

HENRY C. CAREY'S MEMPHIS LETTERS

EDITED BY
STEPHEN MEARDON*

In five letters to the Daily Enquirer of Memphis, Tennessee, published on March 31 and April 7, 10, 13, and 20, 1860, the Philadelphia political economist and protectionist doctrinaire Henry C. Carey offered a revision of his doctrine in hope of saving the Union. The following transcript of the letters is provided as an online appendix to accompany the editor's analysis of them in "Henry C. Carey's 'Zone Theory' and American Sectional Conflict" (Journal of the History of Economic Thought 37 (2), June 2015).

Saturday Morning, March 31, 1860.

Letter from Henry C. Carey, Esq.

The Enquirer is read alike by free traders and protectionists. Of the advocates of the latter system, including Colbert and Adam Smith, Mr. Carey, both in Europe and this country, stands pre-eminent. It is therefore a pleasure to introduce to our readers so able an essayist, leaving them to draw their conclusions from his arguments. [italics mine]

* Department of Economics, Bowdoin College, Brunswick, Maine: smeardon@bowdoin.edu. I thank Guy Saldanha and Jamie Jones at the Bowdoin College Library for helping to obtain copies of Carey's Memphis Letters from the historical newspaper holdings of the Library of Congress; and John Pollock and Lynne Farrington at University of Pennsylvania Rare Book and Manuscript Room for doing the same from volume 15 of Carey's *Works* at the University of Pennsylvania's "Carey Library." I also thank Noah Finberg, the assistant to the editor of JHET, for his assistance in research and copyediting.

To the Editors of the Memphis Enquirer:

GENTLEMEN.—You ask me to explain to your readers something of the working of our present free trade system, in its effects upon the relations of the various portions of the Union; and, more particularly upon the real and permanent interests of the Southern States. To do this as it should be done, would require more time than I could conveniently give to it; but, being well disposed to comply with your request, I here give you a letter on the causes of the sectional discord that has now become so nearly universal, and that must result in dissolution of the Union, unless a remedy can be applied; doing this in the hope that it may tend toward awaking your many readers to a knowledge of the great fact, that the real interests of all the States are to be promoted by a return to that protective policy which was so early advocated by Mr. Calhoun, and so long supported by Henry Clay.

Thirty years since, South Carolina, prompted by a determination to resist the execution of laws that were in full accordance with both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution, first moved a dissolution of the Union. Failing to find a second, she stood alone. Since then, all has greatly changed. Now, each successive day brings with it from the South not only threats but measures of disunion, each in its turn finding more persons in the centre and the North anxious for the maintenance of the Union, yet disposed towards acquiescence in the decision of their Southern brethren, whatever that may prove to be. This is a great change to have been effected in so brief a period, and sad as it is great. To what may it be attributed, and how may the remedy be applied?

Before answering this latter question, let us inquire into the causes of the disease—for that purpose looking for a moment into the records of our past. The men who made the Revolution did so, because they were tired of a system the essence of which was found in Lord Chatham's declaration, that the colonists should not be permitted to make for themselves "even so much as a single hobnail." They were sensible of the exhaustive character of a policy that compelled them to make all their exchanges in a single market—thereby enriching their foreign masters, while ruining themselves. Against this system they needed protection, and therefore did they make the

Revolution—seeking political independence as a means of obtaining industrial and commercial independence. To render that protection really effective, they formed a more perfect union, whose first Congress gave us, as its first law, an act for the protection of manufactures. Washington and his secretaries, Hamilton and Jefferson, approved this course of action, and in so doing were followed by all of Washington's successors, down to General Jackson. For half a century, from 1783 to 1833, such was the general tendency of our commercial policy, and therefore was it that, notwithstanding the plunder of our merchants under British orders in council and French decrees, and notwithstanding interferences with commerce by embargo and non-intercourse laws, there occurred in that long period, in time of peace, no single financial revulsion, involving suspension by our banks, or stoppage of payment by the government. In all that period there was, consequently, a general tendency toward harmony between the North and the South, in reference to the vexed question of slavery, and had the then existing commercial policy been maintained, the years that since have passed would have been marked by daily growth of harmony, and of confidence in the utility and permanence of our Union.

Such, unhappily, was not to be the case. Even at that moment South Carolina was preparing to assume that entire control of our commercial policy, which, with the exception of a single Presidential term, she has since maintained—thereby forcing the Union back to that colonial system, emancipation from which had been the primary object of the men who made the Revolution. With that exception her reign has now endured for more than five and twenty years, a period marked by constantly-recurring financial convulsions, attended by suspensions of our banks, bankruptcies of individuals and of the government, and growing discord among the States.

What, you will probably ask, is the connection between financial revulsion and sectional discord? Go with me, my dear sir, for a moment, into the poor dwelling of one of our unemployed workmen, and I will show you.—The day is cold, and so is his stove. His wife and children are poorly clothed. His bed has been pawned for money with which to obtain food for his starving family. He himself has for months been idle, the shop in which he had been used to work having been closed, and its owner ruined. Ask him why is this, and he will tell you to look to our auction-stores and our shops, gorged with the products of foreign labor, while our own laborers perish in the absence of

employment that will give them food. Ask him what is the remedy for this, and, if he is old enough to remember the admirable effects of the tariff of 1842, he will tell you that there can be none, so long as southern commercial policy shall continue to carry poverty, destitution, and death, into the homes of those who must sell their labor if they would live.—That man has, perhaps, already conceived some idea of the existence of an “irrepressible conflict” between free and slave labor. A year hence, he may be driven by poverty into abolitionism.

The picture here presented is no fancy sketch. It is drawn from life. This man is the type of hundreds of thousands, I might say millions, of persons of various conditions of life, who have been ruined in the repeated financial crises of the five-and-twenty years of British free trade domination. Follow those men on their weary way to the West, embittered as they are by the knowledge that it is to southern policy it is due that they are compelled to separate themselves from homes and friend and perhaps from wives and children. See them, on their arrival there, paying treble and quadruple prices for the land they need, to the greedy speculator who finds his riches[t] harvest in free trade times. Mark them, next, contracting for the payment of four and even five per cent per month, for the little money they need, knowing, as they do, that we are exporting almost millions of gold per week, to pay to foreigners for services that they would gladly have performed. Watch them as they give for little more than a single yard of cotton cloth, a bushel of corn, that under a different policy would give them almost a dozen yards. Trace them onward, until you find their little properties passing into the hands of the sheriff, they themselves being forced to seek new homes in lands that are even yet more distant. Reflect, I pray you, upon these facts, and you will find in them, my dear sir, the reasons why the soil of Kansas has been stained by the blood of men who, under other legislation, would have been found acting together for the promotion of the general good.

Mr. Calhoun sowed the seeds of sectionalism, abolitionism, and disunion, on the day on which he planted his free trade tree. Well watered and carefully tended all have thriven, and all are now yielding fruit—in exhaustion of the soil of the older States, and consequent thirst for the acquisition of distant territory, in Kansas murders and Harper's Ferry riots; in civil and foreign wars. It is the same fruit that has been produced in Ireland, India, and all other countries that are subjected to the British system. Desiring

that the fruit may wither, you must lay the axe to the root of the tree. That done, the noxious plants that have flourished in its shade will quickly decay and disappear.

We are told, however, that the interests of the South are to be promoted by the maintenance of the system under which Ireland and India have been ruined, and which it is the fashion of the day to term free trade. Was that the opinion of Washington, Jefferson, Madison, or Jackson? Is it even now the opinion of the most intelligent of your Southern men? Are not Kentucky and Tennessee, Virginia and North Carolina, Alabama and Missouri, rich in fuel and iron ore, and all the other materials required for the production of a varied industry? Did not the domestic consumption of cotton increase nearly twice more rapidly than the population under the tariff of 1842? Had it continued to increase as it then was doing, would it not now absorb a million and a half of bales—diminishing by many hundreds of thousands the quantity for which we need a foreign market? Under such circumstances would not our planters obtain more for two and a half million of bales than they now do for three and a half millions? Rely upon it, my dear sir, there is no discord in the real and permanent interests of the various sections of the Union. There, all is perfect harmony, and what we now most need is the recognition by our Southern brethren, of the existence of that great and important fact. In that direction, and that alone, may be found the remedy for our great disease.

Looking for it there, the effect will soon exhibit itself in this development of the vast natural resources of every section of the country—in the utilization of the great water-powers of both South and North—and in the increase of that internal commerce to which, alone, we can look for extrication from the difficulties in which we are now involved. Let our policy be such as to produce development of that commerce, and villages will become tied to villages, cities to cities, States to States, and zones to zones, by silken threads scarcely visible to the eye, yet strong enough to bid defiance to every effort that may be made to break them. British policy sought to prevent the creation of such threads—British politicians having seen that by crossing and recrossing each other, and tying together the Puritan of the north, Quaker, the German, and the Irishman of the center, and the Episcopalian of the south, they would give unity and strength to the great whole that would be thus produced. Such, too, is the tendency of our present policy, our whole energies having been, and being now, given to the creation of nearly parallel lines

of communication—roads and canals passing from west to east through New York and Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, and Carolina—always at war with each other, and never touching until they reach the commercial capital of the British islands. In that direction lie pauperism, sectionalism, weakness, and final ruin of our system. Desiring that the Union may be maintained we must seek again the road so plainly indicated to us by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Jackson, the greatest men the South has yet produced.

In common with Franklin and Adams, Hancock and Hamilton, those men clearly saw that it was to the industrial element we were to look for that cement by which our people and our States were to be held together. Forgetting all the lessons they had taught, we have now so long been following in the direction indicated by our British free trade *friends*—by those who now see, as was seen before the Revolution, in the dispersion of our people the means of maintaining colonial vassalage—that already are they congratulating themselves upon the approaching dissolution of the Union, and the entire re-establishment of British influence over this northern portion of the contine[n]t. For proof of this, permit me to refer you to the following extracts from the Morning Post, now the recognised organ of the Palmerstonian government:

“If the Northern States should separate from the Southern on the question of slavery—one which now so fiercely agitates the public mind in America—that portion of the Grand Trunk Railway which traverses Maine, might at any day be closed against England, unless indeed, the people of the State, with an eye to commercial profit, should offer to annex themselves to Canada. On military, as well as commercial grounds, it is obviously necessary that British North America should possess on the Atlantic a port open at all times of the year—a port which, whilst the terminus of that railway communication which is destined to do so much for the development and consolidation of the wealth and prosperity of British North America, will make England equally in peace and war independent of the United States. We trust that the question of confederation will be speedily forced upon the attention of her Majesty’s Ministers. The present time is the most propitious for its discussion. . . . If slavery is to be the Nemesis of Republican America—if separation is to take place—the confederated States of British America, then a strong and compact nation, would virtually hold the balance of power on

the continent, *and lead to the restoration of that influence which, more than eighty years ago, England was supposed to have lost.* This object, with the uncertain future of the Republican institutions in the United States before us, is a subject worthy of the early and earnest consideration of the Parliament and people of the mother country.”

Shall these anticipations be realised? That they must be so, unless our commercial policy shall be changed, is as certain as that the light of day will follow the darkness of the night. Look where we may, discord and decay march hand in hand with the British free trade system—harmony, wealth and strength, on the contrary, growing in all those countries by which that system is resisted. Such having been, and being now, the case, are not those who now advocate the Carolinian policy among ourselves, doing all that lies in their power toward undoing the work that was done by the men of '76.

Yours, very respectfully,

HENRY C. CAREY.

PHILADELPHIA, March 21, 1860.

Saturday Morning, April 7, 1860.

Second Letter from Henry C. Carey, Esq.

Philadelphia, March 25, 1860

To the Editors of the Memphis Enquirer:

GENTLEMEN: In my former letter it was shown how the Carolinian free trade policy has given rise to, and steadily fostered the anti-slavery feeling of the North, thereby producing Kansas murders and Harper's Ferry riots. Continuing further the examination of that policy in its effects upon Southern interests, I propose to show that to it, alone, is due that Southern weakness which now manifests itself in denunciations of the North; in threats of secession not intended to be carried out; and in wordy resolutions in reference to direct trade—adopted at a time when the power to establish such trade declines with each successive year. Preparatory thereto, however, allow me to ask the attention of your readers to the fact, that we have in this great Union several distinct and well-defined nationalities, consequent upon the existence of a very simple law, which governs the movements of men who, by the process of peaceful emigration, are seeking the means of improving the condition of their families and themselves. Look where we may, we see that such persons are disposed to seek those places at which the temperature most resembles the one to which they have been accustomed; the Highlander going to Canada, and the Irishman coming to our Middle States, leaving to the Spaniard and the Portuguese the more sunny lands of the South. Looking homeward, we find this law to have been in constant operation—the people of New England having overrun New York north of the Highlands, the northern edge of Pennsylvania, the northern third or fourth of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and Iowa, and the whole of the three North-western States; New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware and Maryland having, meanwhile, colonized the whole center, and much of the south of the four Western States and being likely soon to occupy the larger portion of those which are so soon to enter the Union as Kansas and Nebraska.

To Virginia and North Carolina have fallen the territories which are now Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri, the northern portion of Arkansas, and the southern portion of Indiana and other western States; South Carolina and Georgia having,

meanwhile, occupied Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and most of Texas and Arkansas. As a consequence of this, it is, that we find the Union divided into four great powers, whose white population, as given by the last census, may thus be stated:

Northern	8,000,000
Northern Central	5,700,000
Southern Central	4,000,000
Southern	2,300,000
<hr/>	
Total	20,000,000

The Southern line of these grand divisions is to be found in a prolongation westward of a point, obtained by taking the southernmost extremity of the Carolinas—say about $41\frac{1}{4}^{\circ}$ of North Carolina. For the Southern line of the North Central we may take the 39th parallel, and for that of the South Central, the 35th, leaving all south of this line for the fourth of the grand divisions above referred to.

The accuracy of the view thus presented by myself a few months since, and its close connection with our political divisions, have been since so fully demonstrated, in an article published in “*The Press*,” of this city, that I am tempted to request you to lay before your readers the following extract, believing that it can scarcely fail to interest them:¹

“In Michigan, the whole number of immigrants was 257,006. Of these, there were born in the north zone:

New England, New York, (and British America, 14,008)	178,717
Born in north-central zone	33,103
Born in the south-central	1,564

¹ Carey draws the following lengthy excerpt from a newspaper article titled “Pennsylvania’s Position in the Union,” published anonymously in the *The Press* (Philadelphia, Penn.: John W. Forney), December 22, 1859 (vol. 3, no. 122). The excerpt is reproduced here in small font in order to better distinguish its place within Carey’s letter. As published in the *Daily Enquirer*, the excerpt has the same font as the rest of the letter and is distinguishable only by the quotation marks at the beginning and end.

Born in the south zone	401
Born in EuropeI;.....	39,023

Thus, of the inhabitants not born in the State, five-sevenths were from the north zone, including Canada; one-seventh from all the States south of the north zone, and one-seventh Europeans.

In Wisconsin there were 242,376 immigrants. Of these, 202,758, or five-sixths of the whole number, were born in the north zone and in Europe. In the north-central zone, 31,066, or a little less than one-sixth of the whole, and in all the more Southern States, only 4,413, or about one-fiftieth.

Passing from these two new States, which are high up in the north zone, to two which lie low in the south zone, we have the following facts from the census:

In Alabama, the whole number of immigrants	183,324
Born in the south zone	108,720 or 7-12
“ “ south-central	64,143 or 4-12
“ “ New England	1,861 or 1-60
“ “ all the other States	2,367
“ Foreigners	6,538
 In Mississippi, the whole number of immigrants	 155,793
Born in the south zone	83,242
“ “ south-central	62,465
“ “ New England	923
“ “ all the other States	3,482
“ Europeans	5,500

Here only one-thirty-fifth of the whole number of immigrants in Mississippi were born in the States north of 39 deg. north latitude.

From these instances, we think the truth of Mr. Carey's general proposition is well sustained. Emigration is ruled by climatic laws.—We proposed to exhibit the same law as it applies to the Western States which lie in the two middle zones, but must content ourselves now with stating that their statistics bear as closely upon the proposition under consideration as those of the States on the extreme North and South given above.

The emigration from Europe supports the theory well. Of those from England, Ireland and Scotland, only one in fourteen were found in the States lying south of 39 degrees

north latitude, northwest the south political zone, while of the Germans, one in seven are in that zone, as it is determined by the lines of latitude; but one half of these are in Texas and Missouri, and even here the climatic law most probably prevails, for while the isothermal or lines of equal temperature correspond very nearly with the parallels of latitude as far west as the Mississippi river, those which enter the Atlantic coast at the 40th and 35th degrees of north latitude deflect rapidly beyond the Mississippi southward, falling as low in middle Texas as the 35th and 30th. So that while a large portion of Missouri is in the north-central zone, as determined by geographical lines, a very large portion of the north and west of Texas is in the same zone, as determined by its mean annual temperature. If this point holds, as we suppose it must, then the German emigration is no exception. One-half of the number must be subtracted from the States of Texas and Missouri, and this will restore the average to one in fourteen of the foreign immigrants settled in the south zone.

It will be recollected by our readers that the isothermal lines in that part of Europe from which our emigrants come, lie about ten degrees farther north in Europe than they do in the Atlantic States of the Union. Great Britain and Prussia lie above the fiftieth degree, and all the rest of Germany above the forty-fifth of north latitude. Their emigrants to this country find their customary temperature above the thirty-fifth and fortieth parallels here, and accordingly the census reports thirteen out of fourteen of them residing in the States above these lines, or, more accurately, within the isothermal lines of their native countries. This fact obtains so accurately that the Danish and Norwegian immigrants, whose native countries are above the sixtieth parallel, are found in this country in our most northern regions. From Sweden there were 2,449 in the north zone; in the south only 436. From Norway there were in the north zone 11,705; in the south zone but 211, and 105 of these were in Texas. And while there were 147,711 from British America, only 1,067 of them were found south of the thirty-ninth parallel.

We are accustomed to speak of man as a cosmopolite, and perhaps too hastily conclude that he is so much less governed by climate than animals and plants are, that he is at once independent and regardless of temperature. But the statement evidently needs correction. The species is adapted to all climates, but the families and kindreds are governed by it in their migrations. This, to us, is a new and surprising result of this investigation. We are helped by it to understand the distinction of the African race among us. It is a question of geography much more than of institutions with all the races. In a new country like ours, where immigration has the power to determine the institutions, sentiments, and pursuits, avocations and opinions, natural temperament and civil policy go together, and this may be the reason why the controlling influence of climatic laws has not before exhibited itself to observation.

The next step in the theory we are considering is, that the emigrants from Europe, and especially from the Eastern States of the Union, carry with them the characteristics of the several regions from which they remove, and so give a similar complexion to their political creeds and industrial policies. We have laboriously examined the votes of the zones, as we have located them, in the last Presidential election, and we obtain the following results:

In those sixteen counties of Pennsylvania which lie, according to our division, above $41\frac{1}{4}$ degrees north latitude, and within the north political zone, Fremont had 39,916 votes, Fillmore, 1107 and Buchanan 24,908. Fremont's plurality over Buchanan, in these counties, which belong to the north, and, as we see, voted with it, was 15,008, or as 40 to 25. In the balance of the State, Buchanan's vote was 205,802, Fremont's 107,594, or nearly two to one.

In those sixteen counties of Ohio which lie north of the political line, Fremont had 39,488 votes, Buchanan, 22,042—a plurality of 17,446. Fremont's plurality in the whole State was but 16,623. Again, in the State election of last October, the whole Republican majority was 13,500, while in the Western Reserve—the counties which we give to the north zone—the majority of that party was 15,000, showing that, outside of these counties, the Democrats had 1500 majotity [sic].

In the nineteen counties of Illinois which lie above the line of the north central zone, Fremont had 41,847 votes; Buchanan had 16,122—plurality over Buchanan, 25,725. In the other counties, Buchanan's plurality over Fremont was 34,784. Not a county in Illinois, south of 40 degrees, gave Fremont a majority, and some of them, in the extreme south of the State, gave him no more than 2, 5 and 9 votes respectively; but these last lie all below the 39th parallel, and belong, therefore, bodily, to the south-central zone.

In the twelve counties of Indiana which are north of the line assumed, Fremont had 15,835 votes; Buchanan, 12,752; but in the whole State Buchanan's plurality over Fremont was 24,295.

Iowa gave Fremont a plurality of 7,784 votes, but in the counties lying south of the north zone, Buchanan's plurality over Fremont was above 4,000 votes.

Looking at the States and parts of States lying in the north zone, we find the following results: For every forty votes cast in them respectively for Fremont, Buchanan had in Vermont 11; in Massachusetts 15; in northern Illinois 16; in northern Ohio 22; in Maine 23; in northern Pennsylvania 25; in New York 28; in Michigan 29; in northern Indiana 32. These proportions, it strikes us, indicate the political sympathies of the people among whom they occur to be closely connected with their respective nativities; and we may here state that the rule holds as well of the people of the north central zone, where the institutions are very similar to those of their northern sister States, and yet their political biases are as distinct and

different as if they were separated from each other by some cause of quarrel or opposition of interests.”

Distinct and different as they undoubtedly are, those of the extreme North and extreme South are still more so; and yet, as I propose to show in another letter, the two have been generally found acting in concert with each other for the adoption of free trade measures, the inevitable effect of which must be, and augmentation of the power of the extreme North to control the destinies of the center and the South. Meanwhile I remain,

Yours very truly,

HENRY C. CAREY

Tuesday Morning, April 10, 1860.

Third Letter of Henry C. Carey, Esq.

Philadelphia, March 27, 1860

To the Editors of the Memphis Morning Enquirer:

GENTLEMEN:—The centre of the Union, as has been seen, is divided into two great portions, which are widely different from each other in many, and most important, respects. In the Northern Centre are found the descendants of English Quakers and Episcopalians, Irish and Scotch Presbyterians, German Protestants and Catholics. We have here a nationality of the most conservative kind, resulting from a fusion of very discordant elements. In the Southern Centre, the German and Quaker elements almost entirely disappear, the mass of the population being the representatives of English settlers, of the day when the Churchman and the Puritan could find no common ground upon which to stand, except persecution of the Irish Catholic. Singularly enough, as will be seen, they are again found, in the two extremities of the Union, almost united in their opposition to the Catholic Centre, which cannot flourish except in common with them both—the harmony of their permanent material interests being entirely perfect.

Thus wildly differing morally, their material interests are yet the same—these two centres now numbering, including Kansas, no less than fourteen States, throughout which, from New Jersey and Virginia to Iowa and Tennessee, there exists an amount of individual wealth elsewhere entirely unparalleled. Thus united, as the MINREAL [sic] ZONE of the Union, we find them acting together on many of the cardinal points of national policy; Virginia and Pennsylvania having voted together on the slavery question in the convention of 1789, and Tennessee and Kentucky having been almost uniformly found acting with New Jersey, Maryland and Pennsylvania, in support of that protective policy, to a feeling of the necessity of which, the country was indebted for the accomplishment of the Revolution.

In the Northern Zone we find the descendants of English Puritans—the social elements there differing from those of the great centre above described, quite as widely as do the qualities of the soil: the mineral constituents of wealth which hereso much abound,

having there but slight existence. There it is, therefore, that we find the TRADING ZONE of the Union.

In the South we find a rich soil, occupied by men who represent the original settlers under the aristocratic Constitution framed by Locke; and here it is that we find the PLANTING ZONE of the Union.

In the first, we have the *nationality of the St. Lawrence*. As yet that term is little recognised by those who occupy the southern shores of our great lakes, though very common among those of the northern ones. How it will be ten years hence, may be judged of by those who have read the extract from "*The Morning Post*," given in my first letter addressed to you [published March 31], and the one from "*The New York Times*," [sic absence of closed quote] given in my letter to Mr. Bryant, published by you on the 18th ult.

In the second, we have the *nationality of the centre*. In the third, that of *the Gulf of Mexico*, or, perhaps, of *the Mississippi*. The day may come when the Union shall have ceased to be one and indivisible—when it shall have come, these will prove to have been the parts into which it will have been divided. Differing so entirely in all respects as do the first and last, they have, nevertheless, been often found combined together for directing the national policy in opposition to the feeling, and interests of both divisions of the centre. To their union was due the adoption of the Slavery clauses of the Constitution. To a great extent they were united in their opposition to the protective tariffs of 1824 and 1828. To their union was due the passage of the destructive tariff act of 1857; and, in no small degree are they now united for its maintenance. Why should this be so? *Because Southern policy, with its constant succession of financial crises, is steadily centralizing in the Northern States all the manufactures, and all the trade of the Union*, as you will see by the facts which will now be offered for the consideration of your readers.

Of the cotton crops of 1841-2, the quantity manufactures here was 267,850 bales. The quantity then manufactured south of this state was almost nothing; nearly all of the cotton factories of the country, of that period, finding their locations in the towns and the villages of Rhode Island and Massachusetts.—From that date, under the protective tariff of 1842, Southern manufactures grew so rapidly that, of the crops of 1848-9, the

consumption in Virginia, and south there of, amounted to 138,000 bales. So great was then the Southern tendency in that direction, that Mr. Rhett, of South Carolina, writing in 1849 to Mr. Abbott Lawrence, of Boston, ventured to predict that, before the end of another decade, the South would cease to export raw cotton—its whole export then taking the form of either yarn or cloth. That decade has already been passed, but it has been a free trade one, the results of which are shown in the following paragraphs from “*The Savannah Republican*.”

“Out of four millions of bales of cotton used last year, only about one hundred thousand bales are estimated to have been manufactured into cloth in all of the slave-holding states—such an insignificant proportion as to be hardly worth mentioning. Of the quantity of cotton manufactured in all the slave-holding states, the following statement will show how it is divided:

	1855	1856	1857	1858	1859
N. Carolina, bales ...	18,500	22,000	25,000	26,000	29,000
South Carolina.....	10,500	15,000	17,000	18,000	20,600
Georgia.....	20,500	25,000	23,000	24,000	26,000
Alabama.....	5,500	6,500	5,000	8,000	10,000
Tennessee	4,090	7,000	9,000	10,000	13,000

There is probably no product of the earth of which so little is made ready for use where it is raised, while there is no reason why it should be so. The water-power of the South is as good as it is anywhere, but the great bug-bear is that labor is too high. An assertion which is not true, as can be proved by the history of those factories which have been successfully managed in Georgia. The kind of labor required in cotton factories occupies persons to whom it is almost charity to give employment, and the compensation is established by the employers. Women and children do most of the work, and a cotton factory well managed operates as a blessing to a town, by giving the poor and helpless people employment.”

Such having been the results of British free trade at the South, let us now inquire what they have been among the men of Massachusetts. Of the crop of 1848-9, the Northern consumption was 518,000 bales—its amount having almost doubled in the short period that had elapsed from the passage of the protective tariff of 1842. In the same period, as we have seen, the Southern consumption rose from almost nothing, to more than one-fourth of the quantity.—Ten years more having since elapsed, the former has risen to 760,000, while the latter has retrograded to less than 100,000; and if we take the average of the last five years, to even less than 80,000. So much for the prophecy of Mr. Rhett, who had failed to understand that South Carolina stood really more in need of a protective tariff, than did the already largely manufacturing States of the North and East.

Such having been the case with regard to manufactures, we may now inquire how it is with regard to trade, for that purpose looking for a moment to an extract from the New York Tribune, given by you in my letter to Mr. Bryant, before referred to. Doing this, we find the Grand Trunk Railroad, through Canada to Portland, Maine, gradually cutting off the trade to Central and Southern cities, and doing this by help of the Southern policy, which compels us daily, more and more, to look to Liverpool as the great center of our system. The more we are compelled to depend upon the British market for the sale of cotton, and for the purchase of cloth and iron, the greater must be the tendency towards taking the shortest and most expeditious route towards Liverpool, and the greater must be the necessity of the South for dependence on the ships and traders of the extreme North, let Southern resolutions in favor of direct trade take what form they may. Had the policy of 1842 been maintained, Mr. Rhett's prophecy would now be in train for being realized, giving to our Southern friends a direct trade with the outer world; for all the time that since has elapsed, they have, however, been following in the direction indicated by British free trade friends—the result now exhibiting itself in the fact that, whereas, in 1848-9 the Southern consumption amounted to five per cent. of the crop, it has already fallen to but about two per cent.

Southern policy thus forcing trade and manufactures to centralize themselves in the East, thereby giving to the Massachusetts agriculturalists a great domestic market, we wonder that New England farmers and manufacturers are well disposed to unite with Carolina planters in shouting hosannas to the British free-trade system? The increase in

the farm products of the little State of Massachusetts, from 1845 to 1855, according to the published statements, was no less than \$28,000,000, or nearly one-sixth of the value of the cotton crop of all the planting States; and this was due to the fact, that the South had insisted upon a policy that has destroyed the domestic competition for the purchase of cotton and for the sale of cloth.

How many years, my dear sirs, of further experience will be required for satisfying our planting friends that, in advocating British free-trade doctrines, they are enriching those whom they are so much disposed to hold as enemies, while crushing those whom they would wish to have as friends?

Leaving them to ponder upon this question, I remain

Yours, very respectfully,

HENRY C. CAREY

[Date of publication is indiscernible from the source text. Assumed Friday morning, April 13, 1860.]

Fourth Letter from Henry C. Carey.

Philadelphia, March 31, 1860

To the Editors of the Memphis Morning Enquirer:

GENTLEMEN—Adam Smith tells his readers, that “in a piece of cloth there are many hundred weights of food and wool, and that when thus combined they can travel cheaply to the remotest corners of the world.” So combining them the farmer is relieved of nearly all the cost of transportation, and therefore is it that, when the consumer takes his place by the side of the producer, the latter becomes rich and strong, and his country grows in independence.

That being so much the case with the first operation of changing the wool and food into cloth, how much more strongly it is so, when the food and cloth are made to assume the form of iron. Study a ton of that metal, beginning with the extraction of the coal and the ore, and following it on through the pig, the bar, the hammer and the knife, and finally to the watch spring, and you will find that a single ton of it may represent many hundred tons of food and wool, that have been used in various operations, from the opening of the mine, the building of houses, and the construction of engines, down to the more minute labor required for the conversion of the iron into steel, and the steel into the needle and penknife. The food and wool, thus compressed, can travel cheaply every where. Therefore it is, that in all those countries whose policy looks to the development of their metallic wealth, as is the case with Belgium, France, Germany, and especially England, there exists a power for the maintenance of direct trade with the various nations of the world, that does not, and cannot exist in those communities, to which Nature has denied a supply of fuel and metallic ores; nor in those whose policy is such as to compel their metallic treasures to remain where Nature placed them.

In which of these categories stands our Union? For answer to this question I pray you to look to the fact that we have *fourteen* tons of coal for every one that is in the whole of Europe; *twenty-two* for every one that is in the British Islands; *fifty-five* for

every one that is in France; and more than *one hundred* for every one that is in Belgium; and yet this last little country, with its four and a half millions of inhabitants, exports to foreign countries nearly two-thirds as much food and wool, in their various forms of cloth and iron, as is now exported by all the States of the North and the Centre, with their five-and-twenty millions of inhabitants. As a consequence of this, the owner of a dozen acres of land in Belgium is rich, while American proprietors are almost starving upon hundreds of acres.

Why should this be so? Because Belgium is now pursuing the policy so long advocated by Britain, and now pursued by France. Because, in common with Louis Napoleon, and his President of the Legislative Convention, Count St. Morny, Belgium holds *that the road to real free trade lies through efficient protection to the farmers in their efforts at having their foods and wool so compressed, that*, to use again the words of Adam Smith, “they can travel cheaply to the remotest corner of the world.” Because, on the contrary, we, under the lead of Northern traders and Southern planters have, for nearly the whole of the last five-and-twenty years, marched in the direction denounced by Adam Smith—preferring to tax our farmers for the transportation of the raw food and wool, than to have it converted into pigs of iron, and thus carried forward into the various machines required for converting it into saws and axes, knives and needles.

For proof of this, let me ask you to look at the following facts: In 1832, the product of iron was 200,000 tons, having increased one-half in the four years of the tariff of 1823. Ten years later, in 1842, under a revenue tariff [this must be an error: SM. Look in the following article for corrections], many furnaces were closed, while others were working only half time, and the total product, notwithstanding the large increase of population, was still but little more than 200,000 tons. Four years later, under the tariff of 1842, the product, as stated by Mr. Walker, had already reached 760,000, and must have exceeded 800,000 at the moment when the tariff of 1846 commenced to affect this national movement. Since then it has been down to 500,000, and up to 1,000,000; and it is at this moment almost exactly where it stood a dozen years since, notwithstanding a capacity to supply the world. Were it possible that the States of the Center could be led to combine together for the creation of that great market for the products of the farm and

the plantation, which would result from the existence of a power to combine food and cloth in the form of stoves and railroad bars, axes, ploughs, and wagons.

Turning now to the metallic deposits of the West, we find similar facts in regard to lead, the product having more than quadrupled under the tariff of 1842, and the export having then already commenced, because of the less prices at which it was supplied. Now, we import more than 60,000,000 pounds a year, and our people pay for it almost double price; and yet, under a system that looked to the extension of domestic commerce, we could supply half the consumption of the world.

Coal depends for a market upon the people who smelt lead, iron and other ores, and those who make cotton and woolen cloths. When they suffer, it suffers; and, as they have suffered much and often within the last five and twenty years, its sufferings have been great. The history of the coal trade of the Atlantic States has been the history of the ruin of thousands of the most active and useful men of the country—the result being seen in the fact that the whole coal region of Eastern Pennsylvania, rich as it is, with all its roads, engines and mines, would not sell this day for one-half as much as has been expended for its development. To the parties who have made the expenditure, taken as a body, it would have been far better that the coal never had an existence. Others, however, have profited—the people of the North and East having obtained cheap fuel, at the cost of the great centre of the mines, and having done so by the help of those Southern men who are always denouncing the people of the East, and annually holding meetings for the purpose of passing resolutions in favor of direct trade.

Why does the great mining center of the Union, with all its wealth, stand in need of protection? Seeking a reply to this question, you will do well to read the following extract from a document published some years since by order of the British House of Commons:

“The laboring classes generally, in the manufacturing districts of this country, and especially in the iron and coal districts, are very little aware of the extent to which they are indebted for their being employed *at all* to the *immense losses* which their employers voluntarily incur in bad times, *in order to destroy foreign competition, and to gain and keep possession of foreign markets.*” “Authentic instances are well-known of employers having at such times carried on their works at a loss in the aggregate of three or four

hundred thousand pounds, (\$2,000,000,) in the course of three or four years.” “If the efforts of those who encourage combinations to restrict the amount of labor, and to produce strikes were to be successful for any length of time, the great accumulations of capital could no longer be made, *which enable a few of the most wealthy capitalists to overwhelm all foreign competition in times of great depression*, and thus clear the way for the whole trade to step in when prices revive, and to carry on a great business, before foreign capital can again accumulate to such an extent as to be able to establish a competition in prices with any chance of success.” “The large capitals of this country are the great instruments of *warfare against the competing capital of foreign countries*, and are the most *essential instruments* now remaining, by which our manufacturing supremacy can be maintained.”

In these few lines we read our mining history of the last thirty years. Time and again have the extremists of the North and South united for the oppression of the center—delivering the latter over to the tender mercies of British capitalists, who find their profit in the high prices which follow the overwhelming of the “foreign competition” for the purchase of food and cloth, which everywhere else is seen to be the result of the power to compress the two into the forms of zinc and iron, lead and copper. Such being the case, need we wonder at the spread of anti-slavery feelings at the North, or at the present manifestation of weakness at the South? Scarcely, as I think.

How is it likely to be in the future? For an answer to this question, allow me to ask your attention to the following figures, giving the electoral votes of the present day east of the Rocky Mountains, and south of Mason Dixon's Line, as compared with those of the period from 1810 to 1820—giving Iowa to the Northern Central Zone as some compensation for placing the whole of Missouri in the Southern one:

	Census of 1810	Census of 1850
North Zone	80	91
Northern Central	40	88
Southern Central	75	69
South Zone	22	51
	217	299

Inferior as is the soil of so much of the Northern zone, it has, as we see, gained largely, and that without accession of foreign territory. The South has more than doubled, and partly because of the purchase of Florida and Texas. Of the two divisions of the mining centre, the Northern has more than doubled, while the Southern has retrograded—thus giving proof of the greater necessity on the part of the South than on that of the North, for the adoption of a policy that shall tend to facilitate the conversion of food and cloth into iron, and thus increase the power to maintain direct commerce with the world.

Is it not time, my dear sirs, that Southern people should awaken to the fact that, while they are always stimulating the growth of anti-slavery feeling, they are always advocating a feeling that tends to the destruction of the towns and cities of the centre, to which they look for aid, while augmenting the power of the extremists, of whom they so much complain?

Waiting their leisure for a reply to this question, I remain,

Yours very truly,

HENRY C. CAREY

Friday Morning, April 20, 1860.

REPLY TO JUDGE SCRUGGS.

FIFTH LETTER FROM HENRY C. CAREY, ESQ.

Philadelphia, April 14

To the Editors of the Memphis Enquirer:

GENTLEMEN:—When, in compliance with your request, I wrote the letters you have published, it was done without the slightest intention of engaging in any controversy or correspondence whatever, my time being just now very much otherwise occupied. Their essential object was that of presenting what appeared to me the facts of the case as they are necessarily viewed by Northern writers, in the hope that Southern men might be induced to reflect upon the important questions, whether they themselves have been the cause of the growth of the Anti-slavery and Abolition feeling in the North, which now so much exists there, and whether it might not be expedient for them to unite with us in removing the cause, as preparation for relieving themselves and ourselves from its effects. It was scarcely to be expected that I should at once satisfy many of them; but my object would be accomplished could I but induce them to begin to reflect upon the fact, that there were really two sides to the question, and that it was therefore worth their while to review their past decision, with the view to see whether they might not have been, and even now be, in error, when requiring the people of the Middle and of the North to take the initiative in every effort at restoring harmony to our now distracted Union.

The mail has, however, this moment brought me a copy of the Bulletin, containing a letter from one of your most respected citizens, Judge Scruggs, written in so kindly a spirit, as to induce me to depart from my resolution, believing that I can satisfy him that, even upon his own showing, I am right.

In his view, Pennsylvania, and not the South, is responsible for the return to the British free trade system in 1846. It is quite true that the vote of this State was cast for Mr. Polk in 1844; but why? Were not our people allowed to be assured that he was “a better tariff man than Mr. Clay?” Did they not vote for him in this belief? Their votes obtained, did he not turn against them? and [sic no cap] was he not supported in this

course of action by a great majority of the Southern votes in Congress?—Was not this State then offered up by Northern Democrats as a sacrifice, by aid of which to propitiate the entire South? Did not the Southern men who voted with us then, know that the flag borne throughout this State during that contest, had inscribed on it the words, “Polk, Dallas, and the tariff of 1842?” Could they, having this knowledge, have desired any better mode of sowing Anti-Slavery seed, than by thus violating the promises they had made? I think not.

The South is ever in the market for the purchase of unscrupulous Northern men, to be used as was Mr. Dallas in 1846. To enable that gentleman to secure his election, he was obliged to make the strongest pledges to his constituents, assuring them that “his good right arm should wither, before it should do anything toward producing a change in the existing economical policy of the country.”—Nevertheless, he himself, by his casting vote, made the change. Why did he do this? Because the South bought him, by means of promises of future support as a Presidential candidate. The South thus created the Anti-Slavery feeling of which it so much complains, and is then surprised that it becomes itself weaker with each successive day and year.

So, my dear sirs, it is always. Messrs. Pierce and Douglas were Northern men, but Southern Democrats bought them; and Southern Whigs with, as I think, but one exception, fell into the trap that had been set for them. So, too, has it been with Mr. Buchanan, the policy of whose administration has been wholly adverse to that indicated in the programme exhibited to his friends in November, 1856; and why? Because the South bought him, as it had already bought so many others. When, therefore, our Southern friends talk of these things being done by Northern men, they do so in entire forgetfulness of the fact, that the South, as a whole, is always in alliance with that portion of our Northern men who are constantly in the market, ready to sell themselves and their consciences to the highest bidder. Never did a body of people make a greater mistake, than did Virginia and North Carolina, when they allied themselves to the Democracy, which has led them and their neighbor States into the difficulties in which they now find themselves involved. It is now full time that they should retrace their steps. When they shall do so, they will find their real friends among those men who continue to advocate the commercial policy which received the sanction of the men who made the Revolution.

We are told, however, that the preliminary [sic] to a change of Commercial policy must be the abandonment, throughout the North, of an “unnatural war upon the South.” Where is this war to be found? In Pennsylvania? Assuredly not; and yet that State is now suffering under Southern policy to an extent that can scarcely be estimated, and with little hope for an improvement in the future. If such a war is any where to be found, it is in the extreme North, toward which Southern policy is now driving all the manufactures and all the trade of the country, at the expense, and to the ruin of the States and cities of the centre and the South. Look at the wonderful growth in the value of agricultural products in Massachusetts, from 1845 to 1855, and then compare with it the state of affairs existing in Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia. The South is always rewarding those it regards as enemies, while crushing those it would desire to have as friends: and, so long as it shall continue to do so, it must go on increasing in its weakness from day to day.

How is it that the British free trade system, sustained by an almost united South, tends to produce Anti-slavery feeling throughout the North, has been already shown. Remove the cause, and the effect will speedily disappear. To ask us to remove the latter, as a preliminary to a removal of the former, is simply to ask of us that which is wholly impossible. The physician called to a patient diseased from excessive drinking, promised him a speedy cure on condition that he would abstain from excessive potations. The patient, unwilling to comply, insisted that the cure should come first, and the abstinence afterwards—and in so doing, he was only walking in the same path with those of our Southern friends who require that the North shall give up its Anti-slavery notions, as preliminary to the abandonment of that commercial policy, to which the growth of Anti-slavery feeling and Abolitionism has almost alone been due.

Hoping that the Judge may, upon further reflection, be led to agree with me in reference to this order of cause and effect,

I remain, very respectfully, yours, &c.,

HENRY C. CAREY

ERRATUM.—In my third letter, second paragraph, sixth line, “individual wealth” in the Center, should read “mineral wealth.”