than just slaves being the victim of a cruel and barbaric system. He is a part of a new wave of thinking that counters Phillips' school of thought in a more thorough manner than the works of Stampp, Elkins, or Aptheker. The former authors argued against Phillips by presenting additional primary source, and at times, using Phillips' own sources against him to prove that slaves were victims and unhappy with their involvement in the slave

---

[15] While some comparisons can be made between Jewish prisoners and slaves, other historians contend that the comparison is not legitimate.

[16] Charles W Joyner, *Down by the Riverside: a South Carolina Slave Community* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984), 9-126.

[17] Ibid., 127-140.

[18] Ibid., 141-224. The Gullah Language is a mix of English and African roots that slaves used to communicate to each other.

[19] Ibid., 225-240.

institution. Joyner takes the next step, exposing the reader to details regarding slave communities and how slaves lived. He reveals that slaves could grow their own gardens, hunt, and fish for their own meat, and even do additional work outside the plantation to earn money, provided that master allowed it. Joyner accepted and agreed with Stampp, Elkins, and Aptheker, in that slaves were treated horribly and that nothing about slavery was justifiable, but believed that further, more nuanced discussions of the topic were still necessary.

Ira Berlin, a modern historian of Southern slavery builds upon Joyner's school of thought with his own works such as *Generations of Captivity: A History of African-American Slaves*. Throughout the book, Berlin details what happened in slave communities and how they evolved through American history.[20] He does this by separating each category into a different generation in chronological order. By detailing the slaves' lives, Berlin delves into how slaves were treated throughout American history and how that treatment helped to form these societies. His focus also presents the worsening conditions as time progressed in the South. Furthermore, Berlin discusses how politics and economics affected the treatment of slaves. For example, the advent of the cotton gin allowed for the production of cotton to expand causing the then dying form of chattel slavery to have renewed life. By extension, this created a divide between the North and South, which continued to grow until the South seceded and civil war began.[21] During that time, cotton production was rapidly growing and the treatment of slaves deteriorated in lieu of the master's own comfort. Berlin is able to capture the deteriorating condition of slavery throughout American history and provides analysis of legislation and events that contributed to the slaves' condition.

Berlin also writes about the reinforced Fugitive Slave Law. This slave law was in effect for nearly 100 years within the United States and demanded that captured slaves be returned to their owners if the slave ran away. Northern abolitionists were able to dissent before the strengthened law was passed, but afterwards they were legally obligated to help slaveholders recapture their slaves. The penalty for failure to do so resulted in jail time. Slaveholders in states such as South Carolina took advantage of

---

[20] Ira Berlin, *Generations of Captivity: A History of African-American Slaves* (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003).
[21] Ibid., 97.

this law and were able to recapture many of their runaway slaves due to the unwilling help of Northerners.

Slavery has long been a popular topic among scholars in the United States, but has often proven to be difficult to discuss. Phillips was the first to attempt to portray slavery in history through his own bias by portraying Southerners to be gentlemen and paternal towards their slaves. He believed that slavery was an institution that benefited all the slaves because it helped to "civilize" and care for them. It took nearly thirty years for historians to deviate from Phillips' thinking. Aptheker laid the foundation for the new era of thought; Stampp, Elkins, and Joyner built on Aptheker's ideas and attacked Phillips viciously, effectively dismantling Phillips' school of biased thinking. Ira Berlin attacks Phillips as well, but also brings revisions to the aforementioned writers all the while, bringing along the idea that not everything is black and white when discussing slavery. This paper will build off the ideas of the latter five historians on the slave system in South Carolina: the Palmetto State.

Background

Forced labor first appeared in the United States in the form of indentured servitude during the early colonial era. Many of these migrants became indentured servants to wealthy individuals, who in exchange for the migrant's labor, paid for their passage to the new world. Under this system, servants gained freedom after a certain amount of time and were usually able to obtain a portion of land and money from their old master when their contracts reached an end. This is where the first vestiges of slavery appear in the history of the United States. Slowly, the need for indentured servants waned as former servants began populating the land along with those who were able to migrate on their own. At this same time, prejudices against blacks started to grow and slowly race based chattel slavery gained a foothold as an institution in the American colonies. Chattel slavery became widespread throughout the colonies, and became a problem during the writing of the Constitution. Signatories from both the Northern and Southern States agreed to compromises concerning slavery such as having three of every five slaves count as one free person, and ending the slave trade by 1808. These compromises were the first of many

that were made concerning the institution of slavery within the United States.

In the late eighteenth century, slavery had begun to lose its stronghold on society. In fact, many opponents of the system believed it would end naturally, because it could no longer self-perpetuate itself. This idea changed, however, with the invention of the cotton gin in 1793. After its invention, the demand for slaves increased again. Tensions soon arose between the North and South. While some concessions were made by slave owners, prior to the Civil War, such as the Mason Dixon line, which divided future slave states from future free states, it must also be understood that slave owners still held great political power at this time. Dr. James Horton said in an interview with the Public Broadcasting Station (PBS):

> […] in the 72 years between the election of George Washington and the election of Abraham Lincoln, 50 of those years sees a slaveholder as president of the United States, and, for that whole period of time, there was never a person elected to a second term who was not a slaveholder…[22]

The realization that over half of the presidents in this period were slaveholders helps explain how slavery was able to gain and retain such a strong foothold in the United States.

Analysis

The mistreatment of slaves within South Carolina was not an immediate process. It took nearly a century for slave conditions to deteriorate, and was due to numerous factors. Such reasons include slave codes set by the South Carolina government in the colonial period, the fact that black slaves outnumbered whites in South Carolina, rebellions within the South, and national tensions about slavery in the mid-nineteenth century that eventually drove the nation apart.

South Carolina was the first colony to establish a slave code in colonial America, a code that other colonies would emulate

---

[22] James Horton, Interview with Gwen Ifill, *PBS Newshour*, (Public Brocasting Station, PBS, January 25, 2007).

when establishing their own.[23] The 1712 slave code of South Carolina declared that blacks were "of barbarous, wild, savage natures, and … wholly unqualified to be governed by the laws, customs, and practices of this province." They had to be governed by such special laws "as may restrain the disorders, rapines, and inhumanity to which they are naturally prone and inclined, and [as] may also tend to the safety and security of the people of this province and their estates."[24]

South Carolina originated the idea, among those that would eventually form the United States that slaves were barbaric and needed to be civilized, and believed it was their duty to "civilize" and Christianize the African slaves.[25] In South Carolina, in order to accomplish this, they would punish the slave for wrongdoing and try to attain "Christian" and civilized behavior through force. Charles Christian lists the many different provisions that the slave code covered, but one that is of particular interest is the search of slave homes. He states that the code called for the search of slave homes every two weeks to search for stolen goods or weapons; the punishment for finding such an item started with whippings and eventually escalated to losing an ear, branding on the third offense, and death on the fourth offense.[26] This provision of punishment was justified to South Carolinians because they believed it helped to teach good morals to slaves, and while the use of harsher punishments, such as death, were not utilized in the early-eighteenth century, they were prevalent later on when slaves lived longer lives and the slave population was replenished through families rather than importation.[27] Slave codes allowed South Carolinians to punish slaves without having any guilt on their moral or ethical conscience, because the codes cited that it was right to punish the slaves in these instances. The codes essentially allowed the masters to punish slaves without restriction in South

---

[23] Charles M Christian, and Sari Bennet, *Black Saga: The African American Experience: A Chronology* (Basic Civitas Books, 1998.), 27-28.

[24] John C Hurd, *The Law of Freedom and Bondage in the United States* (Boston, 1858-62), I, 299 in Kenneth Stampp, *The Peculiar Institution* (New York: Vintage Books, 1956), 11.

[25] Other Southern states soon followed suit and the idea spread rapidly.

[26] Christian, 27-28.

[27] It is important to note that in 1712 slaves were not as numerous, nor were they as capable of fighting off disease. It was not often that a slave was even able to make it to a fourth offense let alone a third during this time due to high mortality rates.

Carolina. In fact, the earliest codes of the colony allowed a master to kill his slave if he saw fit. Slaveholders were able to push the limits of the codes for decades and escalated the maltreatment of slaves up until the mid-nineteenth century.[28] Ironically, it would be these same codes, which were initially created to keep slaves downtrodden and in fear, that would act as fuel to fire rebellions against the system.

A major reason why South Carolinians mistreated slaves was that black slaves outnumbered their white slave-owners in the state, which frightened the whites. To counteract their fears, slave-owners felt the need to establish control over their slaves. To do this, South Carolinian slaveholders used violence and punishment to keep slaves passive. For the most part this type of punishment worked, with the majority of slaves staying passive enough for slave-owners to maintain control. However, there were exceptions to this rule. These unexpected occurrences, when mistreatment of slaves did not turn out the way South Carolinians theorized it would, horrified them and drove them into a panic. Revolts and uprisings demonstrate this fear.

Slave rebellions in the United States were not commonplace within the nation, but there were enough that it concerned slave-owners.[29] Aptheker writes in his book, *American Negro Slave Revolts*, about more than 250 rebellions or uprisings that were similar to Nat Turner's Rebellion.[30] Rebellions directly

---

[28] Just because slave codes were enacted in the colony and state did not mean that slaveholders had to follow them by the letter. In the example of the slave codes concerning the searching of a slaves home, a slave-owner could very well kill his slave at the exact moment the owner found a weapon or stolen good. This was also a way that slave-owners were able to escalate maltreatment. Slaveholders could do whatever they wanted and constantly pushed the limits of the slave codes because they had no opposition, which made life endlessly more difficult for slaves.

[29] Rebellions refer to the traditional sense of armed possibly organized uprisings. Slaves also had their own little ways of rebellion that included doing things that would give them a break during work hours. For example, breaking a tool, working slow enough to not get whipped, constantly getting pregnant, faking illness, or any number of things. In slave testimonies there are examples of slave being able to get what they wanted because they acted insane around the master or mistress. However, these types of personal rebellions will not be elaborated on in this paper. Reading Harriet Jacobs' *Incidents in the Life of a Slave Girl,* William Wells Brown's *The Narrative of William Wells Brown*, or any other narrative concerning a slave's life will give further insight to personal slave rebellions.

[30] Aptheker, ix.

influenced the treatment of slaves because throughout American history the uprisings made slaveholders fearful. Aptheker proves this when he quotes an 1812 letter from a resident in Charleston, South Carolina that is conveying the person's fear of the uprising:

> Consider, I beseech you, that the coast of S. Carolina and Georgia is principally inhabited by a black population, which it is not to be denied, the whites are not able to controul[sic] … A regiment of militia has been sent us from the interior for our protection, but they have mutinied … tho'[sic] the mutiny is arrested for the moment, the spirit of it is by no means quelled.[31]

Aptheker also writes that in January 1961, an outstanding South Carolinian, James L. Petigru learned with anguish that his sister was unwilling to come home from the North because "she says she lives in fear of insurrection."[32] Aptheker continues to write that the wife of Senator James Chestnut Jr. of South Carolina felt the same way.[33] Slaveholders were outwardly stoic; no slave rebellion could usurp the system, but inwardly, they were fearful of the possible success of such a rebellion. Slave-owners resorted to punishment and fear to control their slaves and prevent uprisings. Slaveholders in South Carolina, as well as the South in general, believed that punishment would make slaves utterly afraid to rebel. This idea was especially unfounded as the punishments often made slaves wish to escape their condition even more, which led to more rebellions.

As more rebellions began to occur, slaveholders, especially in South Carolina, increased punishments for slaves. Aptheker shows this when he writes that in 1751 South Carolina passed a law that gave slaves the death penalty for attempting to poison a white person.[34] After rebellions, masters would be paranoid about another uprising occurring, and in response, would punish their slaves through harsher means than before the rebellion. For instance, after the Vesey Rebellion in South Carolina, slaveholders decided to punish their slaves severely for common misdeeds. Instead of receiving five or ten lashes for not working hard enough

---

[31] Ibid., 23.
[32] Ibid., 27.
[33] Ibid., 27.
[34] Ibid., 143.

the master increased that number to twenty or twenty-five. This increase in lashes was commonplace in South Carolina after rebellions so that slaves would be dissuaded from starting new rebellions.

Slaveholders in South Carolina also based their treatment of slaves on national quarrels between Southern and Northern states. The list of events and debates that drove the nation apart is vast and cannot possibly be covered in full, but there are a few key events that divided the nation and fueled South Carolinians to be fearful. Those events and debates were the Compromise of 1850, Bleeding Kansas, and the Presidential election of Abraham Lincoln.[35] The Compromise of 1850 was a major victory for the South in political terms. It allowed California to enter into the United States as a free state, opened up the territories of Utah and New Mexico to vote on slavery through popular sovereignty, and most importantly strengthened the Fugitive Slave Law of the country to force Northerners to help capture runaway slaves or suffer the consequence of jail.[36] In South Carolina, however, the Compromise of 1850 was not as great of a victory. South Carolinians may have been able to use the new Fugitive Slave Law to their advantage, but the outrage from Northerners, especially abolitionists, caused them to be fearful. South Carolinian slaveholders thought that if slaves heard about the outrage amongst Northern abolitionists that they might organize themselves and revolt against their masters.

The event in American history known as Bleeding Kansas also had the same type of impact but in a more direct way. When Kansas became a territory for Americans to settle, droves of abolitionists and pro-slavery settlers flooded into the land. The United States government decided that popular sovereignty would decide whether slavery was allowed in the state. This is when the situation turned from debate to outright violence.[37] Southern pro-slavery settlers and Northern abolitionist settlers started attacking

---

[35] These topics have extreme depth on their own and will not be covered in their entirety. It is important to note that while the major reason for Southern secession is because of slavery, state's rights also had a large part to do with it as well. To read further on these topics look to Kenneth Stampp's edition of *The Causes of the Civil War*, and James McPhearson's *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era*.

[36] Kenneth M Stampp, *The Causes of the Civil War* 3rd rev. ed. (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991), 117.

[37] Ibid., 27.

each other. Eventually, the Southern settlers convened for a fraudulent constitutional convention in which they decided that slavery would be allowed, however the federal government rejected the state constitution sent in by the fraudulent Southern convention. In South Carolina, this mini-Civil War stirred patriotism and panic. Again, in the minds of slaveholders, if slaves were to hear about whites fighting for the idea of black freedom, then the slaves would start to rise up as well.

The remaining event, the election of Abraham Lincoln, was the last event before South Carolina seceded from the Unites States. In the election process, before the votes were cast, South Carolina led most of the other Southern states in promising to secede if Lincoln became president. The reasoning behind this ultimatum was again driven by fear. Lincoln was a Republican and most Republicans at the time were abolitionists. South Carolinian slave-owners feared that the Republicans, if elected to power, would incite slaves in the South to revolt, while also attempting to abolish slavery altogether. All these events caused great fear among South Carolinians, which in turn caused slaveholders to punish their slaves in order to keep them submissive, to pass laws to limit slaves' rights on gathering, and make daily lives for slaves so daunting that they would have little to no time to think about rebelling.

Being a slave in South Carolina, a state that ferociously defended slavery during the mid-nineteenth century, was not an enviable position. Slaves were constantly under the watchful eyes of their masters, mistresses, or overseers if the master made enough money.[38] In South Carolina, most slaves worked in rice or cotton fields, but also performed various other jobs that their masters would require of them. A slave's quality of life depended on where the plantation was located as well as the type of crop the slave worked on.

Working conditions in South Carolina were abysmal for slaves. Joyner quotes an Englishman, William Wyndham Malet, who describes rice planting as, "…easy work: Begin at sunrise, breakfast at nine, dinner at three; by which time the task-work is usually finished."[39] Joyner counters this claim by describing the

---

[38] For future reference whenever the word "master" is referring to someone who has authority over slaves as well as the ability to punish slaves, which includes mistresses, overseers, and of course the master.

[39] Joyner, 44.

brutally difficult work of rice planting. Joyner uses the example of the groundbreaking task, which requires an able-bodied slave to break up 1,200 square feet of ground with a spade after a previous slave had plowed the ground.[40] Slaves did not have an easy work life as Malet describes. He assumes that slaves would get up at sunrise and have their work done by three o'clock in the afternoon leaving them with plenty of time to do as they please, as long as the master sees fit to allow it. This is theoretically true, but Sam Polite, a freed slave, says when describing the task system on cotton plantations:

> Every slave have task to do, sometime[sic] one task, sometime[sic] two, and sometime[sic] three. You have for work till[sic] task through. When cotton done make,[sic] you have other task. Have to cut cord of marsh grass maybe. Task of marsh been eight feet long and four feet high. Then, sometime[sic] you have to roll cord of mud in cowpen.[sic] Woman have to rake leaf from wood into cowpen[sic] .... If slave don't do task, they get licking with lash on naked back.[41]

Polite's quote further refutes Malet's idea that the task system allowed for easier work.[42] Polite makes the point that many times a slave was tasked with several different jobs, which could take all day to accomplish, and if those tasks were not completed then the slave would be punished. Another man, James R. Sparkman master of Mt. Arena, "said that tasks on his plantation were 'easily accomplished, during the winter months in 8 to 9 hours and in summer my people seldom exceed 10 hours labor *per day.*"[43] By a slaveholder's own admission, his slaves worked long hours throughout the entire year. Slaves did not get the luxury of time off and were overworked constantly. To a slaveholder slaves were not useful unless they were working, so they made sure slaves always had something laborious to do.

---

[40] Ibid., 44. (See 44-45 for further examples).

[41] Michael Trinkley, "South Carolina - African-Americans - Brutal Work Regimen" (SCIWAY - South Carolina's Information Highway - SC., accessed November 6, 2012, http://www.sciway.net/afam/slavery/work.html.

[42] The work Sam Polite describes is for cotton, which is different from rice, but the work system is still the same while the individual tasks are different.

[43] Joyner, 44.

Generally, in the South Carolina rice industry male slaves did most of the heavy lifting and difficult tasks.[44] Joyner specifies that only men did the "ditching, embarking, and other tasks that prepared the fields for rice cultivation."[45] One such task was the previously mentioned groundbreaking that was backbreaking work for the slaves. The slaves had to bend over all day and did not have any significant break time to relax or let their muscles rest. Furthermore, the spades the slaves used were heavy and difficult to use. Other tasks such as embarking or ditching involved shoveling and digging trenches five feet deep and as long as five feet wide. This work was not easy despite what Malet thought, and it exhausted slaves. Exhaustion is exactly what the masters wanted; as Joyner writes, "for their part the masters wanted more from their slaves than the grudging performance of only enough work to avoid being beaten."[46] This in turn would make it difficult for the male slaves to hunt, manage some sort of garden, or sell their labor to earn money. Along with wanting slaves to do as much work as possible, masters were fearful that if they did not exhaust their slaves physically and mentally with long workdays, they would start thinking of rebellion. In the master's mind, the slave who has time to think is dangerous and must be put to work or punished for not working because there is a chance that the slave could be thinking of ways to escape or start a revolt.

The slave-owner's fear also affected slaves' living conditions, which were often horrendous. Slave quarters had evolved from a one-room building; to maybe two rooms so that the master could separate males and females, and at the very least allow two families to live in one building. Ira Berlin states, when talking about slave quarters in the lower Mississippi valley, "… eighty-five slaves in all – living in two buildings no more than thirty-three feet in length."[47] Although this was not the universal configuration of slave quarters, it describes, in a very accurate sense, how little space slaves actually had in the quarters and how cramped it would have been. "Married" slaves would usually get to

---

[44] It was naturally common throughout the South to make male slaves do difficult or strenuous labor, but there were times when women did strenuous labor as well.

[45] Joyner, 45.

[46] Ibid., 50.

[47] Ira Berlin, *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America* (Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998), 87.

stay in their own house or at the very least be in the same barracks together.[48] Jacob Stroyer, a slave, describes the slave quarters on his plantation in Columbia, South Carolina, as being able to "contain two families."[49] This is a rather large improvement from the barracks described by Berlin, but in reality, the situation was still undesirable. Stroyer also explains that some of the cabins had walls while some did not. He says that families would have to put up old pieces of wood, or hang up old clothing to provide dividing lines.[50] The situation became more stressful if the two families did not trust each other or were in "disagreement" as Stroyer put it.[51] It would be as if a person lived with a hated neighbor, they would always be at each other's throats and would not be able to live a normal life in any semblance of the words.

Slaveholders allowed for such small living areas because they were inexpensive and the upkeep was not a tedious task for slaves. The almost claustrophobic area that slave families had to live in also served as a way to keep slaves occupied with trivial matters rather than thinking about rebelling or running away. With the families so close to each other tensions often ran high and masters who feared uprisings would use this to their advantage. For instance, a slaveholder might give one family warmer clothing than the other, in the same room, to purposely promote jealousy between the two families, who would then concentrate on quarreling with each other rather than rebelling against the master.

Most slaves wore ragged clothing and had barely enough food to survive. In general, masters purposefully under fed and clothed their slaves, as the lack of provisions both reduced the cost of maintenance, and perpetuated the idea that blacks were sub-human individuals who were undeserving of equality with the white man. The quantity and quality of clothing that a slave wore depended on what the slaveholder decided was permissible. This differed greatly throughout the South including within South

---

[48] Slaves were not allowed to be legally married in the South. They held their own ceremonies, had their own rituals, and sometimes even a minister would marry the couple, but no state would recognize the marriage legally. Also, the term "house" is used very loosely.

[49] Jacob Stroyer, *My Life in the South* enlarged edition (Salem, Mass: 1898), in "Excerpts from Slave Narratives - Chapter 14," (VGSkole: Startside for videregående undervisning og informasjon), accessed November 8, 2012, http://www.vgskole.net/prosjekt/slavrute/14.htm.

[50] Ibid.

[51] Ibid.

Carolina. Stroyer details that as a boy he had only an osnaburg, a single piece of woolen fabric sown together for slave children, to wear during the summer.[52] This lone piece of clothing symbolized the degradation Stroyer and other slaves were constantly subjected to. Joyner further supports the claim that quantity and quality depended on the master's decision. Joyner writes, "some planters purchased clothing for their slaves readymade, but most ordered woolen cloth from England and had clothing made on the plantation. Cloth was also woven on the large, generally self-sufficient rice   plantations"[53] Joyner also writes that "J. Motte Alston [a slave-owner] maintained that cotton was used only for summer wear; winter clothing was all wool, with no admixture of cotton."[54] Male slaves usually wore a shirt and trousers or overalls.[55] Joyner describes these shirts as ranging "from fine and coarse shirts described by Emily Weston [daughter of a slaveholder] to the 'weave shirt – die with blue indigo boil with myrtle seed' – that was worn by Rodrick Rutledge [a slave owner]."[56] Women mostly wore dresses.[57] Most slaves' clothing was largely inadequate for general conditions, let alone the strenuous amounts of work they had to perform. Cotton shirts, while more comfortable than the woolen shirts, were worn during the summer months only, when it became too hot to wear woolen shirts. The reason for this seasonal shift in clothing did not stem from benevolence on the part of the master, but rather, from a system of distribution intended to keep male slaves from heat exhaustion or death, as they worked in the fields during the grueling South Carolinian summer. In the same light, Joyner mentions that flannel underwear was distributed to slaves to wear during the winter to keep them from freezing.[58] Shoes were another provision that varied widely on the master's preferences. Dave White, a former slave, said in an interview with Samuel Addison for the Works Progress Administration, "I nebber[sic]

---

[52] Ibid.

[53] Joyner, 108.

[54] Ibid., 109.

[55] Ibid., 114. Joyner is clear that the majority of men wore trousers and shirts rather than wearing overalls with shirts.

[56] Ibid., 114.

[57] Joyner, 109.

[58] Ibid., 114. Female and child slaves were also given flannel underwear for the same reasoning.

know nothin'[sic] 'bout[sic] shoes."[59] Joyner points out that even though there were some slaves in White's position, others had shoes ordered for them by their masters. Joyner writes, "Ellen Godfrey recalled that her master sent to England to get slaves on his plantation good shoes. William Oliver said that the big plantations purchased shoes readymade."[60] Shoes were a big part of life, and vital during the winter months. If a slave did not have shoes during those cold, frosty months his feet would surely freeze off, or at the very least be so painful that they would be unable to walk. This would render the slave useless to the master and be counterproductive and unprofitable for the plantation.

The type and amount of food was also very important to a slave's living condition. In All Saints Parish, Joyner details that slaves had food rationed from their master on Saturday afternoons, which were expected to last until the next Saturday.[61] Joyner explains that most slaves were allowed to raise their own animals and grow their own gardens to supplement the rationed food, and that if a slave ran out of food; he had to steal or go without food until the next Saturday.[62] The master of the plantation determined the type and quantity of food their slaves received similarly, to how they made decisions about clothing. For example, Joyner explains that James R. Sparkman [slave owner] gave out ten quarts of meal, eight quarts of rice or peas, one bushel of sweet potatoes per week, while John D. Magill [slave owner] gave his slave families, "…a peck of sweet potatoes, a dozen salted fish."[63] These foods were not the only things the masters would give their slaves, but it was their basic diet, aside from vegetables or animals grown to supplement them.[64] As rations were typically minimal, slaves

---

[59] Dave White, "Ex-slave 91 years old, Congaree, South Carolina. There was no God but Mossa an' Missus." Federal Writers' Project, South Carolina Narratives, Volume XIV, Part 4, Project 935, accessed November 1, 2012, http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=mesn&fileName=144/mesn144.db&recNum=194&itemLink=D?mesnbib:2:./temp/~ammem_i5fO

[60] Joyner ,114.

[61] Ibid., 91.

[62] Ibid., 91.

[63] Ibid., 91.

[64] Masters all around South Carolina gave their slaves different foods to eat. Some gave the slaves rice daily while other would give differing types of meat. Seafood was very popular amongst the slave population of South Carolina. For more information on the diversity of food look in Joyner's *Down by the Riverside* in chapter three "Sit at the Welcome Table."

had to be frugal in their consumption of food. For parents, this could lead to skipping meals in order to allow their children to eat. Certainly, this was a large sacrifice for slave parents because of the energy consuming tasks forced upon them each day. Furthermore, the ways in which slaves ate their food was unsanitary. Most slave quarters did not have a table, nor was there room for one. White says, "Ma[sic] would den turn[sic] mush[sic] an'[sic] clean a place on de[sic] floor, she make a paddle[sic] an'[sic] we eat off de[sic] floor."[65] Eating on a dirty floor greatly increased the risk of food contamination, which could make slaves sick, which in turn could threaten the health of all slaves on the plantation involved. By modern sanitation standards, cleaning a place on the floor to eat would be considered a safety hazard, but for slaves it was a common part of life.

Everyday interactions between slaves and their owners depended immensely on how temperamental their master was, as well as the amount of interaction the slave had with each member of the master's family or hired laborers. An example of this comes from Govan Littlejohn of South Carolina who said of his master, Captain Sam Littlejohn, "Marse[sic] was a good man and he love his darkies[sic]."[66] Govan also says earlier in the document, "Capt. Sam Littlejohn whipped Miss Sallie H's[sic] slave. His name was Amus H. Cap'[sic] tied him to a tree."[67] Govan demonstrates clearly how the temperament of the master determined how a slave would be treated, or in this case punished. In Govan's case, his master was probably angry or upset with the slaves he punished, but Govan seemed to believe that despite those two instances his master was still a good man and a good master. Therefore, slaves usually had to face the wrath of their masters if they had a difficult day or were upset about something. Slaves were much more likely to have a peaceful and less painful day, when their master was also in a pleasant mood.

Despite the impact temperament had on the conditions and treatment of slaves, there were also other factors: such as how the masters felt racially about their slaves.[68] To most South Carolinian

---

[65] White, "Ex-slave 91 years old" 1.
[66] Littlejohn Govan, "Stories from Ex-Slaves" (1937) Federal Writers' Project Dist. 4, WPA Project 1885-1, accessed November 1, 2012, http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?mesnbib:5:./temp/~ammem_dxks::
[67] Ibid.
[68] This is in the context of racial superiority.

slaveholders it did not matter if they were joyful, angry, upset, etc., they treated their slaves horribly because they considered blacks as second-rate humans who were undeserving of the same respect whites received.[69] Also, there were many people who had no reason, wherewithal, or purpose to own slaves, who ended up with many in their possession. Stampp writes, "bondsmen were owned by persons of unsound minds, such as the South Carolinian who had his chattels 'throw dirt upon [his] roof […] to drive off witches.' They were owned by a woman 'unable to read or write, […] scarcely able to count ten,' legally incompetent to contract marriage."[70] Anyone could own a slave if he or she had enough money to buy one, or if the person had a slave willed to him or her through a relative. These two cases suggest that some slave owners were not mentally sound to care for another person's life, let alone control it. Stampp goes on to list more instances of mentally unstable people owning slaves and even "normal" slaveholders who were corrupted by the power they possessed.[71] An example of such an owner is a South Carolinian who put his slave in solitary confinement in the local jail for running away from the plantation.[72] Slaves lived in perpetual fear of these types of slaveholders. Slaves received punishment for minor things such as working too slow or digging a trench an inch too deep. These corrupt masters made punishment a sport of sorts and loved to use the whip on slaves. These types of owners helped perpetuate the perception that slavery in South Carolina was much worse than the rest of the South.

Punishment of slaves in South Carolina was generally more brutal than the rest of the antebellum South; however, the methods used to carry out these punishments were generally the same. Punishments for slaves could be the result for a variety of reasons: the master was upset for any rational or irrational reason, the slave did a task wrong, the slave was 'uppity' with the master, the slave ran away and was recaptured, or limitless other reasons.[73] Stroyer confirms this when he says,

---

[69] The same sentiment is seen in the Northern States, despite the huge pushes for abolition.
[70] Stampp, 182.
[71] Ibid., 182. "Normal" in the sense that they were not mentally unstable.
[72] Ibid., 173.
[73] "Uppity" is a term generally used by slaveholders to describe slaves rebelling against the institution of slavery or the slaveholder.

> One day, about two weeks after Boney young [the white man who trained horses for Col. Singleton] and mother had the conflict, he called me to him....When I got to him he said, "Go and bring me the switch, sir." I answered, "yes, sir," and off I went and brought him one...[and] he gave me a first- class flogging....[74]

He continues saying, "I said to father, "But I don't know what I have done that he should whip me; he does not tell me what wrong I have done, he simply calls me to him and whips me when he gets ready."[75] Whippings and floggings were the most common form of punishment in South Carolina, but slaveholders employed other methods as well. Owners would use harsher punishments depending on the severity of the misdeed or perceived misdeed. For example, a slave who did not collect his or her quota of rice or cotton might get twenty-five lashes, while a slave who ran away might get 100 lashes; a full iron ball chained to him, and placed in solitary confinement. In other situations, the punishment did not fit the misdeed at all. For instance, if a slave did not collect his or her quota of rice or cotton for the day; he or she might get anywhere from fifty to one hundred lashes depending on how the master felt that day. The master ultimately decided how harsh the punishments would be and handed those rules down to his subordinates or carried them out himself. Stampp confirms the idea of masters controlling the punishment of their slaves and while matching the punishment to the misdeed by writing:

> The majority seemed to think that the certainty, and not the severity, of physical 'correction' was what made it effective. While no offense could go unpunished, the number of lashes should be in proportion to the nature of the offense and the character of the offender. The master should control his temper. "Never inflict punishment when in a passion," advised a Louisiana slaveholder, "but wait until perfectly cool, and until it can be done rather in

---

[74] Jacob Stroyer, *My Life in the South.* enlarged edition; Salem, Mass., 1898 in "Excerpts from Slave Narratives - Chapter 15." VGSkole: Startside for videregående undervisning og informasjon (21.08.12). http://www.vgskole.net/prosjekt/slavrute/14.htm (accessed November 8, 2012).
[75] Ibid.

sorrow than in anger." Planters who employed overseers often fixed the number of stripes they could inflict for each specific offense, or a maximum number of whatever the offense.[76]

Stampp goes on to explain many other examples of masters setting limits and boundaries when it came to punishments.[77] The masters felt that the reasoning for not whipping or flogging in anger was because the punishment would be much more brutal than if the master was calm and collected. If a master would lash out in anger at the slave, then the punishment would not fit the action or behavior. Therefore the master would wait to calm down before punishing his slave. The master would wait to be fairer to the slave and make it seem as if the master did not enjoy the flogging.

South Carolinian slaveholders made a name for themselves through their brutality against slaves. Charles Ball writes in his narrative:

> From my earliest recollections, the name of South Carolina had been little less terrible to me than that of the bottomless pit. In Maryland, it had always been the practice of masters and mistresses, who wished to terrify their slaves, to threaten to sell them to South Carolina; where, it was represented, that their condition would be a hundred fold worse than it was in Maryland. I had regarded such a sale of myself, as the greatest of evils that could befall me...[78]

Slaves felt that being sent to South Carolina was one of the worst things that could happen in life.[79] The main way that slaves discovered how poor the treatment was in South Carolina, was by simple word of mouth. Slaves from the Palmetto State who were sold or taken to other states would share their stories about how horrible and brutal treatment was in South Carolina. Another

---

[76] Ibid., 175.

[77] Ibid., 175-176.

[78] "Charles Ball, 'Slavery in the United States: A Narratives of the Life and Adventures of Charles Ball, a Black Man ...'", n.d. http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/ballslavery/ball.html., 68

[79] Being "sold down the river" to one of the Deep South states such as Alabama, Mississippi, or Louisiana was also considered to be one of the worst events of a slave's life, but that will not be covered. *Solomon Northup's Odyssey* is a television movie that details the trauma of being sold to the Deep South.

confirmation of this sentiment comes from South Carolina's own judicial system, which did not agree with the way owners in the state treated their slaves. Stampp writes, "as a South Carolina judge sadly confessed, there were 'men and women on earth who deserved no other name than *fiends*,' for they seemed to delight in brutality."[80] Slaves in South Carolina encountered slaveholders that were different from slaveholders from other states with many taking it to heart to punish slaves heartily for their misdeeds.

Conclusion

In conclusion, fear caused slave-owners in South Carolina to mistreat their slaves. When slavery was first implemented in colonial America, colonial governments would draft laws to govern the treatment of slaves, known as Slave Codes. These codes, for the most part, were not enforced because it was impractical for colonial policing forces to do so. It was neither cost effective nor efficient for these units to travel to the different plantations to enforce laws that protected people who were considered sub-human. The codes also did not call for the better treatment of slaves, particularly in South Carolina. They did however allow owners to push the negative treatment of slaves over the limits of these laws and the mistreatment of slaves started down a slippery slope. For South Carolina, another reason for the persistent declining condition of slaves is the fact that they outnumbered the white populations. Masters felt the need to constantly remind their slaves of who was in control and used violent punishment to do so. Being outnumbered would lead South Carolinian slaveholders to treat their slaves worse and tighten laws governing slaves whenever an uprising broke out. National tensions also played a role in creating fear in the minds of South Carolinians. They feared that if slaves discovered the North wanted slavery abolished; they would rise up and destroy the South.

The constant maltreatment of slaves was evident in South Carolinian society. With harsher working conditions slaves had to work increasingly longer days, sometimes up to fifteen hours a day. The work done was difficult; it consisted of shoveling or picking, both of which forced slaves to bend over all day with little to no breaks. The mistreatment was also evident in the living

---

[80] Stampp, 181.

quarters, which became smaller and more cramped as time went on. Clothing, because of its poor creation, symbolized the status of slaves, showing that they were below the master, while food was also used to control slaves and was a form of maltreatment through its poor quality and low quantity. These factors were all heavily controlled by slaveholders, who feared their slaves would rise up and revolt. South Carolinian's believed that slaves would be pacified if maltreatment like this took place. Physical punishment was also seen as a way to pacify slaves and masters punished slaves for any number of reasons. Usually, the punishment fit the misdeed, but this was not always the case. South Carolinian slaveholders felt that making the slaves fear punishment would alleviate the fear that slaveholders had of resistance. Ultimately, white South Carolinian fear caused the slave-owning population of the Palmetto State to mistreat their slaves continually, which by the 1850's, in the prelude of secession, had become increasingly worse.

Bibliography

Aptheker, Herbert. *American Negro Slave Revolts*. 1943. Reprint. New York: International Publishers, 1963.

Ball, Charles. "Slavery in the United States: A Narratives of the Life and Adventures of Charles Ball, a Black Man..." n.d. Accessed November 12, 2012. http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/ballslavery/ball.html.

Berlin, Ira. *Generations of Captivity: A History of African-American Slaves*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2003.

Berlin, Ira. *Many Thousands Gone: The First Two Centuries of Slavery in North America*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1998.

Brown, William Wells. *Narrative of William W. Brown, a Fugitive Slave.* Boston: Anti-Slavery Office, 1847.

Christian, Charles M., and Bennet, Sari, *Black Saga: The African American Experience: A Chronology*. Basic Civitas Books, 1998.

Dave White. "Ex-slave 91 years old, Congaree, South Carolina. There was no God but Mossa an' Missus." Federal Writers' Project, South Carolina Narratives, Volume XIV, Part 4, Project 935. Accessed November 1, 2012. http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/ampage?collId=mesn&fileName=144/mesn144.db&recNum=194&itemLink=D?mesnbib:2:./temp/~ammem_i5fO::

Elkins, Stanley. "Slavery in Capitalist and Non-Capitalist Cultures" in *Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life.* 3rd ed. , 52-80. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1976.

George Moses Horton. "Life of George M. Horton. The Colored Bard of North Carolina from 'The Poetical Works of George M. Horton, the Colored Bard of North Carolina, to Which Is Prefixed the Life of the Author, Written by Himself.'" n.d. Accessed November 12, 2012. http://docsouth.unc.edu/fpn/hortonlife/horton.html.

Govan Littlejohn. "Stories from Ex-Slaves" (1937) Federal Writers' Project Dist. 4, WPA Project 1885-1. Accessed November 1, 2012. http://memory.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/D?mesnbib:5:./temp/~ammem_dxks::

Greene, Jack P. "Colonial South Carolina and the Caribbean Connection." *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 88, No. 4 (October 1987): 192–210.

Hall, D. D. ed. "A Yankee Tutor in the Old South." *New England Quarterly* 33, No. 1 (March 1960): 82–91.

Henry, Howell Meadoes. *The Police Control of the Slave in South Carolina*. Vanderbilt University, 1914.

Horton, James. Interview with Gwen Ifill. *PBS Newshour*. Public Brocasting Station, PBS. January 25, 2007.

Hurd, John C. *The Law of Freedom and Bondage in the United States*. Boston: 1858-6, I, in Stampp, Kenneth. *The Peculiar Institution*. New York: Vintage Books, 1956.

"John Andrew Jackson. The Experience of a Slave in South Carolina." n.d. Accessed November 27, 2012. http://docsouth.unc.edu/fpn/jackson/jackson.html.

Joyner, Charles W. *Down by the Riverside: a South Carolina Slave Community*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984.

Jr, Larry E. Hudson. *To Have and to Hold: Slave Work and Family Life in Antebellum South Carolina*. University of Georgia Press, 1997.

Ladd, Corina Ruth. "The Politics of Slavery in the Era of Abolition: A Comparison of Martinique and South Carolina", 1998.

Littlefield, Daniel C. "Continuity and Change in Slave Culture: South Carolina and the West Indies." *Southern Studies: An Interdisciplinary Journal of the South* 25, No. 3 (July 1986): 202–216.

"Octavia V. Rogers Albert (Octavia Victoria Rogers), 1853-1889? The House of Bondage, or, Charlotte Brooks and Other Slaves, Original and Life Like, As They Appeared in Their Old Plantation and City Slave Life; Together with Pen-Pictures of the Peculiar Institution, with Sights and Insights into Their New Relations as Freedmen, Freemen, and Citizens.", n.d. Accessed December 1, 2012. http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/albert/albert.html.

Phillips, Ulrich Bonnell. "Plantation Management," in *American Negro Slavery; a Survey of the Supply, Employment and Control of Negro Labor as Determined by the Plantation Régime*. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1918.

"Peter Neilson. 1795-1861. The Life and Adventures of Zamba, an African Negro King; and His Experience of Slavery in South Carolina. Written by Himself. Corrected and Arranged by Peter Neilson." n.d. Accessed November 12, 2012. http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/neilson/neilson.html.

Powers Jr., Bernard E. "'The Worst of All Barbarism': Racial Anxiety and the Approach of Secession in the Palmetto State." *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 112, No. 3/4 (October 2011): 139–156.

Rice and Slaves: Ethnicity and the Slave Trade in Colonial South Carolina. University of Illinois Press, 1991.

Smith, Miles. "American Mediterranean: Southern Slaveholders in the Age of Emancipation." *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 112, No. 1/2. (April 2011): 99–101.

Stampp, Kenneth M. *The Causes of the Civil War*. 3rd rev. ed. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1991.

Stampp, Kenneth. "To Make Them Stand in Fear" in *The Peculiar Institution*, 141-191. New York: Vintage Books, 1956.

Staudenraus, P. J. "Victims of African Slave Trade; A Document." *Journal of Negro History* 41, No. 2 (March 1956): 148–151.

Stroyer, Jacob. *My Life in the South.* enlarged edition; Salem, Mass., 1898 in "Excerpts from Slave Narratives - Chapter 14." VGSkole: Startside for videregående undervisning og informasjon. Accessed November 8, 2012. http://www.vgskole.net/prosjekt/slavrute/14.htm.

Thornton, John K. "African Dimensions Of The Stono Rebellion." *American Historical Review* 96, No. 4 (October 1991): 1101.

"Tom Jones. Experience and Personal Narrative of Uncle Tom Jones; Who Was for Forty Years a Slave. Also the Surprising Adventures of Wild Tom, of the Island Retreat, a Fugitive Negro from South Carolina", n.d. Accessed November 10, 2012. http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/jonestom/jones.html.

Trinkley, Michael. "South Carolina - African-Americans - Brutal Work Regimen." SCIWAY - South Carolina's Information Highway - SC. Accessed November 6, 2012. http://www.sciway.net/afam/slavery/work.html.

Weiner, Marli F. *Mistresses and Slaves: Plantation Women in South Carolina, 1830-80*. University of Illinois Press, 1997.

Wilkins, Joe. "Window on Freedom: South Carolina's Response to British West Indian Slave Emancipation, 1833-1834." *South Carolina Historical Magazine* 85, No. 2 (April 1984): 135–144.

"William G. Hawkins (William George), 1823-1909, Rev. Lunsford Lane; or, Another Helper from North Carolina." n.d. Accessed November 12, 2012. http://docsouth.unc.edu/neh/hawkins/hawkins.html.

Author Bio

Samuel Benke was raised in Highland, California. He attended school in Redlands and graduated from Redlands East Valley High School. Samuel went to Crafton Hills College prior to attending CSUSB, where he graduated 2012. During his time in school, Samuel developed a love for two things (aside from his fiancé): Basketball and History. Samuel played basketball most of his life including some time with the Glendale Community College team before injuries prevented him from playing. Samuel was invited to join the coaching staff at his Alma Mater, REV, where he is now Head Coach of the Freshman Boys Basketball team. History, particularly American history, became one of Samuel's passions when he learned of who his ancestors were and what roles they played. Mainly: Thomas Sumter, Thomas "Stonewall" Jackson, and his Great Grandpa Cherry, who fought in World War II, influenced young Samuel, and led him to the path he is on now. Samuel plans to continue his education at California State University Fullerton, where he will pursue a Master's Degree in History. He hopes to eventually teach at a two-year college. Samuel would like to thank his fiancé, Katie, his parents, Steve and Sally, and the rest of his family and friends for their continued support throughout his life, as well as God for the opportunities that He has opened. Samuel would also like to thank the reader for taking the time to read this article and hopes it was as enjoyable to read as it was to research.