

THE GEORGIA CONVENTIONS OF 1850 AND 1861:
A COMPARATIVE STUDY

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of History
Sam Houston State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

by
Anne H. ^{Holland} Rogers
May, 1973

THE GEORGIA CONVENTIONS OF 1850 AND 1861:
A COMPARATIVE STUDY

by

Anne H. Rogers

A THESIS

Approved:

Oliver M. Refsell, Chairman

Lee E. Olm

Approved:

Roger E. Jester

Bascom Barry Hayes
Dean of the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

Rogers, Anne H., The Georgia Conventions of 1850 and 1861: A Comparative Study. Master of Arts (History), May, 1973. Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas. 170 pp.

Purpose

The purpose of this thesis was to ascertain and compare certain aspects of the Georgia Conventions of 1850 and 1861 in order to obtain information regarding the nature and extent of changes in Georgians' attitudes toward the union during the interval between these two conventions. A number of factors have been considered, including conditions existing during the pre-convention periods, local leadership, the extent of voter participation in the election of delegates, the size of the popular majorities, the policies proposed during the conventions and the vote on these proposals. While the comparative study required an extensive investigation of these factors in regard to the Convention of 1850, the primary objective of this thesis has been to provide information concerning the secession of Georgia in 1861.

Methods

A major portion of this thesis was based on information derived from primary sources. The use of secondary sources was, for the most part, confined to the more general survey of the pre-convention periods, although journals of the Georgia General Assembly as well as the published speeches and private correspondence of various individuals were also utilized. The remainder of the study was based almost exclusively

on reports of county meetings and election returns published in contemporary newspapers and on the proceedings of the two conventions.

The convention journals and compiled reports of meetings held in various counties prior to the conventions were used in surveys of several categories of local leaders active during both periods. Regional and, to some extent, statewide patterns of continuing leadership were determined on the basis of these surveys.

The returns in five elections were utilized in the study of voter participation in the election of delegates in 1850 and 1861. The vote in each of the two convention elections was expressed as a percentage of the vote in immediately preceding elections. Thus the total vote in each county in 1850 was calculated as a percentage of the vote cast in these counties in the gubernatorial election held in the fall of 1849. Since two general elections were held just prior to the election of 1861 (the gubernatorial election of 1859 and the presidential election of 1860), the 1861 vote was expressed as a percentage of the average vote cast in these two elections. The percentages of voter participation in the elections of 1850 and 1861 obtained in this manner were compared on both a state and regional basis.

The study of the popular majority of 1850 was based on the highest vote cast for a unionist candidate and a resistance candidate in each county. The 1861 study was based on the highest vote for a secessionist candidate and a co-operationist candidate in each county. However, in some instances 1861 votes were probabilities projected on the basis of known county majorities or minorities, the known average vote in the county in preceding elections and the average regional percentage

of voter participation in the election of 1861. The popular majorities in 1850 and 1861 were expressed as percentages of the combined total of the highest vote cast for the two categories of candidates and compared on both a state and regional basis.

Findings

Basic similarities in the more radical of the two policies proposed in the Convention of 1850 and the more conservative of the two policies proposed in the Convention of 1861, both of which were rejected, indicate a definite change in the attitudes of most Georgians between 1850 and 1861. This is confirmed by evidence indicating that only a limited number of individual leaders and county electorates demonstrated a consistent attitude by supporting resistance in 1850 and co-operation in 1861.

As a general rule, former unionist leaders active in 1861 tended to favor co-operation, while former resistance leaders were more inclined to favor secession. Since former unionists made up a large majority of the known continuing leadership, this was, on the whole, a relatively conservative group. However, although former unionists also dominated the known continuing leadership elected in 1861, a majority of these delegates were secessionists.

Changes in the relative size of the conservative popular vote were less pronounced than the delegate vote in the two conventions would seem to indicate. This is largely the result of the exaggerated impression of unionist strength conveyed by the overwhelming majority in the Convention of 1850. The unionist majority in this convention was 89

percent as compared to a 64 percent popular majority in the election of delegates. The 55 percent secessionist majority in the Convention of 1861 was also slightly larger than the probable 52 percent popular majority for secession.


The actual popular majority for secession in 1861 cannot be determined as a result of the abbreviated form in which the official returns were presented and the incorrect classification of a number of co-operationist delegates in these returns. The probable secessionist majority of 52 percent determined in this study is a downward revision of that cited in the official returns.

All four regions in the state show unionist popular majorities in 1850. In 1860 three recorded popular majorities for secession, and one had a co-operationist popular majority. However, the radical percentage of the popular vote increased in all four regions in 1861.

Average percentages of voter participation in 1850 and 1861 were similar in the state as a whole; however, the regional analysis revealed significant differences. Increases in average percentages of participation were observed in two regions. Although the average in a third region decreased from 100 percent in 1850 to 91 percent in 1861, voter participation was extremely high in both instances. Moreover, this region, made up of only six counties, had relatively little effect on the statewide average. The average percentage of voter participation in 1861 was significantly lower in only one region, the large cotton belt, where the weather was apparently a limiting factor. The results of the regional study as well as increases in the average percentage of participation in counties where candidates were unopposed tends to

indicate that voter interest was higher in 1861 than in 1850 but was not fully expressed as a result of a non-political factor.

Approved:



Oliver M. Refsell
Supervising Professor

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to Professors Oliver M. Refsell, Lee E. Olm and Roger E. Jester of the Sam Houston State University Department of History for their advice and encouragement during the preparation of this thesis. I am also grateful to those librarians in Texas and Georgia whose assistance made possible the acquisition of vital research material--the members of the staff at Sam Houston State University Library, Rice University Library, the Georgia Department of Archives and History, Emory University Library and the Georgia College Library. Miss Gretchen Kottcamp's efforts to obtain numerous source materials through the Sam Houston State University inter-library loan service are particularly appreciated. Special thanks is due Robert J. Richardson, Head of Public Services, Georgia College Library, and graduate student David Anderson of that college, without whose assistance legible copies of the 1861 election returns would not have been available. Finally, I cannot express the depths of my gratitude to my husband and children, whose patience and understanding made it possible for me to complete this work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	x
Chapter	
I. COMPROMISE VERSUS SECTIONALISM	1
II. CONVENTION PRELUDE: 1850, 1860-1861	15
III. CONVENTION ACTION: 1850, 1860-1861	41
IV. DELEGATES AND CANDIDATES	63
V. COUNTY LEADERSHIP	95
VI. THE ELECTIONS: 1850, 1861	121
VII. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	155
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	162
APPENDIX A	166
APPENDIX B	167
VITA	170

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Descending Intermediate Leadership: 1850, 1860-1861	104
II. Ascending Intermediate Leadership: 1850, 1860-1861	108
III. Non-elective Leaders Active in 1850 and 1860	114
IV. Voter Participation: 1850, 1861	130
V. Popular Vote: 1850, 1861	141

CHAPTER I

COMPROMISE VERSUS SECTIONALISM

The spirit of compromise, which helped to bring the Constitution of the United States into being in 1787, was an essential ingredient in the preservation of the union established under that Constitution. It was in this spirit that the South accepted the Compromise of 1850. However, by the latter part of 1860 more than three decades of increasing sectional polarization had eclipsed the willingness to compromise in both the North and the South. The results were the secession of eleven Southern states, the formation of the Confederate States of America as a separate nation, and the Civil War.

The Compromise of 1850 had been little more than an uneasy sectional truce. It was weakened by the passage of personal liberty bills in a number of Northern states in an effort to circumvent the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850. The Compromise was also strained by the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, the controversy over the admission of Kansas to the union, the rise of the anti-slavery Republican party to national prominence in 1856, the Dred Scott decision in 1857, and the abolitionist-inspired raid of John Brown on Harpers Ferry, Virginia in 1859.

The first major sectional break occurred in April and May, 1860, when the Democratic party disintegrated. Most of the Southern Democrats supported John C. Breckinridge for the presidency, while a majority of the Northern Democrats backed Stephen A. Douglas. This party split was

the predecessor of a much more serious sectional division--the dissolution of the union after the election of the Republican candidate, Abraham Lincoln.

The results of the presidential election of 1860 indicate the extent to which the spirit of compromise had succumbed to sectionalism. Lincoln, the most overwhelmingly sectional of the four candidates, received absolutely no votes in the states of the lower South, a total of approximately 9,400 in the border states of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia and Kentucky, and about 17,000 in Missouri. Yet he won the election with a popular vote of 1,857,610 and 180 electoral votes. Lincoln carried every Northern state except New Jersey, and he received more than half of the New Jersey electoral vote. Breckinridge carried nine Southern states, including all of the future members of the Confederacy except Virginia and Tennessee. He had 847,953 popular votes and 72 electoral votes. Douglas received only 12 electoral votes, although his popular vote of 1,365,976 exceeded that of Breckinridge. He carried one state, Missouri, and received a portion of the New Jersey electoral vote. John Bell, the Constitutional Union party's nominee and the only truly national candidate in the field, carried three states: Virginia, Kentucky and Tennessee. However, he received only 590,631 popular votes, which was less than 13 percent of the total vote.¹

Compromise had been accepted for the sake of the union in 1850,

¹Dwight Lowell Dumond, The Secession Movement, 1860-1861 (New York: MacMillan Company, 1931), p. 271. (Hereinafter cited as Secession Movement.) These figures do not include any popular vote for South Carolina, where the electors were chosen by the legislature.

but a decade later only a small percentage of the nation's voters were willing to put their faith in a compromise, union candidate. Bell polled 67,658 votes in the North, 136,880 in the Gulf states, and 379,093 in the border states and the states of the upper South.²

To most Southerners the most alarming aspect of the election was the elevation of a Republican to the office of president, a Republican backed by a substantial majority of Northern voters and representing a party identified in the South with the abolition of slavery. A number of Southerners believed that it would be impossible to compromise with such an administration, that the South must either submit to Northern domination and the ultimate abolition of slavery or leave the union. Others clung to the hope that compromise might still be possible if the people of the North could be convinced that the Southern states would secede unless concessions were granted. The views of the former group prevailed; before Lincoln's inauguration seven Southern states had severed their ties with the union.

The spirit of compromise died relatively easy in South Carolina, where the ordinance of secession was passed on December 20, 1860. However, South Carolina had never been noted for her willingness to compromise. This state, along with Georgia and Mississippi had called state conventions after Congress passed the Compromise of 1850. However, South Carolina delayed her convention until April, 1852 in order to give either Georgia or Mississippi an opportunity to lead a secession

²Ibid. In compiling the Northern vote for Bell the states of Oregon and California have been omitted. It should also be noted that fusion tickets in Rhode Island, New Jersey and New York gave the entire anti-Republican vote in these states to Douglas.

movement. After both the Georgia and Mississippi conventions had accepted the Compromise, South Carolina reluctantly capitulated.³ The South Carolina convention passed, by a vote of 136 to 19, a resolution stating that

. . . the frequent violations of the constitution of the United States by the Federal government, and its encroachments upon the reserved rights of the sovereign states of the Union, especially in relation to slavery, amply justify this state, so far as any duty or obligation to her confederates is involved, in dissolving at once all political connection with her co-states; and that she forbears the exercise of this manifest right of self-government from considerations of expediency only.⁴

The South Carolina Convention of 1852 implied that it rejected secession at that time only because South Carolina did not wish to stand alone outside the union. This was in marked contrast to the more optimistic declaration of the Georgia Convention of 1850, which accepted the Compromise in order to maintain the union and to achieve "a permanent adjustment of this sectional controversy."⁵ Indeed, the action taken by the Georgia convention was one of the reasons why it was inexpedient for South Carolina to secede in 1852.

It is perhaps an overstatement to claim that Georgia saved the

³Ulrich B. Phillips, The Course of the South to Secession: An Interpretation, ed. E. Merton Coulter (Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1958), p. 139.

⁴Journal of the State Convention of South Carolina; together with the Resolutions and Ordinance (Columbia: Johnson and Cavis, Printers to the Convention, 1852), pp. 18-19.

⁵Journal of the State Convention, Held in Milledgeville in December, 1850 (Milledgeville: R. M. Orme, State Printer, 1850), p. 19. (Hereinafter cited as Journal of the Convention, 1850.)

union in 1850, as some historians have asserted.⁶ On the other hand, the significance of the Georgia convention's adoption of the Georgia Platform must not be underrated. In 1850 Georgia was one of the largest and most prosperous states in the South. In addition to her size and economic position, Georgia's central location and prestige made her participation vital to the success of any Southern movement. Georgia's convention met first, while leaders in the other states of the lower South were still debating the advisability of accepting the Compromise and the means of resistance if they chose to reject it. Georgia's acceptance of the Compromise strengthened the position of Southern conservatives and served notice to Southern extremists that this state was not ready to abandon the union. Yet the Georgia Platform also included an ultimatum, warning the North that certain specific encroachments on Southern rights in the future would be considered grounds for secession. This portion of the Georgia Platform made Georgia's policy more acceptable to Southern extremists without alienating Southern conservatives. In short, the Georgia Platform was an astute bit of statesmanship which played a major role in uniting the Southern states in support of the Compromise and in opposition to disunion.⁷

After Georgia's action the budding secession movement centered in South Carolina and Mississippi lost momentum. By the fall of 1851, when delegates to the Mississippi convention were elected, unionists

⁶Avery O. Craven, "Georgia and the South," Georgia Historical Quarterly, XXIII (September, 1939), p. 231.

⁷Richard Harrison Shryock, Georgia and the Union in 1850 (Durham: Duke University Press, 1926), pp. 5, 8-9. (Hereinafter cited as Georgia and the Union.)

in that state were able to rout the secessionists, dominate the convention, approve the Compromise and even pass, by a vote of 73 to 17, resolutions denying a constitutional right of secession.⁸

Some historians have tended to discount the validity of the secession movement of 1850-1851, viewing it as primarily a movement for Southern unity rather than as an attempt to dissolve the union.⁹ Others contend that there was a "dangerous secession movement" at this time.¹⁰ Although it may be argued that the more extreme public statements made by some of the Southern leaders during this period were essentially attempts to gain better terms for the South within the union, the private correspondence of Governors Seabrook of South Carolina and Quitman of Mississippi clearly indicates that a secession movement did exist.¹¹

It is improbable, but not impossible, that the South Carolina and/or Mississippi secessionists might have succeeded in carrying their states out of the union in the early 1850's had Georgia not acted quickly and decisively. However, this is a matter of conjecture not relevant to this study. This study will center on the fact that Georgia

⁸Allan Nevins, Ordeal of the Union, Vol. I, Fruits of Manifest Destiny, 1847-1852 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947), pp. 372-374. (Hereinafter cited as Ordeal of the Union, Vol. I.)

⁹Howard C. Perkins, "A Neglected Phase of the Movement for Southern Unity, 1847-1852," Journal of Southern History, XII (May, 1946), p. 154.

¹⁰Clement Eaton, A History of the Old South (New York: MacMillan Company, 1949), p. 548.

¹¹John F. H. Claiborne, Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman, Vol. II (New York: Harpers, 1860), pp. 37-38, 44. Seabrook to Quitman, October 23, 1850 and Quitman to J. J. McRae, September 28, 1850.

chose to exert her influence in favor of compromise within the union in 1850 and yet only ten years later reversed this decision by choosing disunion.

The circumstances under which the Georgia Convention of 1861 met were different in that Georgia did not have the opportunity to speak first as she had in 1850. South Carolina seceded before the Georgia delegates were elected, and by the time they convened on January 16, Mississippi, Alabama and Florida had followed South Carolina out of the union. Georgia's voice could hardly serve as a determining factor after four other Southern states had already enacted a policy of separate state secession. Yet, in spite of this, it was conceivable that the Georgia convention would not pass an ordinance of secession.

There was precedent for Georgia's refusing to follow South Carolina's lead; she had done so in the nullification controversy of 1832. There were also strong cultural and commercial rivalries between these two states. Georgians might very well have so resented the pressure of South Carolina's hasty, unilateral action that this factor, when combined with the existence of strong union sentiment in the state, could have helped to defeat immediate secession in Georgia. But immediate secession was not defeated. The secessionist majority in the Georgia convention was small, but it was large enough to initiate a policy of disunion.

Georgia presents an excellent opportunity for a case study of the triumph of sectionalism over compromise. Although the fact that four states preceded Georgia out of the union undoubtedly influenced that state's action in 1861, still the decision to secede was made by

Georgians, as was the decision to accept the Compromise ten years earlier. Georgia utilized the same procedure in both instances--a special convention, authorized by the legislature, called by the governor, and made up of delegates nominated by county meetings and elected on a county basis. Yet this process resulted in two radically different decisions.

While the contrast in the actions of two state conventions held within a ten year period would seem to indicate a change in the attitudes of Georgians toward the union, the nature and extent of this change have never been investigated in detail. One of the reasons for this is the fact that the 1861 election returns were not available. The total number of votes for secession and co-operation released by the executive department were known, but the record of the county vote on which these totals were based was apparently no longer extant. However, since the research on which this study is based has unearthed the official election returns compiled by the executive department, a comparative study of the two conventions is now possible.

The limited comparison of the Convention of 1850 and the Convention of 1861 presented herein focuses on the leaders active during both crises and on the results of the elections held to select delegates to these conventions. It is designed to answer several questions relating to the secession movement in Georgia. Did the resistance leaders of 1850 rise from defeat to lead their state out of the union in 1861? Did the unionists of 1850 lose hope in compromise as a means of preserving the union and turn in disillusionment to secession? Did voter attitudes throughout the state change between 1850 and 1861, or was the

secessionist majority in the Convention of 1861 the result of regional change? How did the extent of voter participation in the election of 1850 compare with that of 1861, when adverse weather conditions supposedly caused a light turnout in the state as a whole? Finally, was there actually a popular majority for secession in 1861, and if so, how did this compare with the unionist popular majority of 1850?

The term "unionist," as applied to individuals active in Georgia in 1850, is used to refer to those who supported the acceptance of the Compromise with no action to resist or to protest its implementation. "Resistance" must be rather vaguely defined as an inclusive term used to refer to those who advocated some form of protest against the Compromise and action designed to express that protest. Actions proposed by resistance men in Georgia included discriminatory state taxation of Northern goods, either voluntary or legislative non-intercourse with Northern states, and a united Southern refusal to accept the Compromise coupled with a demand for further concessions to Southern rights. Although some of the resistance proposals might have led indirectly to disunion, secession as such was openly advocated by so few of those in the Georgia resistance movement in the fall of 1850 that it will not be considered a part of the general resistance program.

Two basic designations are used in referring to individuals active during the crisis of 1860-1861, "secessionist" and "co-operationist." The term "secessionist" may be defined as one who felt that Georgia should secede prior to Lincoln's inauguration and includes both the advocates of separate state action and those who believed that the Southern states should secede as a unit if possible. Technically

the latter group were co-operationists, but because they advocated co-operation only as a preferred means of secession, they may be considered secessionists. The term "co-operationist" is used herein to denote those who had not lost all hope in compromise as a means of preserving the union. It refers to those who hoped to obtain Northern concessions and guarantees of Southern rights by means of strong and united Southern demands backed by the threat of secession. This group also includes those anti-secessionists who thought that co-operation would introduce an element of delay which might help to save the union.

This study is based almost entirely on information obtained from primary sources. The proceedings of both conventions, Georgia legislative journals and the private correspondence of various individuals were utilized, but a major portion of the research centered on newspapers published in 1850 and in 1860-1861. In addition to editorial statements and election results, these papers contain a number of accounts of county meetings held to express local opinion and to nominate candidates for the conventions. These reports as well as the published position statements of various candidates are used extensively in the study of local leadership.

Newspaper sources were selected on the bases of size of circulation, political alignment, location and availability. Nine out of a total of thirty-seven papers in the state in 1850 (excluding those devoted primarily to agriculture, religion, medicine, humor and literature) and ten of the seventy-one newspapers published in Georgia in 1860 have been utilized. Although circulation figures for both periods are incomplete, these represent a minimum 70 percent of the papers with a

circulation of 2,500 or more in 1850 and a minimum 46 percent of such papers in 1860. Estimates of maximum possible percentages of papers with 2,500 or more circulation represented in this study are as high as 85 percent for 1850 and 60 percent for 1860.¹²

The newspaper sources are fairly well-balanced insofar as political alignment is concerned. Four took a unionist position in 1850; five favored resistance. The union papers include the Macon Georgia Journal and Messenger, the Augusta Daily Chronicle and Sentinel, the Columbus Enquirer, and the Milledgeville Southern Recorder. The resistance papers are the Macon Georgia Telegraph, the Augusta Daily Constitutionalist, the Albany Patriot, the Milledgeville Federal Union, and the Savannah Morning News. The four unionist papers of 1850 favored co-operation in 1860-1861; the five resistance papers advocated secession. The Atlanta Daily Intelligencer, 1850 files of which were not available for study, also supported secession in 1860-1861.

The selection of sources was designed to produce not only large and politically balanced samples of the county meetings held prior to both conventions but also a high degree of balance in terms of geographic-economic factors and slave-white population ratios.

There are three major geographic divisions in Georgia--the Coastal Plain, the Piedmont Plateau and the northern mountain region. However, the agricultural economy of the period under consideration cut

¹²Kenneth W. Rawlings, "Statistics and Cross-sections of the Georgia Press to 1870," Georgia Historical Quarterly, XXIII (January, 1939), pp. 180-184; Donald E. Reynolds, Editors Make War: Southern Newspapers in the Secession Crisis (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1970), pp. 223-224.

across geographic lines to a certain extent. Consequently the state may be divided into geographic-economic regions more adaptable to political analysis than those based on geographic factors alone. In the latter part of the ante-bellum period there were four of these regions--the northern district, the cotton belt, the pine barrens and the coastal region. The northern region included both the mountain district and the hill country of the extreme upper Piedmont. Slave labor was of little use on the subsistence farms common to this region. The cotton belt extended across the Piedmont and the upper Coastal Plain of middle Georgia and into the southwest corner of the state. Slaves were considered vital to the economy of this area, where the production of short-staple cotton for commercial markets was the primary economic activity. The pine barrens region, including south-central and southeastern Georgia, was ill-suited to agriculture. Subsistence farming was attempted, and some livestock was produced; however, the use of slaves was limited. The coastal region consisted of six counties bordering on the Atlantic. The economy in this area was based on shipping and the production of rice and long-staple cotton. As in the cotton belt, slaves were considered essential.¹³

¹³E. Merton Coulter, Georgia: A Short History (Revised ed.; Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947), pp. 3-4; Thomas P. Janes (ed.), Handbook of the State of Georgia Accompanied by a Geological Map of the State (2nd ed.; Atlanta, 1876), p. 222; George V. Irons, "The Secession Movement in Georgia, 1850-61" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Duke University, 1936), pp. 2, 362 (hereinafter cited as "Secession Movement in Georgia"). The term "pine barrens" is a misnomer used herein only because it is usually employed in the regional analysis of the 1861 delegate vote. In fact this geographic-economic region consisted of two Coastal Plain sub-regions, the narrow strip of actual pine barrens and the larger wiregrass district.

Slave-white population ratios were directly related to geographic-economic factors. Counties with slave populations of 50 percent or more were concentrated in the cotton and coastal regions, while most of the counties with predominantly white populations were located in the northern and pine barrens regions.¹⁴

Although thirty-seven new counties were created between 1850 and 1860, the regional distribution remained relatively stable. In 1850, 22 percent of Georgia's ninety-five counties were located in the northern region; 56 percent, in the cotton belt; 16 percent, in the pine barrens; and 6 percent, in the coastal region.¹⁵ In 1860 the northern region included almost 26 percent of the 132 counties in the state; the cotton belt, approximately 51 percent; the pine barrens, almost 19 percent; and the coastal region, approximately 5 percent.¹⁶

The regional distribution of the newspapers used is not ideal, but it is the best that could be achieved with existing sources. The two Augusta papers represent the eastern part of the cotton belt; the Macon and Milledgeville papers, the middle Georgia interior; the Columbus paper, the western cotton belt. Although the Albany Patriot was published in the southwestern corner of the cotton belt, its coverage

¹⁴Irons, "Secession Movement in Georgia," p. 362; Ulrich B. Phillips, Georgia and States Rights (Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch Press, 1968), p. 3.

¹⁵William G. Bonner, Bonner's Pocket Map of the State of Georgia (Milledgeville, 1849); Irons, "Secession Movement in Georgia," p. 362.

¹⁶Phillips, Georgia and States Rights, p. 2; Irons, "Secession Movement in Georgia," p. 362. These 132 counties are listed according to region in Appendix A.

area included the western part of the pine barrens. The Savannah Morning News, a coastal region paper, also covered events in some of the eastern pine barrens counties. No 1850 editions of newspapers published in the northern region were available, but the Augusta, Macon and Columbus papers carried occasional reports from this region. The 1860 and 1861 editions of the Atlanta Daily Intelligencer were consulted in an effort to obtain additional information concerning the northern counties.

The county meeting samples obtained from these sources are, in most cases, adequate for the study of regional leadership patterns. Perhaps even more important, these newspapers contain election returns not preserved in the state archives, returns vital to the study of voting patterns in this key state during the sectional crises of 1850 and 1860-1861.

CHAPTER II

CONVENTION PRELUDE: 1850, 1860-1861

A sectional crisis seemed imminent in the fall of 1849. A number of slavery-related issues awaited Congress, and Southerners were apprehensive that they would not be dealt with in a manner acceptable to the South. One of the most volatile of these issues involved the principles embodied in the Wilmot Proviso. Initially introduced in Congress as a rider to an appropriation bill in 1846, the Proviso would have excluded slavery from most of the territory acquired as a result of the war with Mexico. This measure, approved by the House but rejected by the Senate, continued to provoke heated debate. No territorial settlement had been made, and the problem had intensified with the discovery of gold in California and the rapid population growth which followed this discovery. By 1849 it was obvious that a decision must be made in regard to the disposition of the Mexican Cession. While Northern support for the concept of the Wilmot Proviso was strong, Southerners adamantly opposed it.¹

The situation was further complicated by what Georgia Governor George W. Towns condemned as "the fell spirit of blind and infuriated

¹Nevins, Ordeal of the Union, Vol. I, pp. 9, 221, 250-251. After its initial failure to pass the Senate, the Wilmot Proviso was repeatedly reintroduced in subsequent sessions of Congress; however, Southern Senators were able to prevent its being enacted.

fanaticism" on the part of Northern abolitionists.² The reaction of Southern extremists also contributed to the tension. In October a special Mississippi convention had issued a call for a Southern convention to be held in Nashville the following June "with a view and the hope of arresting the course of aggression" on Southern rights, and, if necessary, "to devise and adopt some mode of resistance."³

Thus the sectional controversy appeared to be nearing a critical point when the Georgia General Assembly met early in November, 1849. In his message to the legislature on November 6, Governor Towns denounced abolitionist agitation, the effort to exclude slavery from the territories, and attempts to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia as well as to end the interstate slave trade as being aggressive acts against the South. Towns charged that "one aggression is quickly succeeded by another," and declared,

While wrongs should be endured for a season rather than resort to extreme measures, . . . I cannot . . . persuade myself that our safety, or honor, will permit the perpetuation of another additional aggression to the list of wrongs so long and patiently borne from the North.⁴

If such aggressions were attempted by the federal government, they "must be repelled, all amicable means being first exhausted, by all the power, moral and physical, at the command of the State."

²Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, at a Biennial Session of the General Assembly, Begun and Held in Milledgeville, the Seat of Government, in 1849 and '50 (Milledgeville: Richard M. Orme, State Printer, 1850), p. 34. (Hereinafter cited as Journal of the House, 1849-1850.)

³Shryock, Georgia and the Union, p. 213.

⁴Journal of the House, 1849-1850, pp. 34-36.

Referring to the fact that he had expressed similar opinions in his recent successful campaign for governor, Towns told the legislators that he spoke for "the great body of our constituents." He concluded by asking the General Assembly to grant him the authority to call a convention of the people of Georgia to

. . . take into consideration the measures proper for their safety and preservation, in the event of the passage of the Wilmot Proviso, or other kindred measure, by the Congress of the United States.⁵

Before the legislature adjourned in the spring of 1850, it met Towns' request by passing an act providing for a state convention if any one of five contingencies occurred. Four acts of Congress were specified--the prohibition of slavery in any United States territory, the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, the abolition of the interstate slave trade and the admission of California or New Mexico to the union. The fifth contingency was the refusal of the authorities of any Northern state to yield fugitive slaves on demand. The convention bill provided that in the event of

. . . either of the foregoing events, it shall be and is hereby made the duty of the Governor of this State, within sixty days thereafter, to issue his proclamation ordering an election to be held in each and every county to a convention of the people of this State to convene at the seat of Government within twenty days after said election.⁶

The Georgia Senate approved this act by a vote of thirty-one to eight;⁷ the House passed it by a vote of one hundred and six to

⁵Ibid., p. 37.

⁶Ibid., pp. 513-515.

⁷Federal Union (Milledgeville), September 10, 1850.

twelve.⁸ However, the vote in the House is somewhat misleading. After the convention bill passed the House, twenty-seven of those who had voted in favor of the bill signed a protest against the California-New Mexico admission clause. These representatives explained that they had voted for the bill in spite of their failure to prevent the inclusion of this clause because they felt that the other contingencies strongly justified the calling of a state convention. On the other hand, they considered the admission of California and/or New Mexico constitutional and not "valid cause for the call of a Convention." They also protested against

. . . any measure or mode of redress, the inevitable tendency whereof leads to a dissolution of this most "perfect Union," . . . until such time as the action of Congress clearly indicates a deliberate intention by the free States to disregard the guarantees of the Constitution and to trample upon the rights of the people of the Southern States to their property in slaves.⁹

In addition to the convention bill, the legislature passed a series of resolutions more radical than any previously introduced in the Georgia General Assembly. These resolutions, known as the Georgia Resolutions, included an implied threat of secession as well as an endorsement of the means of implementing this threat--a state convention. They were originally submitted in mid-November and were approved by both the House and the Senate by early February.¹⁰ The first seven of these ten resolutions were general declarations of Southern rights and

⁸Journal of the House, 1849-1850, p. 520.

⁹Ibid., pp. 546-548.

¹⁰Shryock, Georgia and the Union, pp. 220, 232.

citations of Northern encroachments on these rights; the eighth expressed approval of the policy incorporated into the convention bill.

The ninth resolution stated that

. . . the people of Georgia entertain an ardent feeling of devotion to the union of these States, and that nothing short of a persistence in the present system of encroachment upon our rights by the non-slaveholding States can induce us to contemplate the possibility of a dissolution.¹¹

After considerable debate the House approved the eighth resolution by a vote of ninety-eight to twenty-eight; however, the ninth resolution was passed by a majority of one hundred and twenty-two to one.¹²

While the General Assembly was debating the convention bill and the Georgia Resolutions, sectional controversy raged in the United States Congress. It had begun as soon as Congress met, with a battle in the House over the selection of a speaker. Although there were party overtones, the issues involved in the speakership contest were essentially sectional. After three weeks of bitter debate and sixty-three ballots, Howell Cobb of Georgia was elected.¹³

The difficulties encountered in the House in the election of a speaker foreshadowed even greater congressional discord over other sectional issues. Although California's application for admission to the union as a free state helped to precipitate the crisis, other questions related to slavery were involved, as the Georgia convention bill

¹¹Journal of the House, 1849-1850, pp. 484-486, 509.

¹²Ibid., pp. 507-510. The Senate vote on these resolutions is not available.

¹³Zachary Taylor Johnson, The Political Policies of Howell Cobb (Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1929), pp. 60-67.

indicates. In an effort to effect a broad compromise settlement of these questions, Kentucky Senator Henry Clay introduced a series of compromise measures in the Senate on January 28, 1850. After months of debate, most of Clay's proposals were embodied in five separate acts approved by Congress around the middle of September. Under these acts, known collectively as the Compromise of 1850, California was admitted to the union as a free state; the territories of New Mexico and Utah were established, with the decision as to whether they would apply for admission as slave or free states left up to residents of the territory; a portion of the land claimed by Texas was granted to New Mexico in return for which the United States assumed responsibility for Texas' public debt prior to 1845; the slave trade was abolished in the District of Columbia; and a stringent fugitive slave law was enacted.¹⁴

Although Congress had not abolished slavery in the District of Columbia or the interstate slave trade and had approved no act prohibiting slavery anywhere, one of the contingencies specified in the Georgia convention bill was involved in the compromise measures. Since California had been admitted to the union, Governor Towns promptly issued a call for a state convention to meet in December.¹⁵ However, it should be remembered that at least twenty-seven members of the Georgia legislature who felt strongly enough about Southern rights to vote for the convention bill had nevertheless disapproved of this particular act as grounds for a convention.

¹⁴Shryock, Georgia and the Union, pp. 238-240, 295.

¹⁵Federal Union, September 24, 1850.

Between the passage of the convention bill and the calling of the convention, there had been indications that many Georgians favored a more moderate course than that suggested by the actions of a majority of the legislators. The legislature had approved Georgia's participation in the Nashville Convention,¹⁶ yet when the election of delegates to this convention was held in April, it proved a farce. Only about 2,500 Georgians voted in this election, and a portion of these cast write-in votes of protest against the convention.¹⁷ On the other hand, nearly 90,000 votes had been recorded in the gubernatorial election of the previous fall.¹⁸ Thus at least 97 percent of these voters chose to ignore the election of delegates to the Nashville Convention.

Some supporters of the Southern unity movement attributed the light vote to the absence of opposition candidates, arguing that, since only one slate of nominees had been presented in each district, the people had felt it unnecessary to vote. It was also suggested that a tendency to identify the Nashville Convention with a potential disunion move might have been a factor. However, a more accurate assessment of the results of this election would seem to be that a large number of the people in Georgia "either desired compromise or else were indifferent to the whole controversy, during the winter and spring of 1850."¹⁹

By the end of the summer little indifference was evident in

¹⁶Journal of the House, 1849-1850, pp. 657-658.

¹⁷Shryock, Georgia and the Union, pp. 257-258.

¹⁸Georgia Journal and Messenger (Macon), December 19, 1849.

¹⁹Shryock, Georgia and the Union, pp. 259-260, 262.

Georgia. Congress was about to pass the compromise measures, and union and resistance meetings were being held in counties throughout the state.²⁰ In September, three of Georgia's congressmen, Howell Cobb,²¹ Alexander Stephens,²² and Robert Toombs,²³ returned to lead the campaign for acceptance of the Compromise. Speaking in various parts of the state, they argued that the admission of California was not unconstitutional and that the Compromise as a whole was an honorable settlement. Stephens and Cobb were both conservatives; they had been expected to support the unionist position. However, Toombs had been an outspoken defender of Southern rights in Congress, and his alignment with the unionists was a blow to the resistance cause.²⁴

Toombs had expressed his opposition to the California clause in

²⁰Ibid., pp. 281-283.

²¹Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950), p. 994. (Hereinafter cited as Biographical Directory of Congress.) At age thirty-five, Cobb had served eight years in Congress, including one term as speaker of the House. He was subsequently elected governor in 1851 and returned to the U. S. House in 1855. In 1857 he became Secretary of the Treasury but resigned in December, 1860 to become a leader in Georgia's secession movement.

²²Ibid., p. 1859. Stephens had been a member of the Georgia legislature for six years before his election to Congress in 1843. He served in the House from this time until 1859. He later became vice-president of the Confederacy.

²³Ibid., p. 1926. Toombs had served in the Georgia General Assembly before he was elected to Congress in 1844. He represented Georgia in the U. S. House until 1852, when he was elected to the Senate. He held the latter post until Georgia seceded, after which he served as Confederate Secretary of State.

²⁴Johnson, The Political Policies of Howell Cobb, pp. 98-100.

the Georgia convention bill in March, 1850,²⁵ but the tone of his speeches had suggested that he might oppose the Compromise. In February he declared,

Though the Union may perish, though slavery may perish, I WARN MY COUNTRYMEN NEVER TO SURRENDER THEIR RIGHT TO AN EQUAL PARTICIPATION IN THE COMMON PROPERTY OF THE REPUBLIC, nor their right to full and ample protection of their own property from their own government. THE DAY THEY DO THIS DEED "THEIR FALL WILL BE LIKE THAT OF LUCIFER, NEVER TO RISE AGAIN."²⁶

As late as June Toombs said that the South would stand by the union if its "just rights" were protected, but that if these rights were refused he was ready to "strike for Independence."²⁷ However, in September, when Congress was voting on the compromise bills, Toombs indicated that he would stand with the Georgia unionists, commenting that

From the first day of this session to this hour I have had but one ultimatum. That was--hostile legislation by Congress against our property. That I have been, now am, and shall ever be ready to resist. No man is more rejoiced than I am that this alternative is not presented to me by these bills.²⁸

Governor Towns apparently believed that a majority of the people of Georgia agreed with Toombs' statement that resistance to the Compromise was unnecessary.²⁹ Nevertheless, on September 23 Towns issued

²⁵Federal Union, March 26, 1850. Toombs to George W. Towns, March 11, 1850.

²⁶Federal Union, October 15, 1850. This quotation appeared under the masthead of this resistance paper during the two months prior to the convention. The obvious implication was that, in advocating acceptance of the Compromise, Toombs himself had "fallen" and would never rise again.

²⁷Congressional Globe, 31st Congress, 1st Sess. (1849-1850), XXI, Pt. 2, p. 1216.

²⁸Ibid., p. 1775.

²⁹Shryock, Georgia and the Union, p. 300.

a proclamation calling a state convention for the purpose of "redressing present wrongs, and providing other safeguards for future security." He attempted to persuade the citizens of his state that it was

. . . an hour of danger--when your institutions are in jeopardy--your feelings wantonly outraged, your social organizations derided, your honor deeply wounded and the Federal Constitution violated by a series of aggressive measures, all tending to the consummation of one object, the abolition of slavery. . . .³⁰

However, Towns' appeal and the efforts of others who advocated resistance were unsuccessful. When delegates to the convention were elected on November 25, union papers hailed the results as a triumph for the unionists.³¹ In turn most of the resistance papers conceded defeat.³²

More than a year had elapsed between this election and the time that the convention was proposed. The General Assembly had deliberated for nearly three months before authorizing the convention, and almost seven months passed before it was actually called. Finally, over two months intervened between the governor's proclamation calling the convention and the election of delegates.

The sequence of events was much more rapid in 1860-1861. On November 8, 1860 Georgia Governor Joseph E. Brown asked the General Assembly to authorize a convention if Lincoln were elected president, and within nine days the legislature had granted his request. Brown issued

³⁰Federal Union, September 24, 1850.

³¹Daily Chronicle and Sentinel (Augusta), November 30, 1850; Columbus Enquirer, December 3, 1850.

³²Daily Constitutionalist (Augusta), November 27, 1850; Georgia Telegraph (Macon), December 3, 1850.

a proclamation calling the convention on November 21, only two weeks after his speech to the General Assembly. Delegates were elected a month and a half later.³³

When Governor Brown delivered his special message to the legislature on November 8, the returns of the presidential election of the day before were still incomplete. However, Brown was convinced that Lincoln had been elected and based his message on this conclusion.³⁴ He asked the General Assembly to pass retaliatory laws against the citizens of Northern states in which personal liberty laws impeded the execution of the Fugitive Slave Law of 1850 and to approve discriminatory taxes on goods from the eight Northern states that had "most palpably violated the Constitution by their legislation and their action." The governor also recommended the appropriation of a one million dollar military fund so that Georgia might be placed in "a defensive condition as fast as possible and prepare for an emergency, which must be met sooner or later."³⁵

The most significant portion of Governor Brown's message dealt with the issue of secession. He argued that separate state secession was the right of any sovereign state and urged the calling of a state convention at an "early date" if "it is ascertained that the Black

³³T. Conn Bryan, "The Secession of Georgia," Georgia Historical Quarterly, XXXI (June, 1947), pp. 89-92.

³⁴Ibid., p. 89.

³⁵Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, at the Annual Session of the General Assembly, Commenced at Milledgeville, November 7, 1860 (Milledgeville: Boughton, Nisbet and Barnes, State Printers, 1860), pp. 41-42, 57. (Hereinafter cited as Journal of the House, 1860.)

Republicans have triumphed over us." Quoting the words of an earlier governor of Georgia, Brown concluded his message by saying, "To every demand for further concessions, or compromise of our rights, we should reply, 'The argument is exhausted,' and we now 'stand by our arms.'"³⁶

According to Herschel V. Johnson,³⁷ the Georgia legislators were at first undecided as to what course the state should take; "they were wavering, confused, without a plan and almost without a policy." Johnson insisted that if the legislators had been "left to themselves" they "would have inclined to a conservative course." He charged that "outside counsellors," specifically former "leaders of the Breckenridge [sic] democracy," who were present and "rampant for immediate secession," aroused the legislators and influenced their actions.³⁸

The initial indecision described by Johnson was reflected in the General Assembly's invitation to prominent state leaders to speak before the legislators and to advise them as to what action should be taken. On November 12, 13, 14 and 15 four of the most important speeches made in response to this invitation were delivered before joint sessions of

³⁶Ibid., pp. 47-48, 57.

³⁷Percy Scott Flippin, Herschel V. Johnson of Georgia, State Rights Unionist (Richmond: Dietz Printing Co., 1931), pp. 153, 157-158, xxiii. Johnson had served as a United States Senator from Georgia, two terms as governor of the state and had been the vice-presidential nominee on the Douglas ticket in 1860. A strong opponent of secession, he was invited to address the legislature when the convention bill was under consideration, but declined. However, he did express his support for the state convention as well as a policy of co-operation with other Southern states in a letter to several legislators.

³⁸Herschel V. Johnson, "From the Autobiography of Herschel V. Johnson, 1856-1867," American Historical Review, XXX (January, 1925), p. 323. (Hereinafter cited as "Autobiography.")

the General Assembly.³⁹

Thomas R. R. Cobb⁴⁰ opened the debate with an emotional appeal for immediate secession. He argued that Lincoln's election justified secession on both legal and political grounds. The "spirit of the Constitution" had been violated by an alliance of "Abolitionism and Agrarianism" which had brought to power the representative of a party of "fanatics" unwilling to compromise on the issue most vital to the South, slavery.⁴¹ Under these circumstances Georgia had no choice; she must secede immediately, for "there is danger in delay." Delay would invite aggression from the North. It would create doubt as to the courage of Georgians and weaken the support of Northern conservatives who were in sympathy with the oppressed South. Finally, secession should be immediate because the current administration was friendly to the South and unlikely to initiate a policy of coercion. These factors led Cobb to

³⁹N. B. Beck, "The Secession Debate in Georgia, November, 1860-January, 1861," Antislavery and Disunion, 1858-1861: Studies in the Rhetoric of Compromise and Conflict, ed. J. Jeffery Auer (New York: Harper and Row, 1963), pp. 336-340, 344. (Hereinafter cited as "Secession Debate.")

⁴⁰William J. Northen (ed.), Men of Mark in Georgia, Vol. III (Atlanta: A. B. Caldwell, 1911), pp. 336-337. The younger brother of Howell Cobb, T. R. R. Cobb was a noted Georgia lawyer and the author of the Georgia Legal Code. Although he was the brother of one of the state's most powerful political leaders, he had not been active in politics previously.

⁴¹"Substance of Remarks Made by Thomas R. R. Cobb, Esq., Before the General Assembly of Georgia, November 12th, 1860" (hereinafter cited as "Cobb Before the General Assembly"), The Confederate Records of the State of Georgia, Vol. I, ed. Allen D. Chandler (Atlanta: Charles P. Byrd, State Printer, 1909), pp. 167-174 (hereinafter cited as Confederate Records).

the conclusion that only immediate action could "preserve peace."⁴²

Cobb ended his speech by exhorting the legislators to

. . . wait not till the grog-shops and cross-roads send up a discordant voice from a divided people, but act as leaders, in guiding and forming public opinion. Speak no uncertain words, but let your united voice go forth to be resounded from every mountain top and echoed from every gaping valley; . . . until it shall put a tongue in every bleeding wound of Georgia's mangled honor which shall cry to Heaven for "Liberty or Death."⁴³

On the following night Robert Toombs spoke in favor of immediate secession. As had Cobb, Toombs maintained that "the election of Lincoln, with all of its surroundings" was sufficient cause for disunion. Northern hostility had been made evident by the failure to abide by the Fugitive Slave Law, the attempt to exclude slavery from the territories, and efforts to incite Southern slaves to insurrection. When Lincoln assumed office, he would employ the "power of the Federal Government" to aid his "abolition horde" in "consumating their avowed purposes," which included the "final and total abolition" of slavery. Toombs told the legislators that Georgia must secede and that

Nothing but ruin will follow delay. . . . Twenty years of labor, and toil, and taxes all expended upon preparation would not make up for the advantage your enemies would gain if the rising sun of the fifth of March should find you in the Union. Then strike, strike while it is yet time.⁴⁴

On November 14, after both Toombs and Cobb had urged immediate secession, Alexander Stephens made a plea for a final effort to secure redress of Southern grievances within the union. He told his audience

⁴²Ibid., pp. 178-179, 180.

⁴³Ibid., p. 182.

⁴⁴"Speech of Hon. Robert Toombs, Delivered Before the Legislature," Georgia Telegraph, December 6, 1860.

that his object was "not to stir up strife, but to allay it; not to appeal to your passions, but to your reason." Stephens believed that Lincoln would be unable to do anything to jeopardize Southern safety or security, "whatever may be his spirit to do it." He argued that the President could do nothing unless he was "backed by power in Congress," and since there were conservative majorities in both houses of Congress, Lincoln's "hands are tied." Therefore, immediate secession would be both unnecessary and unwise.⁴⁵

Stephens was, however, in favor of a state convention. He recommended that this convention reaffirm the Georgia Platform with the additional provision that the Northern states repeal their personal liberty laws as "a condition of our remaining in the Union." He also contended that the Northern states should be given time to consider this ultimatum before any Southern state seceded.⁴⁶

Finally, Stephens advocated the calling of a conference in which all the Southern states would be represented. He told his fellow Georgians that, if disunion should become necessary,

. . . let us not be divided among ourselves. But if possible secure the united co-operation of all the Southern States and then in the face of the civilized world we may justify our action, and, with the wrong all on the other side we can appeal to the God of battles to aid us in our cause. But let us not do anything in which any portion of our people may charge us with rash or hasty action.⁴⁷

⁴⁵"Speech of Hon. A. H. Stephens Delivered in the House of Representatives of Georgia, Wed. Evening, Nov. 14th, 1860," Southern Recorder (Milledgeville), November 20, 1860. (Hereinafter cited as "Speech of Stephens.")

⁴⁶Ibid.

⁴⁷Ibid.

In addition to this outline of the course of action that he favored, Stephens also defined his position on an issue which had apparently been under discussion in the capitol city during the first week of the legislative session--secession by act of the General Assembly. He seemed to interpret T. R. R. Cobb's somewhat ambiguous closing burst of rhetoric as an appeal for such an act. Stephens referred directly to Cobb's speech when he warned the legislature that it was "not the proper body to sever our Federal relations" and had "no power so to act." He told the members of the General Assembly,

You must refer this question to the people and you must wait to hear from the men at the cross-roads and even the groceries; for the people . . . are the Sovereigns in this country. Sovereignty is not in the Legislature. . . . You Legislators . . . are the servants of the people and not their masters.⁴⁸

The effect of Stephens' position on this point was evaluated by H. V. Johnson, who said that it "perhaps prevented any formal attempt to take the State out of the Union by Legislative action." Johnson also commented that many distinguished men, including Toombs and T. R. R. Cobb

. . . urged the Legislature to take Georgia out of the Union. . . . they could not wait the slow process of referring the question to the people by calling a Convention. They hesitated to trust the people. At one time the General Assembly--or rather a majority--were disposed to heed these rash counsels.⁴⁹

Johnson's charge that Toombs favored legislative secession is corroborated by an exchange between Toombs and Stephens during the latter's speech to the General Assembly. After Stephens told the

⁴⁸Ibid.

⁴⁹Johnson, "Autobiography," p. 323.

legislators that they did not have the authority to take Georgia out of the union but must call a convention representative of the sovereignty of the people, Toombs commented, "I am afraid of conventions." Stephens replied that he did not fear "any convention legally chosen by the people." He charged that Toombs "wished to have no convention, but for the Legislature to submit their vote to the people, 'submission to abolition rule or resistance?'" This, according to Stephens, was unfair, for "who in Georgia is going to submit to abolition rule?" Toombs' reply was, "The convention will."⁵⁰

The issue of legislative secession was also raised in the Georgia House on November 14 when a representative from Catoosa county introduced resolutions stating that

. . . on account of the many treasonable acts passed by Northern fanatical Legislatures, and other wrongs, insults and indignities heaped upon the Southern states by reckless and unscrupulous majorities, . . . Georgia should no longer remain in the Union--now a Union only in Name--a Union of oppression and aggression by the North upon the South.

Be it therefore further Resolved, That Georgia ought not, and will not, remain any longer in this so-called Union, but that she will and does hereby separate herself from it and look to her own sources for the justice and equality that have been denied her by the Northern States.⁵¹

The question as to whether Georgia's action would be determined by the legislature or by a convention authorized by that body was resolved by a non-legislative conference of prominent state leaders. On November 13 the Joint Committee on the State of the Republic issued an open letter to twenty-two persons, including Governor Brown, Toombs,

⁵⁰"Speech of Stephens," Southern Recorder, November 20, 1860.

⁵¹Daily Chronicle and Sentinel, November 16, 1860.

Stephens and T. R. R. Cobb, requesting that these men meet and try to reach an agreement that would promote state unity. The letter stated that the members of the joint committee believed that if these twenty-two men, who had "long enjoyed the confidence of our people, can agree upon a policy--that policy will be adopted by the Legislature, and will be approved by the people."⁵²

A meeting was held in response to this letter, and on November 15 one of the participants, Benjamin H. Hill,⁵³ announced the results to the General Assembly. Hill stated that "prominent leaders of all shades of opinion" had conferred that day and had agreed that "it was the right and the privilege of the people in convention to pass on these questions."⁵⁴

Hill advocated essentially the same policy as that proposed by Alexander Stephens. He called on Georgians to "defend the Union against its enemies, until that Union shall take sides with the enemy, and then let us defend ourselves against both." When he was interrupted with a question as to how long he would wait before despairing of redress within the union, Hill replied,

Until the experiment is tried . . . the contingencies may transpire before the fourth of March next. If they do not,

⁵²Georgia Telegraph, November 22, 1860.

⁵³Northen, Men of Mark in Georgia, Vol. III, pp. 336-339. Hill was a controversial politician active in Georgia for more than a decade prior to 1860. Elected to the Georgia House in 1851, he was defeated in bids for a seat in Congress in 1855 and the governorship in 1857. He had been elected to the Georgia Senate in 1859.

⁵⁴Southern Recorder, November 27, 1860.

if a larger time shall be needed, Mr. Lincoln cannot do us damage.⁵⁵

By November 16 the legislators had heard the views of invited speakers who favored immediate secession as well as those who opposed it. They had been advised by both the governor and a conference of state leaders that they should authorize a state convention. On November 15 the one million dollar state defense bill requested by Governor Brown and approved by the House had been passed without a dissenting vote in the Senate.⁵⁶ Two days later the Senate also passed a bill providing for an election to be held on the first Wednesday in January, 1861, to select delegates to a state convention which would meet on the sixteenth of January.⁵⁷ On November 20 the House gave its unanimous approval to this bill,⁵⁸ and the following day Governor Brown issued a proclamation officially calling a convention to "consider the mode, measure and time" of resistance.⁵⁹

The convention bill submitted to the Senate on November 17 stated that delegates would be elected on December 20, and the convention would meet on January 9. A last-minute amendment changed these

⁵⁵Ibid.

⁵⁶Journal of the Senate of the State of Georgia, at the Annual Session of the General Assembly, Commenced at Milledgeville, November 7, 1860 (Milledgeville: Boughton, Nisbet and Barnes, State Printers, 1860), pp. 91-92. (Hereinafter cited as Journal of the Senate, 1860.)

⁵⁷Ibid., pp. 97-98. Vote not recorded.

⁵⁸Journal of the House, 1860, pp. 106-107.

⁵⁹Federal Union, November 27, 1860.

dates to January 2 and January 16 respectively.⁶⁰ While the amended bill, which delayed the election for nearly two weeks and the convention for an additional week, was a slight concession to conservatism, it is possible that the change in dates inadvertently aided the secessionists. As late as December 19, the day before the election would have been scheduled, a secessionist from Southwest Georgia wrote

. . . there is work to be done and nobody doing it. I am fearful of the consequences of such supineness and neglect. . . . We have done what little we can here but there is great need for missionaries in every part of the State. The cry of co-operation is injuring us.⁶¹

Yet by the end of the month one of the co-operationist leaders, Alexander Stephens, could "see no ray of hope." With the election only two days away, he was almost certain that "this State will go for secession."⁶²

Although it is not possible to predict, with any claim to accuracy, what might have happened had the convention delegates been elected on December 20 rather than on January 2, the events of the intervening period are considered to have been important factors in the secessionist victory on the latter date. These events included the secession of South Carolina and indications that congressional compromise efforts

⁶⁰Journal of the Senate, 1860, pp. 97-98.

⁶¹Ulrich B. Phillips (ed.), The Correspondence of Robert Toombs, Alexander H. Stephens, and Howell Cobb, Vol. II, Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1911 (Washington: American Historical Assn., 1913), p. 524. A. Hood to Howell Cobb, December 19, 1860. (Hereinafter cited as Correspondence of Toombs, Stephens, and Cobb.)

⁶²Ibid., pp. 526-527. Stephens to J. Henly Smith, December 31, 1860.

would be unsuccessful.⁶³

South Carolina adopted her ordinance of secession on December 20. The day before a Georgian commenting on secessionist prospects in the state had written that if South Carolina seceded "at once, we are safe, if not we are in danger."⁶⁴ Historians tend to concur in the belief that South Carolina's action "aided the secession movement" in Georgia.⁶⁵ Whatever the degree of influence exerted on the Georgia electorate by South Carolina's secession, it would have been reduced had this event coincided with the election of delegates for the simple reason that a number of voters would have been unaware of it.

Co-operationists responded to South Carolina's secession with the argument that separate state secession on the part of one or more Southern states did not invalidate either the principle of co-operation or its potential effectiveness. Even if Mississippi, Alabama and Florida followed South Carolina's example before the Georgia convention met, this would leave "ten Southern States, whose approval of immediate, separate secession is . . . doubtful; the disapproval of some of them being unquestionable." Therefore, it was argued,

If one-third of the aggrieved States adopt the course of immediate secession, let the remaining two-thirds try the plan of pacific adjustment. We may be able to effect an adjustment, and to secure guaranties satisfactory to all, and thus win back the more precipitate. It is even possible that their absence from

⁶³Bryan, "The Secession of Georgia," pp. 93-95.

⁶⁴Phillips, Correspondence of Toombs, Stephens, and Cobb, p. 524. A. Hood to Howell Cobb, December 19, 1860.

⁶⁵Bryan, "The Secession of Georgia," p. 93.

our counsels, their extreme position, may make more apparent the necessity for amicable adjustment, and may thus aid our negotiations.⁶⁶

This argument undoubtedly convinced some Georgians that co-operation was still practical. However, it has been asserted that the actual secession of one state and the probable secession of three more coupled with proposals that the seceding states co-operate after the fact in the formation of a Southern Confederacy "caused many co-operationists to move into the secession ranks."⁶⁷

Another factor which tended to disillusion co-operationists was the failure of special committees of both houses of Congress to report compromise measures. The House Committee of Thirty-Three, made up of one representative from each state, voted in mid-December to postpone until the end of the month the consideration of proposals relating to constitutional amendments demanded by Southerners.⁶⁸ Thirty Southern members of Congress reacted by informing their constituents that further efforts to reach a compromise were hopeless. Five of Georgia's eight congressmen and her junior Senator, Alfred Iverson, were among those who signed this document. This address declared that "all hope for relief in the Union, through the agency of committees, Congressional legislation, or Constitutional amendments is extinguished." Because the Republicans were "resolute in their purpose to grant nothing that will, or ought, to satisfy the South," these men advocated immediate, separate

⁶⁶"Mr. [Charles J.] Jenkins' Address at the City Hall, Monday, December 24th, Daily Chronicle and Sentinel, December 25, 1860.

⁶⁷Bryan, "The Secession of Georgia," p. 95.

⁶⁸Dumond, Secession Movement, pp. 155-157, 159-160.

state secession and the formation of a Southern Confederacy.⁶⁹

The address of the Southern congressmen did not destroy Georgia co-operationists' hopes of defeating the secessionists in January. On the day that the secessionist congressmen issued their address, fifty-two members of the Georgia General Assembly met and prepared an address of their own to the conventions of those states scheduled to meet prior to the Georgia convention. This address urged that no Southern state take "final separate State action . . . on the question of our longer continuance as members of the present confederacy of States" until a "General Convention" of Southern states "shall assemble and deliberate." Resolutions were adopted repudiating separate state secession on Georgia's part and suggesting "that the people require every candidate seeking their votes, to take distinct position against immediate separate State secession, at least until a proper effort for co-operation has failed."⁷⁰

The Southern congressmen had been unable to cite any tangible evidence to support their contention that there was no hope of congressional action. However, by December 23 Robert Toombs, who was a member of the special Senate Committee of Thirteen, could do more than express an unsupported opinion. In a telegram addressed "to the People of Georgia," Toombs reported that compromise proposals which he had submitted to the Committee of Thirteen had been "treated with either derision or contempt" by Republicans on the committee. Furthermore, a compromise

⁶⁹"Address of Southern Congressmen," Federal Union, December 25, 1860.

⁷⁰Daily Chronicle and Sentinel, December 18, 1860.

settlement introduced by Kentucky Senator J. J. Crittenden had been defeated in the committee by the unanimous vote of the Republicans. Finally, "a majority of the Black Republican members of the Committee DECLARED DISTINCTLY THAT THEY HAD NO GUARANTEES TO OFFER, which was silently acquiesced in by the other members."⁷¹

Toombs had gone to Washington to apply "a test which ought to satisfy every honest resistance man in Georgia." He proposed to

. . . offer in Congress such amendments of the Constitution as will give you full and ample security for your rights; then if the Black Republican party will vote for the amendments, or even a majority of them in good faith, they can be easily carried through Congress; then I think it would be reasonable and fair to postpone final action until the Legislatures of the northern States could be conveniently called together for definite action on the amendments. If they intend to stop this war on your rights and your property, they will adopt such amendments at once in Congress; if they will not do this, you ought not to delay an hour after the fourth of March to secede from the Union.⁷²

Whether Toombs was motivated by a genuine hope that his "test" might succeed in averting disunion,⁷³ or whether he simply sought to strengthen the position of the secessionists⁷⁴ is beside the point here. His motives did not lessen the impact of his telegram. The belief that compromise within the union was possible had been one of the cornerstones of the co-operationist program. When Toombs shattered this

⁷¹"Address of Senator Toombs to the People of Georgia," Federal Union, January 1, 1860. (Hereinafter cited as "Address of Toombs.")

⁷²Southern Recorder, December 25, 1860. Robert Toombs to Messrs. E. B. Pullin and Others, December 13, 1860.

⁷³Phillips, Georgia and States Rights, p. 200.

⁷⁴Kenneth M. Stampp, And the War Came: The North and the Secession Crisis, 1860-1861 (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1950), p. 134.

belief, he also shattered co-operationists' hopes of preventing Georgia's secession.⁷⁵

Toombs spoke with authority when he told Georgians,

I came here to secure your constitutional rights or to demonstrate to you that you can get no guarantees for these rights from your Northern confederates. . . . I have put the test fairly and frankly. It is decisive against you; and now I tell you upon the faith of a true man that all further looking to the North for security for your constitutional rights in the Union ought to be instantly abandoned. . . . Secession by the fourth of March next should be thundered from the ballot-box by the unanimous voice of Georgia on the second day of January next.⁷⁶

There was thunder in Georgia on January 2, but it was produced by a storm rather than by the secessionists. Contemporary observers believed that there was a light voter turn-out as a result of the adverse weather conditions as well as earlier rains which had made roads "almost impassable" in some areas.⁷⁷ Moreover, there were conflicting reports concerning the outcome of the election. Although complete election returns were not available, secessionist papers claimed that a majority of the delegates elected favored disunion, while co-operationist editors contended that this was doubtful.⁷⁸

Less than two months had elapsed between the Republican victory in the presidential election and the election of delegates to Georgia's

⁷⁵Dumond, Secession Movement, pp. 198-199.

⁷⁶"Address of Toombs," Federal Union, January 1, 1860.

⁷⁷Federal Union, January 8, 1861; Daily Georgia Telegraph, January 3, 1861. See Chapter VI for a more complete discussion of this aspect of the election.

⁷⁸Federal Union, January 8, 1861; Southern Recorder, January 15, 1861. See Chapter VI for an analysis of the results of this election.

convention. The latter election had been held while the emotional reaction to the former was still at its height. This emotional reaction had been intensified by indications that there was little likelihood of a meaningful congressional compromise of sectional issues.

This was in sharp contrast to the situation in 1850, when Georgia's governor proposed the convention over a year before it met, and the legislature waited another three months before acting on this proposal. Furthermore, the General Assembly approved the Georgia Resolutions and the convention bill at the peak of a sectional debate in Congress, when there had seemed to be little hope of a compromise settlement. However, by the time the convention bill was invoked such a compromise had been maneuvered through Congress.

CHAPTER III

CONVENTION ACTION: 1850, 1861

The Compromise of 1850 had been intended as a final solution to the sectional controversy, but, in effect, it was only a truce. The Georgia Convention of 1850 ratified this truce; the Convention of 1861 repudiated both the truce and the union it had been designed to preserve. This was the major difference between these two conventions--the contrast which makes their comparison worthwhile.

After the unionist victory in the election of delegates in 1850, a resistance paper bemoaned the defeat of the "men who would have saved the state,"¹ but the delegates who assembled in Milledgeville on December 10 were determined to save both the state and the union. The latter intention was expressed by the convention's president at the outset when he said that he would prefer death to a dissolution of the union.² However, as the convention progressed, it became evident that this extreme did not accurately reflect the feelings of most of the delegates. A majority of these delegates considered the union "secondary in importance only to the rights and principles it was designed to perpetuate"

¹Georgia Telegraph, December 3, 1850.

²"Debates and Proceedings of the Convention," Federal Union, December 17, 1850. (Hereinafter cited as "Debates and Proceedings.") This report, begun in the December 17 issue and completed in the December 24 issue, was later published in pamphlet form. Considered a more valuable source than the official journal of the convention because it contains detailed accounts of debates not available in the latter, it is utilized extensively herein. However, the official journal will, in most instances, be the preferred source for votes.

and believed that it should be preserved "so long as it continues to be the safeguard of those rights and principles." On the other hand, Georgia would resist certain encroachments on these rights to the "last resort" of disunion if it became necessary.³

These statements were part of the report presented by a thirty-three man committee appointed on the second day of the convention. This committee, composed of three delegates from each judicial district in the state, was instructed to "report, for the consideration of the Convention, action appropriate to the occasion."⁴ The chairman, who is usually credited with writing the Report of the Committee of Thirty-Three, was Charles J. Jenkins.⁵ Jenkins read the committee's report to the convention on December 13. It consisted of a lengthy preamble, addressed in part to the people of Georgia and in part to the people of the North, as well as five resolutions, which became known as the Georgia Platform.⁶

The portion of the preamble addressed to the people of Georgia traced the events leading up to the Compromise of 1850 and concluded that only a "spirit of mutual concession" had made the passage of the compromise measures possible. Noting that Georgians found grounds for

³Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 18-19.

⁴Ibid., pp. 6-7.

⁵Northen, Men of Mark in Georgia, Vol. III, pp. 283-284. Jenkins was an Augusta lawyer who had served in both houses of the Georgia General Assembly and had been elected speaker of the Georgia House three times. An unsuccessful candidate for governor in 1853, he was appointed to the Georgia Supreme Court in 1860.

⁶Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 11-19.

objection as well as approval in the Compromise as a whole, the preamble asked, "May Georgia, consistent with her honor, abide by the general scheme of pacification? If she may, then does her interest lie in adherence to it, or in resistance?"⁷

In answer to the first question, it was argued that because concessions had been made by the North in all other areas, the admission of California could be accepted "honorably and gracefully" even by those who considered it "inexpedient and unconstitutional."⁸

The discussion of the second question dealt with only the most extreme form of resistance, secession, which was termed "the only competent measure of resistance." When the issue was defined in this manner, the question became, in effect, was Georgia better off in the union than out of it? The response was that the advantages of remaining in the union far outweighed the disadvantages. Therefore, Georgia would accept the Compromise in order to "perpetuate the American Union, and to restore that peace and harmony upon which its value to herself, to her confederates, and to mankind, essentially depends."⁹

The preamble then addressed the people of the North in what it called "the language of calm and frank remonstrance, rather than of defiance or menace." Appealing to their reason and sense of morality, it urged the citizens of the Northern states to live up to all the terms of the Compromise and to cease the agitation of the slavery issue, for

⁷Ibid., pp. 11-13.

⁸Ibid.

⁹Ibid., pp. 13-14.

the South was "entitled to absolute security and quiet on this subject." Northern conservatives were advised that the responsibility for checking abolitionist activities rested with them. Finally, the preamble pointed out that although Georgia's "choice is fraternity and Union, with Constitutional rights," her "alternative" was "self-preservation by all the means which a favoring Providence may place at her disposal."¹⁰

During the debate preceding the vote on the preamble, resistance leaders attempted to modify this portion of the committee's report. They hoped to have the preamble considered paragraph by paragraph so that "there shall be an expression of opinion upon every proposition and . . . every member may have an opportunity of correcting every paragraph."¹¹ However, both this motion and a more direct attempt to amend the preamble along resistance lines were defeated. The preamble was then approved by a 236 to 23 majority.¹²

The five resolutions following the preamble were intended to clarify Georgia's position so that she would "be blameless of all future consequences." Each resolution was taken up separately. The first affirmed Georgia's loyalty to the union so long as it remained "the safeguard of those rights and principles" which it was established to maintain. The second expressed a belief in the policy of compromise as a means of preserving the union. Both of these resolutions were approved

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 14-18.

¹¹"Debates and Proceedings," Federal Union, December 24, 1850.

¹²Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 20-22.

without debate.¹³

The third resolution stated that, although Georgia did not approve of all the compromise measures, she was willing to accept the Compromise as a whole "as a permanent adjustment of this sectional controversy." The fact that Congress had rejected proposals to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia and to exclude slavery in the territory acquired from Mexico was cited as another reason for this decision on Georgia's part.¹⁴

Resistance leaders offered a series of resolutions as a substitute for the committee's third resolution. The resistance resolutions denounced the admission of California, the establishment of territorial governments in Utah and New Mexico, and the abolition of the slave trade in the District of Columbia as "unjust and oppressive to the South." The Fugitive Slave Law was declared to be no more than an act to enforce an already existing provision of the Constitution, and it was asserted that "the South never should have yielded any other right to secure such a law." The vote on the motion to strike the committee's third resolution, which also determined the fate of the resistance substitute, was 230 to 29 in favor of the committee's resolution.¹⁵

¹³Ibid., pp. 18-19, 22.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 19.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. 22-24. Shryock, in Georgia and the Union in 1850 (pp. 332-333), makes an inexplicable error when he states that the third resolution was accepted without opposition. Both the "Debates and Proceedings" of December 24 and the Journal of the Convention, 1850 are clear on this point. The chair ruled that the vote was to be on the motion to strike the committee's third resolution. The vote which defeated this motion precluded consideration of the resistance resolutions and also served to pass the third resolution as presented by the committee.

The last two resolutions drew the line on which Georgia would stand in the future. The wording of the fourth resolution prompted the most prolonged debate of the convention. For the first time some of the union delegates joined the resistance delegates in challenging a substantive portion of the report. The major point of dispute involved a clause in the resolution stating that Georgia would resist, even to the point of a dissolution of the union, the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia "without the consent and petition of the slave owners thereof." The debate centered on the question as to whether the consent of slave owners in the District of Columbia would give Congress the right to abolish slavery there. Another issue raised was whether the congressional emancipation of approximately two thousand slaves in the District of Columbia would justify so drastic a move as disunion.¹⁶

Those favoring the amendment of the fourth resolution argued that the number of slaves in the District of Columbia was insignificant; what was at stake was the principle of congressional non-intervention with the institution of slavery. They contended that if Congress abolished slavery anywhere, with or without the consent of the slaveholders involved, it would set a precedent for the abolition of slavery elsewhere in the South.¹⁷ Unionist and resistance delegates combined forces to approve the motion to strike the qualifying phrase "without the consent and petition of the slaveowners thereof" by a vote of two hundred

¹⁶"Debates and Proceedings," Federal Union, December 24, 1850.

¹⁷Ibid.

and fourteen to forty-five.¹⁸

The fourth resolution as amended and adopted by the convention read as follows:

. . . the State of Georgia, in the judgment of the Convention, will and ought to resist, even (as a last resort,) to a disruption of every tie which binds her to the Union, any action of Congress upon the subject of Slavery in the District of Columbia, or in places subject to the jurisdiction of Congress, incompatible with the safety, the domestic tranquility, the rights and the honor of the slaveholding States; or any act suppressing the slave trade between slaveholding States, or any refusal to admit, as a State, any territory hereafter applying because of the existence of slavery therein; or any act prohibiting the introduction of slaves into the territories of Utah and New Mexico, or any act repealing or materially modifying the laws now in force for the recovery of fugitive slaves.¹⁹

There was a conservative move to exclude the threat that Georgia's resistance to the acts enumerated in the fourth resolution would extend to the last resort of secession if necessary, but the attempt failed.²⁰

The fifth resolution reported by the committee stated that "it is the deliberate opinion of this Convention that upon the faithful execution of the Fugitive Slave Bill by the proper authorities depends the preservation of our much-loved Union."²¹ After a resistance motion to strike the words "by the proper authorities" failed to pass, and a minor amendment substituted the word "law" for "bill," the resolution was

¹⁸Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 25-26.

¹⁹"Debates and Proceedings," Federal Union, December 24, 1850.

²⁰Journal of the Convention, 1850, p. 27. The vote was not recorded.

²¹Ibid., p. 19.

carried.²²

Just prior to the final vote on the Report of the Committee of Thirty-Three in its entirety, resistance leaders introduced a series of resolutions summarizing the policy advocated by the resistance delegates. These resolutions asserted that the compromise measures not only violated "the principles of constitutional equality," but that lack of Northern support made the execution of the Fugitive Slave Law doubtful. They affirmed the right of secession and took a much stronger position on three of the acts specified in the committee report--the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, the refusal to admit a slave state to the union, and the "modification, repeal and non-enforcement of the fugitive slave law." These acts, according to the resistance resolutions, should be considered tantamount to disunion. It was also suggested that Georgia initiate a policy of political non-intercourse with the North and that these resolutions be submitted to the people of the state for ratification. As expected, the resolutions were defeated, but the resistance delegates had managed to put a coordinated and positive statement of their position on the record.²³

Resistance forces had been a small minority throughout the convention. However, while several of those who had consistently voted for resistance motions accepted the inevitable and cast their final vote for the Committee Report, most of the resistance delegates refused to yield. The entire Committee Report, as amended, was approved by a vote of two

²²Ibid., pp. 29-31.

²³Ibid., pp. 31-32.

hundred and thirty-seven to nineteen.²⁴

Thus the Convention of 1850, by an overwhelming majority, had determined that Georgia would accept the Compromise. It had also pointed out that no future compromise was possible insofar as certain issues were concerned. In essence, this convention gave notice that, although Georgia chose compromise and the union in this instance, this choice was neither unqualified nor irreversible. Disunion was an undesired alternative, but it was an alternative which would be considered as a last resort if future events made it necessary. Ten years later the Convention of 1861 met to decide whether disunion had become a necessity or whether it was still to be considered a last resort to be applied only if further efforts to achieve a compromise failed.

All but four of the three hundred and one delegates elected to the Convention of 1861 were present when the convention met on the sixteenth of January.²⁵ Governor Brown, Howell Cobb, the judges of the Georgia Superior Courts and the state Supreme Court as well as the commissioners from Alabama and South Carolina were invited to seats on the convention floor. These men were allowed to retain their seats when the convention voted to go into closed sessions on the third day.²⁶

On January 18 the convention adopted, by a vote of 166 to 130,

²⁴Ibid., pp. 32-33.

²⁵Bryan, "The Secession of Georgia," p. 96.

²⁶"Journal of the Public and Secret Proceedings of the Convention of the People of Georgia Held in Milledgeville and Savannah in 1861 Together With the Ordinances Adopted" (hereinafter cited as "Journal of the Convention, 1861"), Confederate Records, Vol. I, ed. Allen D. Chandler, pp. 219, 227.

resolutions affirming Georgia's "right and duty" to secede and providing for the appointment of a committee "to report an ordinance to assert the right, and fulfill the obligation of the State of Georgia to secede from the Union."²⁷ These resolutions were introduced by Eugenius Nisbet,²⁸ who is described as "a former unionist recently converted to separate state action."²⁹

Nisbet's resolutions were challenged by co-operationists when H. V. Johnson offered a series of substitute resolutions. The Johnson resolutions stated that Georgia hoped that the union might be preserved "if it can be done consistent with her rights and safety." In accordance with this hope, it was proposed that representatives of the ten slaveholding states still in the union meet in Atlanta on February 16, 1861, and that South Carolina, Mississippi, Alabama and Florida be invited to send commissioners to this meeting. Declaring that Georgia was "resolved not to abide permanently in this Union without satisfactory guarantees of future security," these resolutions proposed certain "indispensable amendments to the Constitution of the United States." These amendments related to congressional abolition of slavery and the interstate slave trade, the enforcement of the Fugitive Slave Law, the protection of slavery in the territories, the admission of slave states

²⁷Ibid., pp. 229-230, 236.

²⁸Biographical Directory of Congress, p. 1618. Nisbet was a former member of the Georgia General Assembly (1827-1837), the United States House of Representatives (1839-1841) and the Georgia Supreme Court (1845-1853).

²⁹Ralph A. Wooster, The Secession Conventions of the South (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962), p. 89.

to the union, and the enfranchisement of free Negroes.³⁰

The Johnson resolutions also took a strong stand regarding the continued existence of Northern personal liberty laws, announcing Georgia's "unalterable determination not to remain permanently in confederation with those States, unless they shall purge their statute books of all such acts."³¹

Finally, "if all effort fail to secure the rights of the State of Georgia in the Union, and she is reluctantly compelled to resume her separate independence," Georgia would "unite with the other Southern States similarly situated in the formation of a Southern Confederacy upon the basis of the present Constitution of the United States." However, in the hope that this would not be necessary, the resolutions provided that the Georgia convention adjourn until February 25, pending the action of the proposed meeting of Southern states and "the development of intervening events."³²

No direct vote was taken on Johnson's substitute resolutions at this time. The chair sustained a motion for the previous question; therefore, the vote was on the adoption of the Nisbet resolutions.³³ However, this vote was a preliminary test of secessionist strength in the convention indicative of the ultimate result.

A Committee of Seventeen, including Nisbet, T. R. R. Cobb,

³⁰"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 230-234.

³¹Ibid., p. 234.

³²Ibid., p. 235.

³³Ibid., p. 236.

Robert Toombs, Alexander H. Stephens, Ben Hill and H. V. Johnson, was then appointed to draw up an ordinance of secession. On January 19 this committee submitted the following report:

AN ORDINANCE To dissolve the Union between the State of Georgia and other States united with her under a compact of government entitled "The Constitution of the United States of America."

We, the people of the State of Georgia, in Convention assembled, do declare and ordain, and it is hereby declared and ordained:

That the ordinance adopted by the people of the State of Georgia in Convention on the second day of January in the year of our Lord seventeen hundred and eighty-eight, whereby the Constitution of the United States of America was assented to, ratified and adopted; and also all acts and parts of acts of the General Assembly of this State ratifying and adopting amendments of the said Constitution are hereby repealed, rescinded and abrogated.

We do further declare and ordain, That the Union now subsisting between the State of Georgia and other States, under the name of the "United States of America," is hereby dissolved, and that the State of Georgia is in the full possession and exercise of all those rights of sovereignty which belong and appertain to a free and independent State.³⁴

At this point Hill moved that Johnson's resolutions be adopted as a substitute for the committee's report. The vote on this motion was 164 opposed to 133 in favor of the Johnson substitute.³⁵ When Hill's motion was defeated it became obvious that the co-operationists would be unable to prevent the adoption of the ordinance. They then attempted to amend the ordinance so that it would not go into effect until March 3. However, because the chair sustained a motion for an immediate vote on

³⁴Ibid., pp. 240, 251.

³⁵Ibid., p. 252. The vote of an absent delegate recorded the next day made this total 164 to 134.

the committee's report, the question of delaying the act of secession was not put to the delegates.³⁶

When these efforts had failed, approximately one-third of the co-operationist delegates joined with the secessionists in voting for the ordinance of secession. Consequently this ordinance was adopted by a vote of 208 to 89. The president of the convention promptly declared Georgia a "free, sovereign and independent" state.³⁷

The co-operationists made a final attempt to prevent Georgia's secession on January 21, moving that the ordinance be submitted to the people of the state on February 20 for ratification. The motion was lost, and with it any lingering hopes of the co-operationists.³⁸

Although the secessionists had secured the passage of the ordinance of secession, they were concerned because nearly one-third of the delegates had voted against it. It was feared that this would give the impression that the action taken by the convention would not be supported by all of its members.³⁹ In an effort to dispel any doubts on this point, resolutions were adopted providing that all delegates would sign the ordinance

. . . as a pledge of the unanimous determination of this Convention to sustain and defend the State, in this her chosen remedy,

³⁶Ibid., p. 256.

³⁷Ibid., pp. 256-261. The vote of an absent delegate recorded the following day made this total 209 to 89.

³⁸Ibid., p. 271.

³⁹Bryan, "The Secession of Georgia," p. 100.

with all its responsibilities and consequences, without regard to individual approval or disapproval of its adoption.⁴⁰

In compliance with these resolutions, eighty-three of the co-operationists who had voted against secession to the very end signed the ordinance. However, six co-operationists refused to sign.⁴¹ On January 22 these six delegates submitted a formal statement reaffirming their belief in the policy of co-operation and protesting "the action of the majority" of the convention. They did not approve of this action and wished to express that disapproval, but they would "yield to the will of the majority" and pledge themselves "to the defense of Georgia, if necessary, against hostile invasions from any source whatever."⁴²

Thus by January 22 Georgia's ordinance of secession had been adopted, signed and protested. Alexander Stephens later insisted that a number of the delegates who voted Georgia out of the Union had done so with the idea that secession would be temporary. He contended that at least two-thirds of those voting for the ordinance of secession did so

. . . with a view to a more certain Re-formation of the Union, on the general principles of its Rectification, as set forth in the paper of Mr. Johnson. . . . they acted under the impression and belief that the whole object, on that line of policy, could better be accomplished by the States being out of the Union, than in it.⁴³

⁴⁰"Journal of the Convention, 1861," p. 269.

⁴¹Federal Union, February 5, 1861.

⁴²"Journal of the Convention, 1861," p. 277.

⁴³Alexander H. Stephens, A Constitutional View of the Late War Between the States, its Causes, Character, Conduct and Results, Presented in a Series of Colloquies at Liberty Hall, Vol. II (Philadelphia: National Publishing Company, 1870), p. 321.

According to Stephens, T. R. R. Cobb had sounded this "keynote" of the convention in his speech to the Georgia General Assembly in November.⁴⁴ However, the surviving version of Cobb's speech reveals no suggestion of such an idea.⁴⁵ On the contrary, Cobb went so far as to say that if Georgia were an independent state at the time, not ten voters would choose to join the union.⁴⁶ A contemporary historian also attributes to Cobb the statement that Georgia could "make better terms out of the Union than in it," but he asserts that the remark was made during the convention.⁴⁷ This cannot be verified since the official journal of the convention does not include accounts of speeches made on the floor, and closed sessions prevented newspaper coverage of the debates.

Governor Brown had briefly alluded to the possibility of reunion after secession in a letter written on December 7, 1860, but he implied that this was no more than a possibility, not a probability. Brown suggested that

If the Cotton States would all secede from the Union before the inauguration of Mr. Lincoln, this might possibly lead to a

⁴⁴Ibid.

⁴⁵"Cobb Before the General Assembly," pp. 157-182.

⁴⁶Ibid., pp. 177-178.

⁴⁷Isaac Wheeler Avery, The History of Georgia From 1850 to 1881, Embracing the Three Important Epochs: The Decade Before the War of 1861-5; The War; The Period of Reconstruction, with Portraits of the Leading Public Men of this Era (New York: Brown and Derby, 1881), p. 152. (Hereinafter cited as The History of Georgia.)

Convention of all the States, which might terminate in a reunion with the new constitutional guarantees necessary for our protection.⁴⁸

Shortly after the ordinance of secession was adopted, a co-operationist delegate from Upson county attempted to bring the subject of the reconstruction of the union before the convention. He introduced resolutions stating that

. . . the people of Georgia would be willing that the Federal Union, now broken and dissolved, should be reconstructed whenever the same can be done upon a basis that would secure, permanently and unequivocally, the full measure of the rights and equality of the people of the slaveholding States.⁴⁹

The convention took no action on this suggestion that the old union might be resurrected,⁵⁰ but instead proceeded to provide for Georgia's co-operation in the formation of a new, all-Southern union. Delegates to the Southern Congress scheduled to meet in Montgomery, Alabama, in February were authorized to participate in the formation of a provisional government "for the common safety and defense of all the States represented in said Congress." They were also instructed to "agree upon a plan of permanent Government for said States, upon the principles and basis of the Constitution of the late United States of America," although this would "not be binding or obligatory upon the people of Georgia, unless submitted to, approved, and ratified by this Convention."⁵¹

⁴⁸Federal Union, December 11, 1860. Joseph E. Brown to A. H. Colquitt, H. R. Jackson, Peter Cone, William M. Slaughter, O. C. Gibson, Hugh Buchanan, Lewis Tumlin, Hardy Strickland, William Lofton and William M. McIntosh, December 7, 1860.

⁴⁹"Journal of the Convention, 1861," p. 262.

⁵⁰Ibid.

⁵¹Ibid., p. 331.

On January 24 the convention elected ten men to represent Georgia at this meeting of the Southern states. Included among the ten were seven members of the Committee of Seventeen.⁵²

In addition to drawing up the ordinance of secession and furnishing over two-thirds of Georgia's delegation to the Montgomery meeting, this important committee also undertook the task of justifying Georgia's secession. On January 29 the committee's report presenting "the causes which have led to the separation" was adopted by the convention.⁵³

This report traced the sectional controversy from the time that the union came into being, but it stressed the importance of the events of the past ten years.⁵⁴ Particular emphasis was placed on the rise of the Republican party, which had made "anti-slavery . . . its mission and its purpose." This party had now "been called by their own votes to administer the Federal Government under the Constitution of the United States," even though on "shallow pretences" they habitually disregarded that Constitution's "plainest obligations."⁵⁵

The people of Georgia had been willing, until now, to abide by the terms of the Constitution, but

. . . they know the value of parchment rights, in treacherous hands, and therefore, they refuse to commit their own to the rulers whom the North offer us. Why? Because by their declared principles and policy, they have outlawed three thousand

⁵²Ibid., pp. 240-241, 294-295.

⁵³Ibid., p. 349.

⁵⁴Ibid., pp. 349-361.

⁵⁵Ibid., pp. 350, 360.

millions of our property in the common territories of the Union, put it under the ban of the Republic in the States where it exists, and out of the protection of Federal law everywhere; because they give sanctuary to thieves and incendiaries who assail it to the whole extent of their power, in spite of their most solemn obligations and covenants; because their avowed purpose is to subvert our society, and subject us, not only to the loss of our property but the destruction of ourselves, our wives, and our children, and the desolation of our homes, our altars, and our firesides. To avoid these evils, we resume the powers which our fathers delegated to the Government of the United States, and henceforth will seek new safe-guards for our liberty, equality, security and tranquility.⁵⁶

The fact that the developments of the previous decade were so strongly emphasized in this justification of Georgia's secession would seem to indicate that this was an attempt to explain why a state that had chosen compromise and the union in 1850 was abandoning both in 1861. It is significant that this document was written by Robert Toombs,⁵⁷ who had championed the cause of compromise in the fall of 1850 and who took an equally strong stand for secession in 1860 and 1861. In this instance Toombs may be considered the spokesman for those Georgians who lost hope in compromise as the answer to sectional controversy during this period.

However, before it can be accepted that the number of Georgians who had lost hope in compromise was sufficient to reverse the decision of 1850, another difference between the two conventions must be examined. That difference is the proportion of representation accorded the more populous counties in relation to the less populous counties. In 1850 counties with one representative in the Georgia House elected two

⁵⁶Ibid., pp. 360-361.

⁵⁷Ibid., p. 349.

delegates to the state convention; counties with two representatives chose four delegates.⁵⁸ In 1860 counties with one representative in the House also elected two delegates, but counties with two representatives in the House were allowed only three delegates.⁵⁹ As a result, thirty-seven of the counties with larger populations in 1850 were represented by 148 out of a total of 264 delegates,⁶⁰ while the thirty-seven counties with larger populations in 1860 had only 111 of the 301 delegates elected.⁶¹

The question is, did the reduced representation of the more populous counties substantially alter the action taken by the convention in 1861? If the answer is affirmative, then it is possible that the change in the proportional composition of the Convention of 1861 rather than changes in voter attitudes was responsible for the difference in the results of the two conventions. Conversely, a negative answer would indicate that the variance in the convention strength of the more populous counties was not significant.

The vote on the motion to substitute Johnson's co-operationist resolutions for the ordinance of secession will be utilized in an attempt to answer this question. This vote will be calculated in terms of the proportions of representation in the Convention of 1850. That is, in the case of each county entitled to more than two delegates in 1861,

⁵⁸Federal Union, September 10, 1850.

⁵⁹Federal Union, November 27, 1860.

⁶⁰Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5.

⁶¹"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218.

four votes (symbolic of the number of delegates allowed such counties in 1850) will be divided in the same proportions as were the three actual votes. The resulting statistical probabilities will be used in conjunction with the constant factor (the vote of delegates from counties entitled to two representatives in the convention) to obtain a statistical projection of the size and nature of the majority vote on this question. This statistical projection will then be compared with the actual secessionist majority in order to ascertain whether the difference in the number of delegates assigned to the more populous counties was a determining factor.

The vote on the motion to substitute Johnson's resolutions for the ordinance of secession was 164 to 134 against the motion.⁶² A total of forty-nine delegates from counties entitled to three representatives in the convention voted in favor of these resolutions. This includes the vote of the entire delegations of twelve such counties, two delegates each from five counties and one delegate each from three counties.⁶³ If these figures are revised to the 1850 proportions of representation, the total number of votes for the Johnson resolutions from counties entitled to more than two delegates is sixty-five and one-third. Adding this to the actual vote of the delegates from counties with two-member delegations, it may be assumed that approximately 150 votes would have been cast for the Johnson resolutions if the 1850 proportions of representation had been in effect.

⁶²Ibid., pp. 252, 264. The 134 total includes the vote of an absent delegate recorded on the following day.

⁶³Ibid., pp. 213-218, 252-254, 264.

On the other hand, a total of sixty delegates from the counties entitled to three representatives voted against the Johnson resolutions. This total includes the vote of the entire delegations of seventeen such counties, two-thirds of the delegations from three counties, and one-third of the delegations from three other counties.⁶⁴ If these totals are revised in terms of the 1850 proportions, the total secessionist vote from counties with more than two delegates would be eighty. When this is added to the number of actual votes against the Johnson resolutions cast by delegates from counties with only two delegates, the total secessionist vote expressed in terms of the 1850 proportions of representation is 184. The co-operationist vote calculated in these terms was 150. Thus it appears that the secessionist margin would have increased from thirty to approximately thirty-four if the representation in the Convention of 1861 had been proportioned in the same manner as in 1850.

The projections outlined above are statistical probabilities rather than assertions of fact. However, the relative accuracy of the projections is increased by the small percentage of three delegate counties whose delegations split their vote; only six out of the thirty-seven counties, or 16.2 percent, had split delegations. While it might be argued that a projected fourth vote in these instances represents an unknown quantity, it may also be argued that the projection of a fourth vote in those instances where delegations did not split their vote is

⁶⁴Ibid., pp. 213-218, 254-255. No vote is recorded for the third members of two delegations which cast two-thirds of their vote in favor of the resolutions.

highly predictable. Therefore, based on the figures quoted above, it is reasonable to assume that even had the apportionment used in 1850 been in effect in 1861, the end result would have been the same.

CHAPTER IV

DELEGATES AND CANDIDATES

The results of the conventions of 1850 and 1861 are well-known, as are the respective positions of prominent leaders in the state. Two of these men, Robert Toombs and Alexander Stephens, provide excellent examples of the changes which occurred in the attitudes of Georgians between the conventions. In 1850 both were unionists, advocating the acceptance of the Compromise and strongly opposing any measures of resistance for existing causes. In the latter part of 1860 and early in 1861 Stephens was again one of the more conservative leaders; however, the policy of co-operation which he supported at this time was similar to that proposed by his resistance opponents in 1850. On the other hand, in 1860-1861 Toombs ultimately went far beyond the resistance program of 1850 to become an outspoken exponent of immediate secession.

Although it is not too difficult to determine and compare the positions of leaders such as Toombs and Stephens, relatively little is known about the more obscure men who participated in both controversies. This portion of the study is focused on those who were directly involved in 1850 as well as 1861, either as delegates or as defeated candidates. It is intended to provide information regarding changes in the attitudes of Georgians toward the union during this crucial decade. The comparison of the policies advocated by each of these men in the two periods yields data concerning the nature and extent of changes in the attitudes of a number of local leaders. Moreover, in some cases the defeat or

election of these individuals is a reflection of either a change in the attitudes of a majority of the voters in their counties or the absence of such a change.¹

Changes in voter attitudes may be evaluated in terms of the delegates and defeated candidates surveyed only under specific circumstances. First, the individual's position before the election of delegates in 1850 and in 1861 as well as the pre-election positions of all the members of his county's delegation must be determined. When neither reports of county nominating meetings nor candidates' statements are available, these pre-election positions may, in some cases, be determined from votes cast in the conventions.

In 1850 there were apparently no developments between the time the convention call was issued and the convention which might have influenced candidates to change their positions after their nomination. Therefore, a delegate's vote in this convention may be considered a reliable indication of the platform on which he was elected. If the delegation voted as a unit, this vote will be considered a reflection of the attitudes of a majority of the voters in the county represented.

In 1860-1861 developments during the last week in December and the first two weeks in January apparently influenced some former co-operationists to vote against this policy when the convention met. However, since it is highly unlikely that these developments brought any

¹The limited consideration of voter attitudes in this chapter is only a preliminary to the more detailed analysis presented in Chapter VI. The latter will include information relative to other counties where change or lack of change is evident and will utilize election statistics in an effort to determine the extent of change in each region as well as in the state as a whole.

new recruits to the co-operationist cause, a delegate's vote for co-operation in the convention may be considered indicative of his pre-election position. Further, a delegation's unit vote for co-operation reflects the attitudes of a majority of the county electorate.

On the other hand, an individual's vote against co-operation may not be considered a reliable indication of the delegate's pre-election position. Even if an entire delegation voted against co-operation, the pre-election positions of all members of this delegation must be established by other means before any evaluation of voter attitudes can be attempted. This is necessitated by the possibility that one or more secessionist members of the delegation might have been elected on the basis of personal popularity and standing in the community, while one or more members of the delegation elected as co-operationists might have changed their positions after the election. This is not a remote possibility, especially if the delegation of a county with only two delegates is involved. Therefore, unless it can be determined that all members of the delegation were secessionists prior to their election, voter attitudes in 1850 and 1861 will not be compared in those cases where delegations cast unit votes against co-operation.

A split delegation vote in either convention could also indicate several possibilities. A highly respected community leader might have been elected in spite of his support of policies not favored by a majority of the voters, or a compromise ticket might have been elected. Furthermore, it is possible that individual members of co-operationist tickets might have converted to secession after the election. If a delegation's vote was split in 1861 and there is no evidence to

substantiate the third possibility, it must be assumed that one or both of the other two possibilities was involved. This assumption must also be made in regard to any split delegation in 1850. In both cases there is no well-defined expression of voter attitudes on the issues; therefore, the election of any individual under these circumstances will not be utilized in the determination of voter attitudes.

Finally, no evaluation of voter attitudes may be attempted in the thirty-seven new counties created during the decade between the conventions or in the forty-four parent counties from which these new counties were formed.² Because the voters in the new counties had expressed themselves as a part of the electorates of other counties in 1850, no comparison can be made between their votes at this time and in 1861. Because the electorates of parent counties had been altered by the loss of a portion of the 1850 population to new counties, no meaningful comparison can be made between the action of the electorates of parent counties in 1850 and that of their altered electorates in 1861.

While the factors discussed above limit the number of counties in which voter attitudes can be compared, the positions of the individual delegates and defeated candidates surveyed can be established in a majority of the cases. Four categories of delegates and candidates are studied: delegates elected to both conventions; delegates to the Convention of 1850 who were defeated in 1861; delegates to the Convention of 1861 who had been defeated in 1850; and candidates who were defeated

²Ruth Blair (ed.), State of Georgia Department of Archives and History: Georgia's Official Register, 1931 (Atlanta: Stein Printing Company, State Printers, 1931), pp. 438-440. (Hereinafter cited as Georgia's Official Register.)

in both elections. The number of persons in each category and their respective positions have been ascertained insofar as possible. Criteria utilized in determining positions include convention votes, candidates' statements, and participation in county meetings at which resolutions indicative of a specific position were adopted. However, not all of these criteria can be applied to every individual under consideration.

A comparison of the roll of the Convention of 1850 with that of the Convention of 1861 indicates that a total of thirty-one delegates were elected to both conventions.³ Twenty-eight of these delegates voted to accept the Compromise of 1850, while only two favored resistance. One delegate, W. A. L. Collins, was apparently not present as his vote is not recorded.⁴ The two resistance delegates of 1850 and fourteen of the former unionist delegates voted for secession in 1861. Thirteen of the men who had been unionists in the Convention of 1850, as well as Collins, voted for co-operation ten years later.⁵ The death of another former unionist who was re-elected in 1861, Charles Murphy, prevented his participation in the second convention.⁶

The thirteen delegates who voted for compromise in 1850 and for

³Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5; "Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218.

⁴"Debates and Proceedings," Federal Union, December 24, 1850. These figures are based on the vote on the third resolution in the Georgia Platform.

⁵"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 252-256. These figures are based on the motion to substitute Johnson's co-operationist resolutions for the ordinance of secession.

⁶Biographical Directory of Congress, p. 1603.

co-operation in 1861 were Augustus H. Kenan, Baldwin County; Samuel Knox, Franklin; James P. Simmons and Richard D. Winn, Gwinnett; E. M. Johnson, Hall; Charles W. Mabry, Heard; Richard H. Pierce, Lumpkin in 1850 and Dawson in 1861; George Stapleton, Jefferson; Willis Willingham, Oglethorpe; Alexander H. Stephens, Taliaferro; Henry Strickland, Tattall; Robert B. Dickerson, Walker; and Edmund S. Langmade, Washington.⁷ Additional information regarding the positions of nine of these men is available; however, that relating to Stephens is not presented because his positions in both years have already been discussed.

In a statement issued after his nomination in 1850, Augustus H. Kenan declared that the Compromise should be accepted and that secession for existing causes was out of the question. He also commented that he regarded the Fugitive Slave Law as the "test question of the perpetuity of our government" and was confident that this law would be faithfully executed. However, he conceded that if the North failed to maintain its "constitutional obligations," the South must take steps to protect its rights.⁸ Kenan also presented resolutions expressing disapproval of the Nashville Convention and the Southern unity movement in general at the Baldwin nominating meeting in 1850.⁹ Ten years later Kenan again introduced resolutions adopted by a Baldwin nominating meeting; in contrast to his earlier position, in 1860 he supported united action on the

⁷Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5, 23-24; "Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-256.

⁸Southern Recorder, November 12, 1850. Kenan to Messrs. McGehee, Jordan and Greene, November 8, 1850.

⁹Ibid., November 5, 1850.

part of the Southern states. His resolutions expressed the belief that the union could still be preserved and stated that delegates to the convention should advocate co-operation. The Southern states must make a united demand that Southern rights be guaranteed and that the sectional controversy be settled prior to Lincoln's inauguration.¹⁰ Although he was a member of the Committee of Seventeen, Kenan was one of the eighty-nine co-operationists who continued to oppose that committee's ordinance of secession on the final vote.¹¹

Two delegates from Gwinnett County served in both conventions. One of these men, R. D. Winn, presided over two county meetings in the fall of 1850. The other, James Simmons, introduced strong union resolutions at the first meeting and spoke in opposition to resistance to the admission of California at the second meeting.¹² At a nominating meeting held in October, 1850, Simmons introduced resolutions denouncing any measure which might directly or indirectly tend to bring about a dissolution of the union. Winn, Simmons and the other two candidates nominated at this meeting formally endorsed these resolutions.¹³ No information regarding Winn's position in 1860-1861 is available other than the fact that he voted for co-operation in the convention. However, Simmons not only voted for co-operation, he was also one of the six

¹⁰Ibid., December 25, 1860.

¹¹"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 240-241; 256-260.

¹²Daily Constitutionalist (Augusta), September 8, 1850.

¹³Southern Recorder, October 29, 1850. Richard D. Winn, Thos. W. Alexander, Levi Loveless, James P. Simmons to John F. Martin, Thomas McGuire, K. T. Terrell, Committee, October 23, 1850.

delegates who formally protested the adoption of the ordinance of secession.¹⁴

Although the position of E. M. Johnson of Hall County in 1860-1861 is indicated only by his vote for co-operation in the convention, he was a strong unionist in 1850. At the county nominating meeting he made a speech in support of resolutions which declared that the admission of California was grounds for neither resistance nor disunion and that no candidate would be supported unless he firmly opposed resistance to the Compromise.¹⁵ Johnson's attachment to the union was even more clearly indicated during the Convention of 1850. At this time he proposed the elimination of that portion of the Georgia Platform which warned that future resistance to specific violations of Southern rights would extend to the last resort of disunion, if necessary.¹⁶

Charles W. Mabry of Heard County had voted for the Georgia Platform in 1850; he continued to support it in 1860-1861. As a member of the resolution committee at a meeting held in Heard County early in December, 1860, Mabry helped to prepare a statement reaffirming the Georgia Platform and expressing the hope that the Convention of 1861 would establish further principles regarding Southern rights. These resolutions recommended the calling of a Southern Convention to secure these rights through co-operative action and declared that disunion was

¹⁴"Journal of the Convention, 1861," p. 277.

¹⁵Daily Chronicle and Sentinel, November 8, 1850.

¹⁶Journal of the Convention, 1850, p. 27.

to be considered only as a last resort.¹⁷

Jefferson County delegate George Stapleton was the co-chairman of a meeting held in his county prior to the convention call in 1850. This meeting adopted resolutions favoring the acceptance of California's admission to the union. As a candidate in 1850 Stapleton also endorsed resolutions adopted by the Jefferson nominating meeting which specified that, if elected, delegates must oppose both resistance and disunion.¹⁸

Willis Willingham of Oglethorpe and Henry Strickland of Tatnall were both nominated by 1860 meetings which adopted resolutions favoring co-operation and redress within the union. The Oglethorpe resolutions opposed submission to the election of Lincoln and recommended that a convention of the Southern states initiate any resistance measures. The Tatnall meeting, of which Strickland was chairman, took the position that the election of Lincoln was not a just cause for disunion, condemned hasty action, and argued that all constitutional means of obtaining redress should precede disunion.¹⁹

Two delegates who may also be classified as unionist/co-operationists did not vote in both conventions. It has already been pointed out that W. A. L. Collins of Columbia was apparently not present at the Convention of 1850 and that Charles Murphy of DeKalb died just as the Convention of 1861 was getting under way. Although it is possible that Murphy might have changed his position had he lived long enough to

¹⁷Daily Chronicle and Sentinel, December 18, 1860.

¹⁸Ibid., September 12, November 19, 1850.

¹⁹Ibid., December 13 and 16, 1860.

attend the convention, he had made very strong statements in support of co-operation late in December. At this time he said that he believed it still possible to preserve both Southern rights and the union. He favored a united Southern movement to obtain these rights and was opposed to immediate secession.²⁰ No information other than his vote for acceptance of the Compromise is available in regard to Murphy's position in 1850.

Although Collins did not vote in the Convention of 1850, he was apparently a unionist, having been nominated by a meeting of those "in favor of preserving the Union." Ten years later the Columbia County meeting which nominated him a second time passed resolutions stating that Lincoln's election was not a just cause for secession. It was recommended that the convention demand the repeal of the personal liberty laws and further guarantees of Southern rights.²¹ As noted above, Collins subsequently voted for co-operation in the convention.

Fourteen union delegates who had voted to accept the Compromise in 1850 opposed co-operation and favored immediate secession in the Convention of 1861. They were Washington Poe, Bibb; Francis S. Bartow, Chatham; Asbury Hull, Clarke; Benjamin Sermons, Clinch; Richard Simms, Decatur; Albert G. Porter, Effingham; Elijah W. Chastain, Gilmer in 1850 and Fannin in 1861; Thomas N. Poullain, Greene; Luther J. Glenn, Henry in 1850 and Fulton in 1861; Willis A. Hawkins, Lee in 1850 and Sumter in 1861; William H. Robinson, Macon County; Augustus Reese, Morgan; Samuel

²⁰Daily Intelligencer (Atlanta), December 28, 1860.

²¹Daily Chronicle and Sentinel, November 7, 1850; December 12, 1860.

Glenn, Oglethorpe; and Robert Toombs, Wilkes.²²

The activities of Robert Toombs prior to both conventions have been discussed in a preceding chapter. Information regarding the pre-convention positions of another seven of these delegates is available for both 1850 and 1860-1861. Additional information concerning the position of another in 1850 only and of two more in 1860-1861 is also available.

Washington Poe of Bibb County was in favor of the Compromise of 1850 prior to its adoption by Congress; he served as a vice-president of a county meeting which passed pro-compromise resolutions in mid-summer, 1850.²³ Later, in a speech made at the union nominating meeting in Bibb, Poe charged that the "friends" of the Georgia convention hoped to bring about a dissolution of the union. He introduced resolutions stating that candidates nominated must be pledged to oppose resistance for existing causes.²⁴ Poe and the other three Bibb union candidates declared that, if elected, they would oppose "any and all action by the Convention tending directly or indirectly to a dissolution of the Union."²⁵

Poe became an active secessionist after Lincoln's election in 1860. He presided at a rally held in November to organize the Bibb

²²Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5, 23-24; "Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-260.

²³Daily Chronicle and Sentinel, July 11, 1850.

²⁴Southern Recorder, October 8, 1850.

²⁵Georgia Journal and Messenger, October 23, 1850. A. P. Powers, Robert Collins, William Scott and Washington Poe to James A. Nisbet, October 10, 1850.

"Minute Men," a group which proposed to arm against "impending dangers." Poe was also one of those who signed the call for the immediate secession meeting which nominated him.²⁶ He and the other two nominees spoke at later meetings held to ratify the selection of the county's secession candidates and to endorse their policy.²⁷

Chatham delegate Francis S. Bartow favored the acceptance of the Compromise of 1850, but he believed that Georgia and the South must take a firm stand against future aggressions on the rights of the South. The meeting which nominated him also approved what was known as the "Chatham Platform," a series of resolutions similar to those subsequently passed by the Convention of 1850.²⁸ Bartow endorsed these resolutions, declaring that he was opposed to resistance because the admission of California was constitutional but he feared that the "mad assaults" of the North upon the institution of slavery would ultimately destroy the union. If this happened, he was prepared to maintain Southern rights, property and honor no matter what it entailed.²⁹

In 1860, nearly two months before the presidential election, Bartow implied that he would favor immediate secession if Lincoln were elected. Speaking at a Breckinridge rally in September, he said that he was tired of "endless controversy," adding "if the storm is to come, and it seems to me as though it must, . . . I court it now in the day of

²⁶Georgia Telegraph, November 15, December 13 and 20, 1860.

²⁷Ibid., December 20, 1860; Daily Georgia Telegraph, December 24, 1860.

²⁸Savannah Morning News, October 24, 1850.

²⁹Southern Recorder, November 5, 1850.

my vigor and strength."³⁰ Immediately after the election Bartow introduced resolutions adopted by a Chatham meeting and later read in the Georgia Senate. These resolutions declared that Georgia should not submit to Lincoln's election and urged the calling of a state convention and the organization of the state's defenses.³¹ Another meeting held in December nominated Bartow and two other candidates, all of whom were expressly instructed to vote for immediate secession in the convention.³² As a member of the Committee of Seventeen, Bartow helped to draft the ordinance of secession as well as voting for it.³³

Richard Simms of Decatur County pledged in 1850 that he would not vote to dissolve the union "for the past acts of Congress or for any existing causes." He was not committed to any specific plan but stated that once he was satisfied that the union was safe, he was willing to confer with the other members of the convention as to the best means to prevent future aggressions on Southern rights.³⁴ However, by the latter part of 1860, Simms had decided that the "day of compromise" was past and that there was no point in Georgia's delaying secession in the hope of obtaining her rights in the union.³⁵

Luther J. Glenn was a union delegate from Henry County in 1850.

³⁰Albany Patriot, October 18, 1860.

³¹Journal of the Senate, 1860, pp. 58-59.

³²Georgia Telegraph, December 20, 1860.

³³"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 240-241, 256-260.

³⁴Albany Patriot, October 18, 1850.

³⁵Daily Georgia Telegraph, January 3, 1861.

He had made his position clear at a county meeting held in the summer of that year when he introduced resolutions favoring the compromise measures pending in Congress.³⁶ In 1860 Glenn was a resident of Fulton County. Shortly after Lincoln was elected he served on a committee which drew up resolutions advocating immediate secession. Nominated by a meeting which passed similar resolutions, Glenn made a strong appeal for immediate secession at a rally held in Atlanta in mid-December.³⁷

Greene County delegate Thomas N. Poullain introduced resolutions in the 1850 nominating meeting which required the Greene union nominees to pledge themselves to vote against any measures which might lead, either directly or indirectly, to a disruption of the union for existing causes. Although his position during the campaign of 1860 and 1861 is not quite so well-defined. Poullain seems to have been a co-operationist at one point. In November he was one of the vice-presidents of a county meeting which adopted resolutions favoring co-operation and stating that the election of Lincoln was not sufficient cause for secession.³⁸ Later he was one of three men nominated as an uninstructed, compromise ticket representing "all differences of opinion." Although the candidates were uninstructed, the nominating meeting adopted resolutions advocating Georgia's secession prior to March 4 "in concert with as many states as will co-operate with her."³⁹

³⁶Daily Chronicle and Sentinel, August 15, 1850.

³⁷Daily Intelligencer, November 13, December 6 and 12, 1860.

³⁸Daily Chronicle and Sentinel, October 22, 1850; November 21, 1860.

³⁹Daily Constitutionalist, December 20, 1860.

Willis A. Hawkins was a delegate from Lee County in 1850; in 1861 he represented Sumter County. Hawkins participated in at least two union meetings held in Lee in the summer of 1850. The secretary as well as a member of the resolution committee of one of these meetings, he expressed disagreement with the resolutions adopted, apparently on the grounds that they placed too much emphasis on disunion as an alternative to the adoption of a satisfactory compromise. At the other meeting he introduced resolutions favoring the measures then before Congress and rejecting any ultimatums on the part of the South.⁴⁰ In 1860 Hawkins was a secessionist. As early as October he declared that Georgia should neither submit to Lincoln's election nor wait for an overt act if he became president. At a secession meeting held in an adjacent county in mid-November he advocated "immediate resistance and resistance to the death."⁴¹

Macon County delegate William H. Robinson was a declared unionist in 1850. He served on the nominating committee appointed by the Macon County union meeting and introduced resolutions requiring that candidates pledge "their firm adherence to the Union." In his acceptance speech Robinson commented that he had been opposed to the convention from the beginning. In 1860 he presided over a meeting held just prior to the presidential election which adopted resolutions strongly implying that secession should follow a Republican victory.⁴² However,

⁴⁰Albany Patriot, July 19, August 2, 1850.

⁴¹Georgia Journal and Messenger, November 28, 1860.

⁴²Ibid., October 30, 1850; November 28, 1860.

at the Macon County nominating meeting in December he was a member of a committee which submitted resolutions demanding the repeal of the personal liberty laws and recommending co-operative secession if this demand were not met.⁴³

Although the position of Augustus Reese of Morgan County prior to the Convention of 1861 cannot be determined, in 1850 he was a strong unionist. In the summer of that year he was a member of a committee which submitted resolutions approving any reasonable means of settlement that Congress might adopt.⁴⁴ Reese also served on the resolution committee appointed by the Morgan union nominating meeting in 1850. The resolutions submitted by this committee specified that the nominees must oppose any measure which might lead to disunion.⁴⁵

No information, other than their votes in the convention, is available in regard to the policies advocated by Samuel Glenn of Oglethorpe and Asbury Hull of Clarke prior to the Convention of 1850. In 1860-1861, although both voted against co-operation and for the ordinance of secession, only Hull was a secessionist during the pre-convention period. As a member of the resolution committee appointed by a five county meeting held in November, 1860, Hull helped to prepare a statement advocating separate state secession to be followed by co-operation in the formation of a Southern Confederacy.⁴⁶ In a statement

⁴³Georgia Telegraph, December 20, 1860.

⁴⁴Columbus Enquirer, July 30, 1850.

⁴⁵Daily Chronicle and Sentinel, October 31, 1850.

⁴⁶Ibid., November 21, 1860.

issued after his nomination he referred to Toombs' "test" of the possibility of obtaining Southern rights through congressional action and expressed strong doubt that this would prove successful. Hull indicated that if this were the case he would favor immediate secession when the convention met.⁴⁷ On the other hand, Glenn, one of two delegates from Oglethorpe County who served in both conventions, was apparently a co-operationist when he was nominated. The meeting which nominated him passed resolutions favoring the calling of a Southern convention to initiate co-operative action.⁴⁸

Only two of the twenty-nine resistance delegates of 1850 were elected in 1861. They were David J. Bailey of Butts County and Augustus S. Jones, who represented Screven in 1850 and Chatham in 1861.⁴⁹ Both men voted against co-operation and for secession in the Convention of 1861.⁵⁰

Bailey's position prior to the Convention of 1861 cannot be determined. In 1850 he was a member of the resolution committee at the Butts resistance nominating meeting. This committee reported resolutions advocating constitutional resistance to the Compromise and

⁴⁷Georgia Journal and Messenger, January 2, 1861.

⁴⁸Daily Chronicle and Sentinel, December 16, 1860.

⁴⁹Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5; "Debates and Proceedings," Federal Union, December 24, 1850; "Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218. The roll of the Convention of 1850 gives Jones' name as Augustus H.; however, this is apparently a typographical error. A report of the Screven nominating meeting in 1850 gives his name as Seaborn Jones (Daily Constitutionalist, November 10, 1850), and the 1850 election returns list him as A. S. Jones (Federal Union, December 10, 1850).

⁵⁰"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 252-260.

recommending that Georgia seek redress for "past, present and future encroachments upon our rights."⁵¹

If the 1850 meeting which nominated Jones adopted resolutions, they were not reported;⁵² however, as noted above, he voted for resistance in the convention. In 1860 Jones was nominated, along with former unionist Francis S. Bartow, by a Chatham meeting which instructed its candidates to vote for immediate secession.⁵³

The above survey has established the positions of all fifteen unionist/co-operationists prior to both conventions as well as those of ten unionist/secessionists and one resistance/secessionist. However, the re-election of fifteen of these twenty-six delegates cannot be utilized in the comparison of voter attitudes.

One of the co-operationists represented Dawson, a new county; another four represented the parent counties of DeKalb, Franklin, Walker and Washington. One delegate who apparently favored co-operation during the pre-convention period but voted against co-operation in the convention was also from a parent county, Macon.⁵⁴ Three of the secessionists, L. J. Glenn, Hawkins and Jones, represented different counties in the two conventions. Another was a member of a Greene County compromise ticket which split in the Convention of 1861.

Two re-elected delegates, Willingham and Samuel Glenn,

⁵¹Federal Union, November 19, 1850.

⁵²Daily Constitutional, November 10, 1850.

⁵³Georgia Telegraph, December 20, 1860.

⁵⁴Blair, Georgia's Official Register, pp. 438-440.

represented Oglethorpe County, whose delegation also split in 1861. There is evidence which indicates that Glenn became a secessionist at some time after his nomination; however, no information is available concerning the third delegate from this county, who also voted against co-operation.⁵⁵

Finally, although the positions of secessionists Toombs, Hull and Simms prior to the Convention of 1861 are known, it is not possible to establish the pre-convention positions of all the other members of the delegations from Wilkes, Clarke and Decatur counties.

The elimination of these fifteen delegates leaves eleven unionists whose election in 1850 and re-election in 1861 can be related to voter attitudes in these two years. Two of these men, Bartow and Poe, ran on secessionist tickets and opposed co-operation during the convention. The re-election of these two delegates indicates a radical change in the attitudes of a majority of the voters in Bibb and Chatham counties. On the other hand, the re-election of nine former unionists who were co-operationists in 1861 shows a continuing conservatism on the part of a majority of the voters in the counties that they represented. Since two of these delegates were from the same county, only eight counties are involved. They are Baldwin, Columbia, Gwinnett, Hall, Heard, Jefferson, Tatnall and Taliaferro.

The survey of the thirty-one delegates who were elected to both conventions indicates that fourteen were unionists in 1850 and secessionists in 1861; fifteen were unionists in 1850 and co-operationists

⁵⁵"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 216, 252-256.

in 1861; and two advocated resistance in 1850 and secession in 1861. Thus a radical change is evident in the attitudes of approximately 45 percent of the delegates elected to both conventions, while slightly more than 48 percent favored the more conservative of the policies under consideration in both conventions. About 8 percent favored the more extreme policy in both conventions.

The second category of delegates and candidates is those who were elected to serve in the Convention of 1850 but were defeated in their bids for seats in the Convention of 1861. Because no complete list of the candidates of 1861 is available, the total number of men in this category can not be accurately determined.

A partial list of defeated candidates has been compiled from various sources, including the official, but incomplete, election returns issued by the executive department, scattered election returns published in various newspapers, a partial candidate list published in late December, and the reports of nominating meetings and scattered election returns published in several papers. This composite list is at least sixty-five percent complete. It gives the names of all the defeated candidates, a total of 118, in forty-nine of the one hundred and thirty-two counties in Georgia in 1861. In addition, the name of one defeated candidate in each of forty-nine of the counties entitled to two delegates has been ascertained, as has that of one defeated candidate in each of seven of the counties entitled to three delegates. In two of the three delegate counties the names of two defeated

candidates are included.⁵⁶ While no names of defeated candidates are listed for twenty-five counties, the delegates elected in twelve of these counties were unopposed.⁵⁷ Thus the composite list gives the names of none of the defeated candidates in only thirteen counties where the field possibly included opposition candidates. Ten of these thirteen counties were two delegate counties; three were three delegate counties.⁵⁸ In the absence of evidence to the contrary, it must be assumed that opposition candidates ran in these thirteen counties in 1861. However, if the delegates from some or all of these counties were unopposed, the composite list is more than sixty-five percent complete.

A comparison of the composite list of candidates defeated in 1861 with the roll of the Convention of 1850 indicates that at least eight of the delegates elected in 1850 were defeated ten years later. These men were James M. Calhoun, DeKalb in 1850 and Fulton in 1861; Thomas Bird and J. R. Parrott, Gordon; Augustus M. Russell, Lumpkin; Rheese McGregor, Paulding in 1850 and Polk in 1861; Nicholas L. Howard, Muscogee; Charles J. Jenkins, Richmond; and James Culberson, Troup.⁵⁹

The positions of these men in 1850 can be determined by their votes in the convention; all eight voted to accept the Compromise.⁶⁰ Additional information relating to three of these men in 1850 is

⁵⁶Appendix B.

⁵⁷Federal Union, April 30, 1861; Columbus Enquirer, December 18, 1860; Georgia Telegraph, December 13, 1860.

⁵⁸Appendix B; "Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218.

⁵⁹Appendix B; Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5.

⁶⁰Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 23-24.

available. Two, McGregor of Paulding and N. L. Howard of Muscogee, were nominated by meetings which required that candidates pledge their opposition to any resistance of the Compromise. The Muscogee resolutions went even further, deploring the convention call itself as a resistance measure tending toward disunion.⁶¹ Another, C. J. Jenkins of Richmond County, helped to prepare the resolutions adopted by his county's union nominating meeting. These resolutions denied that the admission of California was grounds for resistance and expressed disapproval of those who advocated such a policy.⁶² It has been noted above that Jenkins was also the chairman of the Committee of Thirty-Three and is usually credited with writing this committee's report.

Neither Jenkins nor the other seven men under consideration here were delegates to the Convention of 1861; therefore, convention votes cannot be used as a direct indication of their positions during the secession crisis. However, if the men who defeated any one of these candidates in the election subsequently voted for co-operation in the convention, this may be considered an indirect indication of the defeated candidate's position.

Without supporting evidence, the convention votes of the delegates who had opposed the defeated candidates from Fulton, Muscogee, Richmond, Troup and Gordon are of no value in determining the positions of the men in question. All or part of these five delegations voted against co-operation and for secession. However, the delegations from

⁶¹Daily Chronicle and Sentinel, November 19, 1850; Columbus Enquirer, October 22, 1850.

⁶²Daily Chronicle and Sentinel, October 16 and 20, 1850.

Lumpkin and Polk voted for co-operation and against secession.⁶³ Since co-operationist delegates were elected in these two counties, it may be assumed that their opponents, McGregor of Polk and Russell of Lumpkin, were secessionists in 1861. The pre-convention position of McGregor's co-operationist opponents is further substantiated by the fact that they were nominated by those who favored "resistance in the Union."⁶⁴

The position of another defeated candidate, James Calhoun of Fulton County, can also be established indirectly. Calhoun's opponents were advocates of immediate secession prior to their election;⁶⁵ therefore, it may be assumed that he was a co-operationist.

Direct information relating to the positions of two men is available. One, Nicholas L. Howard of Muscogee, was nominated by a meeting which adopted resolutions opposing separate state secession and recommending co-operative efforts to secure redress within the union.⁶⁶ Another, Charles J. Jenkins of Richmond, had made his position clear early in December when he urged that other remedies be tried before the last resort of secession. Pointing out that Congress had committed none of the aggressions against which the Georgia Platform had warned, Jenkins recommended the calling of a Southern Convention to present a united ultimatum to the North. He reaffirmed these sentiments in a speech made after his nomination, arguing that Georgia should not

⁶³"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-217; 252-260.

⁶⁴Columbus Enquirer, December 18, 1860.

⁶⁵Daily Intelligencer, December 6 and 12, 1860.

⁶⁶Columbus Enquirer, December 18, 1860.

abandon the union until all hope for its preservation was gone.⁶⁷

The 1860-1861 positions of three of the eight delegates of 1850 who were defeated ten years later could not be ascertained; therefore, it is not possible to compare their positions during the two periods. However, the respective positions of five of these individuals can be compared. Two, McGregor and Russell, were unionists in 1850 but secessionists in 1860-1861. Three, Jenkins, Calhoun and Howard, were unionists in 1850 and co-operationists in 1860-1861. Thus, two 1850 conservatives were defeated in 1861 when they advocated the more extreme position, while three who continued to support the more conservative of the policies under consideration were also rejected by the voters in their counties.

Although the comparison of the respective positions of these five men is useful in the study of changes evident in the policies of individual local leaders, the election and subsequent defeat of only one can be related to voter attitudes in his county. Two of the others were from the new counties of Polk and Fulton; another two were from Lumpkin and Muscogee, both parent counties.⁶⁸ The remaining delegate/defeated candidate was Jenkins of Richmond, a declared unionist in 1850 and a declared co-operationist in 1860-1861. In the latter election he was defeated by a ticket committed to immediate secession.⁶⁹ The fact

⁶⁷Southern Recorder, January 1, 1861; Daily Chronicle and Sentinel, December 27, 1860.

⁶⁸Blair, Georgia's Official Register, pp. 438-440.

⁶⁹Daily Constitutional, December 12 and 13, 1860.

that Jenkins was elected on a unionist platform in 1850 and defeated on a co-operationist platform in 1861 indicates that a majority of the voters in Richmond county had become more extreme, whereas he had remained a conservative.

It was not possible to ascertain the exact number of delegates elected in 1850 but defeated in 1861; however, in the third category, candidates defeated in 1850 but elected in 1861, the number of individuals involved can be determined with a much greater degree of accuracy. The 1850 election returns give the names of all candidates and the number of votes cast for each in every county except one. A comparison of these returns with the roll of the Convention of 1861 shows that eight of the men who ran unsuccessfully in 1850 were chosen to represent their counties in the second convention. They were W. C. Cleveland, Crawford; R. J. Willis, Greene; M. Henderson, Irwin; Aris Newton, Jasper; William Martin, Lumpkin; James Hilliard, Stewart; L. B. Smith, Talbot; and Willis Kilgore, Walton.⁷⁰

Three of these eight men, Cleveland, Willis and Hilliard, voted against co-operation and for secession in the convention. Five, Henderson, Newton, Martin, Smith and Kilgore, voted for co-operation.⁷¹

Additional information is available regarding the positions of three of the co-operationists prior to the election of delegates in 1861. Aris Newton of Jasper was nominated by a meeting which adopted resolutions declaring that the election of Lincoln was not a sufficient

⁷⁰"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218; Federal Union, December 10, 1850.

⁷¹"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 252-260.

cause for disunion and expressing the belief that there was no need for hasty action. Willis Kilgore was nominated by a meeting which required its candidates to endorse resolutions stating that the Southern states should co-operate in the effort to obtain redress within the union and in secession if such efforts failed. Although no report of the meeting which nominated Levi B. Smith was located, he made a speech at a meeting held in an adjacent county on December 12 in which he said that secession was a last resort to be applied only if and when all efforts to preserve both the union and Southern rights had been exhausted.⁷²

The pre-convention position of only one of the secessionists can be determined. This delegate, Washington C. Cleveland of Crawford, presided over a meeting held in his county in December at which resolutions declaring that Georgia's only choice was secession or dishonor were unanimously adopted. Another secessionist, R. J. Willis, was a member of an uninstructed, compromise ticket nominated in Greene County. Although the nominating meeting adopted resolutions expressing the hope that Georgia would participate in the co-operative secession of the Southern states prior to March 4, the resolutions also provided that candidates were not required to endorse this or any other policy.⁷³

Two of the eight men under consideration had been unionists in 1850. One, Newton, issued a statement in conjunction with the other three Jasper County union candidates declaring that they favored

⁷²Federal Union, December 25, 1860; Daily Chronicle and Sentinel, December 7, 1860; Columbus Enquirer, December 25, 1860.

⁷³Georgia Telegraph, December 6, 1860; Daily Constitutionalist, December 20, 1860.

acceptance of the Compromise because of their "devotion to the Union and dread of the unutterable horrors of civil commotions." The other, Hilliard of Stewart, was also pledged to oppose resistance measures if elected.⁷⁴

Five of the eight men elected in 1861 but defeated ten years earlier had apparently advocated resistance to the Compromise in 1850. Willis Kilgore of Walton County was nominated by a moderate resistance meeting which adopted resolutions stating that Georgia should protest the Compromise and issue an ultimatum regarding any future aggressions on Southern rights.⁷⁵ Four other candidates, Martin of Lumpkin, Willis of Greene, Smith of Talbot and Cleveland of Crawford, were defeated by men whose convention votes for acceptance of the Compromise are an indirect indication that their opponents had favored resistance.⁷⁶

The position of Henderson of Irwin County in 1850 is unknown. The two delegates who represented his county split their votes,⁷⁷ and no other means of determining his position is available.

The respective positions of seven of the eight individuals defeated in 1850 but elected in 1861 can be compared. Three, Martin, Smith and Kilgore, were resistance candidates in 1850 and co-operationists in 1861. Although they were considered extremists in 1850 and conservatives in 1861, actually they advocated virtually the same policy

⁷⁴Federal Union, November 12, 1850; Columbus Enquirer, October 8, 1850.

⁷⁵Daily Constitutionalist, November 13, 1850.

⁷⁶Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5, 23-24.

⁷⁷Ibid.

at both times. The other two resistance candidates of 1850, Cleveland and Willis, were secessionists in 1861. One of the unionists of 1850, Hilliard, became a secessionist in 1861; the other, Newton, was a co-operationist.

Since four of these men represented the parent counties of Crawford, Stewart, Lumpkin and Talbot,⁷⁸ no relationship between their defeat, subsequent election and voter attitudes can be established. Greene County must also be eliminated because the delegates elected in 1861 were members of a compromise ticket. This leaves only two counties in which voter attitudes may be compared, Walton and Jasper. The voters of Walton County elected unionists in 1850 and co-operationists in 1861; this indicates a continuing conservatism on the part of a majority of these voters. In Jasper County a majority of the electorate favored resistance in 1850 and co-operation in 1861. Because the resistance policy of 1850 was similar to that of the co-operationists of 1861, the voting pattern in this county is the most consistent yet observed.

In order to determine the men who make up the fourth category of delegates and candidates, those who were defeated in both elections, it is again necessary to use the incomplete, composite list of 1861 candidates. A comparison of this list with the election returns of 1850 indicates that at least four men ran unsuccessfully for both conventions. They were D. W. Lewis of Hancock; I. S. Vincent of Clarke; R. White of Jackson; and John E. Craig of Gwinnett.⁷⁹ However, this must

⁷⁸Blair, Georgia's Official Register, pp. 438-440.

⁷⁹Appendix B; Federal Union, December 10, 1850.

be considered only a partial listing of the men in this category.

Apparently all four of these men were resistance candidates in 1850. Craig was nominated by a meeting which adopted resolutions objecting to the Compromise and recommending that the convention adopt "active and energetic measures" to rectify past wrongs and to provide for future security.⁸⁰ The positions of the other three candidates are indirectly indicated by the fact that their opponents voted to accept the Compromise.⁸¹ It is therefore assumed that Vincent, White and Lewis were resistance candidates in 1850.

The policies advocated by Vincent and White in 1861 cannot be determined; however, both Lewis and Craig were secessionists. Lewis was nominated by a Hancock meeting which passed resolutions endorsing immediate secession.⁸² In Gwinnett County, Craig was opposed by three men who voted for co-operation in the convention.⁸³

The defeat of resistance tickets in Hancock and Gwinnett in 1850 and the subsequent defeat of the secessionist candidates in 1861 indicates a continuing conservatism on the part of a majority of the voters in both counties.

This continuing conservatism is evident in 71 percent of the counties where the attitudes of a majority of the electorate in 1850 and 1861 were compared. Only fourteen counties were involved. In ten,

⁸⁰Daily Constitutional, November 8, 1850.

⁸¹Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5, 23-24.

⁸²Daily Constitutional, January 1, 1861.

⁸³"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 215, 252-256.

unionist delegates were elected in 1850 and co-operationists in 1861. In three, unionists were elected in 1850 and secessionists in 1861. In one, resistance delegates were elected in 1850 and co-operationists in 1861. However, since the consideration of voter attitudes was arbitrarily restricted to counties represented by the four categories of delegates and candidates, no particular significance should be attached to these incomplete figures.

Although the results of the preliminary and limited voter study are inconclusive, the results of the survey of candidates nominated for both conventions may be summarized and evaluated. The survey indicates that at least fifty-one of the candidates of 1850 ran again in 1861. The thirty-one delegates elected to both conventions represent an accurate total, and the eight candidates defeated in 1850 but elected in 1861 represent a total which is very nearly, if not entirely, accurate. However, the eight delegates of 1850 defeated in 1861 and the four candidates defeated in both elections are probably only partial figures.

The policies advocated by fifty of these men in 1850 have been determined; thirty-nine were unionists, and eleven favored resistance. Thus approximately 78 percent of the candidates of 1850 who were nominated in 1861 were former unionists. This somewhat surprising degree of unionist preponderance would probably be increased if complete listings were available in all categories. Since nearly 88 percent of the men elected to the Convention of 1850 were unionists, the partial listing of delegates of 1850 who were defeated in 1861 tends to reduce the unionist total. For the same reason, the partial listing of candidates defeated in both elections tends to reduce the resistance total.

However, the fact that there are twice as many men in the former category as there are in the latter would seem to indicate that the unionist total is affected more than the resistance. Even if this were not the case, a unionist majority of 78 percent is significantly large.

Nearly 95 percent of the former unionists who ran in 1861 were elected in 1850. In 1861 almost 80 percent were elected. Fifty-two percent of those elected in 1861 were co-operationists, while the remaining 48 percent were secessionists. Three of the eight former unionists defeated in 1861 were co-operationists; two were secessionists, and the positions of three are unknown.

Only 18 percent of the resistance candidates who ran for both conventions were elected in 1850. Although approximately 64 percent were elected in 1861, this was still a smaller percentage than that of the unionists elected. Fifty-seven percent of the former resistance candidates elected in 1861 were secessionists; nearly 43 percent were co-operationists. Two of those defeated in 1861 were secessionists, and the positions of the other two are unknown.

The policies advocated in 1860-1861 by forty-six of the candidates for both conventions are known; half were co-operationists and half were secessionists. Twenty, or almost 87 percent of the co-operationists were elected. Sixteen were former unionists; three had been resistance candidates in 1850, and the earlier position of one is unknown. Nineteen, or nearly 83 percent of the secessionists were elected. Fifteen had been unionists in 1850, and four had favored resistance. While a majority of the candidates for both conventions elected in 1861 were former unionists, both the unionist majority and

the resistance minority elected were very nearly evenly divided in support of co-operation and secession. Furthermore, although a slightly larger percentage of the candidates for both conventions who were elected in 1861 were co-operationists, the death of one of these men reduced the co-operationists' convention strength to that of the secessionists.

CHAPTER V

COUNTY LEADERSHIP

The men chosen to run for the Conventions of 1850 and 1861 were the upper echelon local leaders during these two periods of decision. A second level of county leadership which played a part in the decision-making process was made up of those non-elective leaders who served as officers, committee members or speakers at primary meetings held to express local opinion and/or to nominate candidates for the conventions. Both levels of the local leadership structure as well as an intermediate group who were nominees in one year and non-elective leaders in the other are included in the comparison of the county leadership of 1850 with that of 1860-1861.

The local leadership study deals with representative groups of upper echelon, intermediate and non-elective leaders active in both 1850 and 1860-1861. These groups are analyzed on a regional basis in an effort to ascertain the nature of the relationship between the unionist and resistance leadership of 1850 and the co-operationist and secessionist leadership of 1860-1861 in each region. Regional trends toward co-operation and secession at each level of the continuing local leadership are also investigated. Finally, these trends are compared with voting patterns in the Convention of 1861 in order to determine whether the patterns observed among the continuing local leadership conform or contrast with those of the men who represented their regions in the convention.

The study outlined above is limited to the investigation of continuing local leadership patterns. While a reliable projection of the extent of continuing leadership would be most useful, this could not be obtained from the data available. Such a projection would require complete reports of all the meetings held in a large number of representative counties in each geographic-economic region in both 1850 and 1860. Although the samples obtained are insufficient for this type of study, they are, in most cases, adequate for a more general evaluation of regional patterns.

The 1850 sample, which is utilized in the survey of 1861 nominees active at the non-elective level in 1850, includes reports of meetings in over two-thirds of Georgia's ninety-five counties. The sample is heavily weighted in favor of the cotton belt, but the distribution of the remainder is such that a balanced study may be obtained if each region is considered separately. Ninety percent of the counties in the cotton belt and 66 percent of the coastal counties are represented; therefore, a rather extensive survey of this portion of the intermediate group is possible in these two regions. While the percentages of representation in the northern region and the pine barrens are smaller (43 and 35 percent respectively), these regional samples are adequate for the study of patterns in these two areas.

The 1860 sample contains reports of meetings in nearly half of the 132 counties in the state at the time. This sample is used in the survey of 1850 nominees who were active in 1860 meetings. It includes 32 percent of the counties in the northern region, 64 percent of the cotton belt counties, and 24 percent of those in the pine barrens.

However, since only one coastal county is represented, the investigation of patterns relating to this portion of the intermediate group must be limited to the other three regions.

Unfortunately, the combined 1850-1860 sample, which is used in the study of the non-elective leadership, is much less satisfactory than the separate samples. Although both the 1850 and 1860 samples are extensive and representative in all but one instance (the coastal counties of 1860), they do not combine well. In the 1850-1860 sample the northern, pine barrens and coastal regions are so poorly represented that an evaluation of non-elective leadership patterns in these regions is not feasible. Consequently, the study of this group is limited to the cotton belt, where 46 percent of the counties of 1860 are represented.

While the samples described above are insufficient for a statistical analysis of the extent of continuing local leadership, it should be remembered that the figures given in regard to two of the upper echelon categories are either complete or very nearly complete. The other two categories are based on the partial list of candidates defeated in 1861, which is somewhat weighted in favor of the cotton belt. However, since all regions are well-represented and patterns are investigated on a regional basis, this slight imbalance causes no distortion.

The delegates and defeated candidates who were upper echelon county leaders in both 1850 and 1860-1861 were surveyed in the preceding chapter. However, the emphasis was on their roles at the state, or convention level and as reflectors of change in voter attitudes. Here these men will be considered in terms of regional patterns within the local leadership.

It has already been determined that at least fifty-one men were nominated for both conventions. Two of these are omitted from the regional study because they moved from one region to another between 1850 and 1860. Fifteen of the remaining forty-nine were from northern counties; twenty-nine, from the cotton belt; four, from the pine barrens; and one represented a coastal county.¹

In the northern region, 87 percent of those who were nominees in both years were unionists in 1850, and 13 percent favored resistance. Eight of the thirteen unionists were delegates to both conventions; five were delegates in 1850 and defeated candidates in 1861. Seven of the men in the first category and one in the second were co-operationists in 1861. The remaining delegate to both conventions and two of the 1850 delegates who made unsuccessful bids for seats in the second convention were secessionists in 1861. The policy advocated in 1861 by the other two unionists who were elected in 1850 but defeated ten years later could not be determined. Both of the resistance nominees were defeated in 1850. One of these men ran as a co-operationist in 1861 and was elected; the other ran as a secessionist and was defeated.²

The respective positions of thirteen of these men can be compared. Eight were unionist/co-operationists; three were unionist/secessionists; one was a resistance/co-operationist; and one was a resistance/secessionist. Thus 60 percent of the known continuing upper echelon leadership in the northern part of the state favored co-operation;

¹See above, pp. 67-68, 71-73, 79-80, 83-91; Appendix A.

²Ibid.

27 percent were secessionists, and the positions of 13 percent are undetermined.

Several aspects of the pattern indicated in the northern region should be noted. First, former unionists clearly dominated the continuing upper echelon leadership. Secondly, there was a definite tendency for northern unionists to favor co-operation in 1861, while the resistance split favored neither co-operation nor secession. Finally, as a whole, the continuing upper echelon leadership in this region shows a strong trend toward co-operation.

In the cotton belt 72 percent of those nominated in both 1850 and 1861 were unionists during the first crisis. Twenty-eight percent were resistance candidates. Seventeen of the twenty-one unionists were delegates to both conventions; three were delegates in 1850 and defeated candidates in 1861, and one was defeated in 1850 but elected in 1861. Seven of the unionists in the first category, two in the second and one in the third were co-operationists in 1861. Nine of those in the first category and one in the third were secessionists. The position of one of the union delegates of 1850 who was defeated in 1861 is unknown. One of the eight resistance candidates was a delegate to both conventions; four were defeated in 1850 but elected in 1861, and three were defeated in both years. The resistance delegate of 1850 was a secessionist in 1861 as were two of those defeated in 1850 but elected in 1861 and one candidate defeated in both elections. Two of the delegates of 1861 who had been defeated resistance candidates in 1850 were co-operationists in the second convention. The positions of the other two resistance

candidates, both of whom were defeated twice, are unknown.³

The respective positions of twenty-six of these upper echelon cotton belt leaders can be compared. Ten were unionist/co-operation-ists; ten were unionist/secessionists; four were resistance/secession-ists, and two were resistance/co-operationists. Thus 41 percent of the continuing upper echelon leadership in this region favored co-operation in 1861; 48 percent were secessionists, and the positions of the remaining 10 percent are unknown.

The pattern in the cotton belt is similar to that observed in the northern counties in that former unionists dominated the continuing upper echelon leadership. However, the resistance minority in the cotton belt was larger than that in the northern region. In contrast to the situation in the northern counties, the cotton belt unionists were evenly divided in support of co-operation and secession, while the resistance split apparently favored secession. As a whole, the continuing upper echelon leadership in this region shows no definite trend toward either co-operation or secession.

In the third region, the pine barrens, four men are known to have been nominated for both conventions. Three were elected on unionist platforms in 1850; the position of the fourth, who was defeated, is unknown. All four were elected in 1861. Two of the former unionists voted for secession in the second convention, while the other unionist and the candidate defeated in 1850 voted for co-operation.⁴ Thus the

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

upper echelon pattern of unionist domination was continued in the pine barrens. Since it is possible that the candidate whose position in 1850 is unknown was a unionist, no significance is attached to the fact that the known unionists split two to one for secession in 1861. On the other hand, the even split of the continuing upper echelon leadership in the pine barrens indicates the absence of a definite trend toward either co-operation or secession.

Only one man from the coastal region is known to have been a candidate for both conventions. He was elected as a unionist in 1850 and as a secessionist in 1861.⁵ However, the actions of one individual do not constitute a pattern.

While the continuing upper echelon leaders surveyed above remained at the same level in both years, the second type of county leader to be considered was a candidate for only one convention but was a part of the non-elective leadership prior to the other convention. This intermediate group is divided into two categories--the nominees of 1850 and the nominees of 1861. Those in the first category, who moved from the upper echelon of 1850 to the non-elective level in 1860-1861, were descending intermediate leaders. Those in the second category, who moved from the non-elective level to the upper echelon, were ascending intermediate leaders. Each category includes both delegates and defeated candidates.

A comparison of the roll of the first convention⁶ with the 1860

⁵Ibid.

⁶Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5.

sample shows that at least fifteen of the delegates of 1850 were active in county meetings held in the fall of 1860. The reports of the meetings in which these former delegates participated were published between November, 1860 and January, 1861 in six newspapers.⁷ These reports indicate that eleven of these men favored co-operation in 1860, while only two were secessionists. The positions of the remaining two men could not be determined because the nature of the meetings in which they participated was not clearly indicated in the published proceedings. In 1850, only one of these delegates had voted for resistance; the other fourteen were unionists.⁸

A comparison of the 1850 election returns⁹ with the 1860 sample indicates that at least ten of the candidates defeated in 1850 were non-elective leaders during the second sectional crisis. The reports of the meetings in which they took part were published in November and December, 1860 in three newspapers.¹⁰ These reports show that five were secessionists in 1860, and three were co-operationists. The positions of the other two men could not be determined. In 1850, nine had apparently been resistance candidates. The position of the tenth is

⁷Daily Chronicle and Sentinel; Southern Recorder; Federal Union; Georgia Telegraph; Georgia Journal and Messenger; Daily Intelligencer.

⁸Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 23-24.

⁹Federal Union, December 10, 1850.

¹⁰Georgia Telegraph; Daily Chronicle and Sentinel; Daily Constitutional.

unknown.¹¹

The names of the twenty-five men known to have been a part of the descending intermediate leadership, the counties which they represented, and their respective positions are given in the table on pages 104-105.

As noted above, the coastal counties are so poorly represented in the 1860 sample that this region is excluded from this portion of the local leadership study. None of the men listed in Table I are from this area. One is from the northern region, and two are from the pine barrens; the remaining twenty-two are from counties located in the cotton belt.¹²

The limited information relating to the descending intermediate leadership in the northern counties and the pine barrens makes it impossible to determine whether any particular pattern existed in either region. The nominee from the northern region was a unionist/secessionist. In the pine barrens there was one resistance/co-operationist and one unionist whose position in 1860 is unknown.

On the other hand, a definite pattern is evident in the cotton belt. Nearly 55 percent of the 1850 nominees who were active in county meetings held in this region prior to the Convention of 1861 were former unionists; 41 percent had favored resistance in 1850, and the positions

¹¹Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5, 23-24. The unit vote of a county delegation is considered an indirect indication of the position of members of the defeated ticket; a split delegation leaves the positions of the defeated candidates in doubt unless other information is available.

¹²Appendix A.

TABLE I

Descending Intermediate Leadership: 1850, 1860-1861

County	Nominee ^a	Position 1850	Position 1860
Bibb	Robert A. Smith* John Rutherford*	resis. resis.	seces. seces.
Campbell	John Carlton*	unknown	co-op.
Clarke	Wilson Lumpkin*	resis.	seces.
DeKalb, 1850 Fulton, 1860	William Ezzard	union	seces.
Elbert	Thomas J. Heard Thomas W. Thomas	union union	co-op. co-op.
Greene	W. W. D. Weaver	union	co-op.
Hancock	James Thomas	union	co-op.
Henry	Bushrod Petit	union	co-op.
Jasper	John W. Burney	resis.	co-op.
Laurens	E. J. Blackshear	union	co-op.
Macon	Nathan Bryan John Hunter*	union resis.	co-op. unknown
Madison	R. H. Bulloch	union	seces.
Meriwether	O. Warner*	resis.	co-op.
Monroe	David Ogletree* J. S. Pinckard	resis. union	unknown unknown
Pulaski, 1850 Wilcox, 1860	Norman McDuffie	union	unknown
Randolph, 1850 Quitman, 1860	B. H. Rice	union	co-op.
Richmond	John C. Snead* J. M. Smythe*	resis. resis.	seces. seces.

TABLE I (continued)

County	Nominee ^a	Position 1850	Position 1860
Tatnall	William W. Tippins*	resis.	co-op.
Upton	Thomas Beall	union	co-op.
Wilkinson	James Jackson	union	co-op.

^aDefeated candidates are indicated by asterisks.

of almost 5 percent are unknown. Ten of the twelve unionists were co-operationists in 1860; one was a secessionist, and the position of one is unknown. Five of the nine former resistance candidates were secessionists; two were co-operationists, and the positions of two are unknown. The man whose position in 1850 is unknown was a co-operationist in 1860. Thirteen, or 59 percent of the total, were co-operationists in 1860; 27 percent were secessionists, and the positions of 14 percent are unknown. Thus the pattern which emerges among the descending intermediate leadership in the cotton belt shows a trend toward unionist domination modified somewhat by the presence of a substantial resistance minority. There was a pronounced tendency for former unionists to support co-operation, and a less pronounced tendency for the former resistance men to favor secession. Finally, the overall split in 1860 indicates a trend toward co-operation.

The results of the study of the first category of the intermediate group were limited to the determination of patterns of continuing leadership in one region, the cotton belt. However, a more extensive regional analysis is possible in regard to the second category,

the ascending intermediate leadership.

A comparison of the convention roll¹³ with the 1850 sample shows that at least thirty-eight of the delegates of 1861 were non-elective county leaders in 1850. The reports of the meetings in which they participated were published between July and November, 1850 in eight newspapers.¹⁴ These reports indicate that nineteen were unionists and seventeen favored resistance. The positions of two could not be determined. In 1861, twenty-six were secessionists and twelve were co-operationists.¹⁵

A comparison of the composite candidate list¹⁶ with the 1850 sample shows that at least twenty of the men defeated in 1861 were active in county meetings held prior to the Convention of 1850. The reports of the meetings in which these men participated were published between July and November, 1850 in seven newspapers.¹⁷ These reports indicate that fourteen were unionists and five favored resistance. The position of one is unknown. In 1861, six were secessionists,¹⁸ and

¹³"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218.

¹⁴Federal Union; Southern Recorder; Daily Chronicle and Sentinel; Daily Constitutionalist; Savannah Morning News; Albany Patriot; Columbus Enquirer; Georgia Telegraph.

¹⁵"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 252-256.

¹⁶Appendix B.

¹⁷Federal Union; Southern Recorder; Daily Chronicle and Sentinel; Daily Constitutionalist; Albany Patriot; Columbus Enquirer; Georgia Journal and Messenger.

¹⁸"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-256. The unit vote of a county delegation for co-operation is considered an indirect indication that their opponents had favored secession.

eight were co-operationists.¹⁹ The positions of six are unknown.

The names of the fifty-eight men known to have been a part of the ascending intermediate leadership, the counties which they represented, and their respective positions are given in the table on pages 108-110. All four of the major geographic-economic regions are represented in this table. Six of the men listed were from northern counties; forty-one were from the cotton belt; eight were from the pine barrens, and three represented coastal counties.²⁰

Two-thirds of the men from the northern region known to have been ascending intermediate leaders were unionists in 1850, while nearly 17 percent favored resistance. The positions of another 17 percent are unknown. Three of the four unionists were co-operationists in 1861; the position of the other is unknown. Both the former resistance man and the individual whose position in 1850 is unknown were secessionists. Fifty percent of the total were co-operationists; 33 percent were secessionists, and the positions of 17 percent are unknown. The pattern indicated by these figures shows a pronounced unionist dominance of the continuing leadership and a strong tendency for former unionists to favor co-operation. The overall trend among this portion of the intermediate group in the northern region seems to have been toward

¹⁹Ibid.; Georgia Telegraph, December 20, 1860; Albany Patriot, December 20, 1860; Columbus Enquirer, December 18 and 25, 1860; Southern Recorder, January 1, 1861. The opponents of these eight men either cast unit votes for secession or split their votes. Since neither action may be considered an indirect indication of the position of the defeated candidate, it was necessary to utilize the reports of nominating meetings.

²⁰Appendix A.

TABLE II

Ascending Intermediate Leadership: 1850, 1860-1861

County	Nominee ^a	Position 1850	Position 1861
Baker, 1850 Dougherty, 1861	Lott Warren*	union	co-op.
Bibb	John B. Lamar Cicero Tharpe* J. H. R. Washington*	union resis. union	seces. co-op. co-op.
Bibb, 1850 Baker, 1861	A. H. Colquitt	resis.	seces.
Bulloch	S. L. Moore H. B. Hodges*	resis. resis.	seces. unknown
Burke	Elisha Allen Edmund Gresham	union union	seces. seces.
Butts	Henry Hendricks	resis.	seces.
Camden	F. M. Adams N. J. Patterson	resis. resis.	seces. seces.
Cass	Turner H. Trippe W. T. Wofford	union union	co-op. co-op.
Crawford, 1850 Taylor, 1861	C. F. Fickling*	union	seces.
Decatur	James M. Griffin* C. J. Munnerlyn	union unknown	unknown seces.
Floyd	Simpson Fouche	resis.	seces.
Franklin	John H. Patrick	union	co-op.
Franklin, 1850 Hart, 1861	James Allen*	union	unknown
Harris	Stephen Castello* H. D. Williams	union union	seces. co-op.
Houston	John M. Giles	resis.	seces.

TABLE II (continued)

County	Nominee ^a	Position 1850	Position 1861
Irwin	Jacob Young	resis.	co-op.
Irwin, 1850 Wilcox, 1861	George Reed*	resis.	seces.
Jackson	John G. Pittman	union	seces.
Jones	Peyton T. Pitts	union	seces.
Lee	W. B. Richardson	unknown	seces.
Lincoln	LaFayette Lamar	union	co-op.
Lowndes	Israel Waldhour*	union	co-op.
McIntosh	J. M. Harris	union	seces.
Macon, 1850 Taylor, 1861	B. F. Newsom*	union	seces.
Madison	James S. Gholston	union	seces.
Meriwether	William D. Martin	resis.	co-op.
Morgan	T. P. Saffold	union	co-op.
Murray	L. W. Crook*	unknown	seces.
Muscogee	Henry L. Benning	resis.	seces.
	Hines Holt*	union	co-op.
	Porter Ingram*	resis.	co-op.
	A. S. Rutherford	resis.	seces.
Pike	John Gardner*	union	co-op.
	Isaac B. Williamson*	union	co-op.
Putnam	David R. Adams	union	co-op.
Richmond	George W. Crawford	union	seces.
	I. P. Garvin	resis.	seces.
Screven	Curtis Humphries	resis.	seces.
	J. L. Singleton	resis.	seces.

TABLE II (continued)

County	Nominee ^a	Position 1850	Position 1861
Sumter	W. W. Barlow* T. M. Furlow Henry K. McKay*	union resis. union	unknown seces. unknown
Telfair, 1850 Coffee, 1861	J. H. Frier	union	co-op.
Troup	James M. Beall	resis.	seces.
Twiggs	John Fitzpatrick	resis.	seces.
Washington	S. A. H. Jones*	union	unknown
Warren	Augustus Beall* M. D. Cody	resis. union	seces. co-op.
Warren, 1850 Glascok, 1861	Calvin Logue	union	seces.
Wilkinson	N. A. Carswell	union	co-op.

^aDefeated candidates are indicated by asterisks.

co-operation.

In the cotton belt, 63 percent of the forty-one nominees of 1861 known to have been active at the non-elective level prior to the first convention were unionists in 1850. Thirty-two percent were in favor of resistance, and the positions of 5 percent are unknown. Eleven of the twenty-six unionists were co-operationists in 1861; eleven were secessionists, and the positions of four are unknown. Only three of the men who had favored resistance in 1850 were co-operationists in 1861; the other ten were secessionists. Both of the men whose positions in 1850 are unknown were also secessionists. A total of twenty-three, or 56

percent of these cotton belt leaders were secessionists in 1861; 34 percent were co-operationists, and the positions of 10 percent are unknown. Thus in the cotton belt former unionists made up a substantial majority of the ascending intermediate leadership. The unionists were apparently evenly divided in support of co-operation and secession, while the resistance men had a strong tendency to favor secession. Finally, a trend toward secession is evident among this portion of the continuing local leadership in the cotton belt.

In the third region, the pine barrens, 75 percent of eight known ascending intermediate leaders favored resistance in 1850, while only 25 percent were unionists. Four of the former resistance men were secessionists in 1861; one favored co-operation, and the position of the sixth is unknown. Both of the unionists were co-operationists. Fifty percent of the total were secessionists in 1861; nearly 38 percent were co-operationists, and the positions of almost 13 percent are unknown. Thus in this region the ascending intermediate pattern shows a resistance dominance of this portion of the continuing leadership. This resistance majority had a strong tendency to favor secession in 1861, while former unionists were inclined to favor co-operation. On the whole, there was apparently a slight trend toward secession among the ascending intermediate leadership in the pine barrens.

In the coastal region two of the three known ascending leaders were in favor of resistance in 1850; the other was a unionist. However, it should be noted that the small number of individuals involved tends to reduce the significance of the resistance majority. On the other hand, the fact that all three were secessionists in 1861 may be

considered an indication that there was a definite trend toward secession among the ascending intermediate leadership in this region.

The two categories of intermediate leadership surveyed above represent two distinct classes of leaders. A comparison of ascending and descending patterns in each region would be most useful; however, such a comparison can be made in only one of the four regions, the cotton belt.

In the cotton belt, both the ascending and descending intermediate leadership was dominated by unionists, although this unionist dominance was more pronounced in the former group. While the ascending unionists were evenly divided in support of co-operation and secession, the descending unionists showed a strong tendency to favor co-operation. Both the ascending and descending resistance men were inclined to favor secession. Finally, a definite trend toward secession is evident in this region among the ascending leadership as a whole, while a trend toward co-operation is indicated among the descending leadership. Thus in the cotton belt those who moved from the upper to the lower level of county leadership were, as a group, more conservative than those who advanced to the higher level.

While the intermediate leadership moved from one level to another between 1850 and 1860, the third type of county leader to be considered remained at the same level in both years. The men who made up the continuing non-elective leadership were candidates for neither convention but were active in county meetings held prior to both. As noted above, the limitations of the combined 1850-1860 sample used in the survey of this group restrict the study of this portion of the

continuing leadership to the cotton belt.

The combined 1850-1860 sample indicates that at least seventy men from this region were active at the non-elective level in both 1850 and 1860. Reports of the meetings in which these men participated were published between July and November, 1850 and between November, 1860 and January, 1861 in eight newspapers.²¹ These reports show that forty-eight were unionists in 1850; while nineteen favored resistance. The positions of three could not be determined. In 1860, thirty-three were co-operationists; twenty-five were secessionists; and the positions of twelve are unknown. The names of these seventy men, their counties and respective positions are given in the table on pages 114-115.

As Table III shows, twenty-six of these men were from Bibb County. It is possible that there was a greater degree of continuing non-elective leadership in this county than in the other counties in the sample. On the other hand, since the Bibb meetings in both 1850 and 1860 were much more thoroughly reported than those in any other county, it seems likely that the size of the Bibb representation is the result of a more complete survey of the continuing non-elective leadership than was possible in the other counties in the sample. However, even if the former explanation is correct, the regional pattern could be distorted as a result of the fact that 37 percent of the known continuing non-elective leadership in the cotton belt was from one county. Because of this, the pattern is analyzed with the Bibb leaders included and with

²¹Federal Union; Southern Recorder; Daily Chronicle and Sentinel; Daily Constitutionalist; Albany Patriot; Columbus Enquirer; Georgia Telegraph; Georgia Journal and Messenger.

TABLE III
Non-Elective Leaders Active in 1850 and 1860

County	Leader	Position 1850	Position 1860
Baker, 1850 Dougherty, 1860	John Jackson	union	unknown
	E. H. Platt	unknown	seces.
	Peter J. Strozier	union	co-op.
	Nelson Tift	resis.	co-op.
	D. A. Vason	union	seces.
Baldwin	B. A. White	union	co-op.
Bibb	L. F. W. Andrews	union	co-op.
	J. W. Armstrong	union	co-op.
	Samuel T. Bailey	resis.	seces.
	Roland Bivins	union	co-op.
	Thurston R. Bloom	union	seces.
	A. H. Chappell	union	unknown
	Anderson Comer	union	co-op.
	J. Mercer Greene	resis.	seces.
	J. J. Gresham	union	seces.
	Lewis J. Groce	union	co-op.
	Thomas Hardeman, Jr.	union	co-op.
	Pulaski S. Holt	resis.	co-op.
	Thaddeus G. Holt	union	co-op.
	William S. Holt	union	unknown
	S. B. Hunter	resis.	unknown
	John L. Jones	union	seces.
	R. S. Lanier	union	seces.
	William Lundy	union	unknown
	James A. Nisbet	union	seces.
	Simri Rose	union	co-op.
	B. F. Ross	resis.	seces.
	Isaac Scott	union	co-op.
	E. L. Strohecker	resis.	seces.
	Thomas Stubbs	union	seces.
	James Tinley	union	unknown
	Stephen Woodward	resis.	seces.
Clarke	William L. Mitchell	unknown	seces.
Crawford	George R. Hunter	resis.	seces.
	Samuel Rutherford	union	co-op.
Greene	Y. P. King	union	co-op.

TABLE III (continued)

County	Leader	Position 1850	Position 1860
Houston	J. W. Belvins	resis.	seces.
	Samuel D. Killen	resis.	seces.
	John H. Powers	union	seces.
	Charles West	resis.	seces.
Jasper	Thomas J. Smith	resis.	co-op.
Jefferson	J. W. Alexander	union	unknown
	Benjamin S. Carswell	union	co-op.
Jones	R. W. Bonner	resis.	seces.
Macon	William Felton	union	co-op.
	Burwell Green	union	unknown
	Benjamin Harris	union	co-op.
Marion	Mark H. Blandford	union	seces.
	Samuel H. Crawford	union	unknown
	C. H. McCall	union	unknown
Monroe	R. P. Trippe	union	unknown
Morgan	T. J. Burney	union	co-op.
	Joshua Hill	union	co-op.
Muscogee	Robert M. Gunby	union	unknown
	G. E. Thomas	union	co-op.
	M. W. Thweatt	unknown	co-op.
	John G. Winter	union	co-op.
Putnam	William E. Adams	resis.	co-op.
	Samuel Pearson	union	co-op.
	Robert J. Wynn	union	co-op.
Richmond	Foster Blodgett	union	co-op.
	John D. Butt	resis.	seces.
	H. H. Cumming	union	co-op.
	W. M. D'Antignac	resis.	seces.
	Antoine Poullain	resis.	seces.
	A. P. Robertson	resis.	seces.
Upson	William A. Cobb	union	co-op.
	T. A. D. Weaver	union	co-op.
Walton	Jesse H. Arnold	union	co-op.
	Orion Stroud	union	co-op.

these twenty-six men excluded. In those cases where possible distortion is indicated, the figures on which the pattern is based are adjusted by reducing the size of the Bibb representation to that of the next largest county representation, with values assigned in proportion to those in the original Bibb group.

When the men from Bibb County are included, Table III shows that forty-eight, or 69 percent of the total, were unionists in 1850; 27 percent favored resistance, and the positions of 4 percent are unknown. Twenty-eight of the unionists were co-operationists in 1860; nine were secessionists, and the positions of eleven are unknown. Fourteen of the nineteen resistance leaders were secessionists; four were co-operationists, and the position of one was not determined. Two of the men whose positions in 1850 are unknown were secessionists in 1860, and one was a co-operationist. Forty-seven percent of the continuing non-elective leadership in the cotton belt favored co-operation in 1860; 36 percent were secessionists, and the positions of 17 percent are unknown. If the nineteen former unionists and seven former resistance leaders from Bibb are excluded from these totals, the revised figures show that 66 percent of the remaining forty-four non-elective cotton belt leaders were unionists. Twenty-seven percent favored resistance, and the positions of 7 percent are unknown. The twenty-nine unionists split nineteen to three in favor of co-operation with the positions of seven unknown. Nine of the twelve resistance leaders were secessionists; three were co-operationists. Two of the men whose positions in 1850 are unknown were secessionists in 1860, and one was a co-operationist. Fifty-two percent of this portion of the continuing non-elective leadership favored

co-operation in 1860; 32 percent, secession, and the positions of 16 percent are unknown.

With one important exception, the results of the study in which the Bibb leadership is included are similar to those found when the men from this county are excluded. In both instances unionists dominated the continuing non-elective leadership in the cotton belt and showed a strong tendency to favor co-operation, while the resistance minority had an even more pronounced tendency to support secession. However, whereas no distinct overall trend toward either secession or co-operation is evident in the study which includes Bibb, a slight trend toward co-operation becomes apparent when the Bibb leadership is excluded. This difference suggests a possible distortion of this aspect of the regional pattern as a result of the disproportionate influence of one county. Therefore, in order to obtain a more accurate indication of the pattern in the region as a whole, the totals must be adjusted in the manner outlined above. The percentages based on these adjusted figures show 51 percent in favor of co-operation; 33 percent for secession, and 16 percent unknown. This substantiates the slight trend toward co-operation found when the Bibb representation was excluded from the study.

As noted above, the study of the continuing non-elective leadership was limited to the cotton belt. This was also the only region in which all the groupings of local leaders under consideration could be analyzed. In each case unionists dominated the continuing leadership. While upper echelon and ascending intermediate unionists in the cotton belt were more or less evenly divided in favor of secession and co-operation, descending intermediate and non-elective unionists tended to

support co-operation. Thus, as a whole the continuing unionist leadership in the cotton belt showed a slight tendency to favor co-operation. On the other hand, with all four groups of former resistance men splitting in favor of secession, the continuing resistance leadership in this region showed a strong tendency to favor secession. The overall pattern of continuing local leadership in the cotton belt points to a slight trend toward co-operation. Only the ascending intermediate group had a definite tendency to favor secession. Although the results of this aspect of the upper echelon study show no definite trend in either direction, both the descending intermediate and the non-elective studies indicated a trend toward co-operation.

This probable trend toward co-operation is in contrast to the voting pattern of the men who represented the cotton belt in the Convention of 1861. Fifty-eight percent of the 157 delegates from this region present at the convention were secessionists; 42 percent voted for co-operation.²² Thus a definite trend toward secession is evident in the convention.

In the northern region, patterns relating to only two groups of local leaders were determined. Both of these categories, the continuing upper echelon and the ascending intermediate leadership, were dominated by former unionists. In each case unionists tended to favor co-operation while resistance men showed no marked tendency in either direction. As a whole, both the continuing upper echelon and the ascending intermediate patterns in the northern region showed a trend toward

²²"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-256; Appendix A.

co-operation.

This trend toward co-operation is also evident in the vote of the region's delegates in the Convention of 1861. A total of seventy-eight delegates from northern counties attended the convention. Fifty-three, or 68 percent of these men voted for co-operation, while 32 percent were in favor of secession.²³

Only two continuing local leadership patterns could be determined in the pine barrens, and these two patterns indicate no general regional pattern. The continuing upper echelon leadership was dominated by unionists; the ascending intermediate, by resistance men. Although unionists in the latter group tended to favor co-operation, and resistance men were inclined to support secession, neither tendency can be verified by the upper echelon study. This is also the case in regard to overall trends in 1860-1861. The upper echelon leaders active during both periods were evenly divided in support of co-operation and secession, while the ascending intermediate group seemed slightly inclined to favor secession.

Although the known patterns of continuing local leadership in the pine barrens present a rather confused picture, the vote of the delegates from this region shows a definite trend toward secession. Seventy-two percent of these fifty delegates were secessionists, and only 28 percent favored co-operation.²⁴

In the coastal region only one continuing local leadership

²³Ibid.

²⁴Ibid.

pattern could be determined, that of the ascending intermediate group. Although no general regional pattern may be based on the actions of this group alone, it should be noted that all three of the known ascending intermediate leaders in this region as well as the one continuing upper echelon leader were secessionists. This suggests the possibility that the continuing local leadership in the coastal region may have been inclined to favor secession. If such a trend did exist, it was reflected in the delegate voting pattern. All thirteen of the delegates who represented the coastal counties in the Convention of 1861 cast votes for secession.²⁵

Although the results of the local leadership study are rather limited insofar as the pine barrens and coastal regions are concerned, less than 25 percent of the 132 counties of 1860 were located in these regions. On the other hand, a relatively consistent general pattern of continuing leadership is evident in the northern region and the cotton belt. In both of these regions unionists clearly dominated the continuing leadership and, as a whole, were more inclined to favor co-operation than secession. The continuing resistance leadership in both regions was generally more inclined to favor secession. Finally, the continuing county leadership as a whole in both the northern region and the cotton belt tended to advocate a policy of co-operation in 1860-1861.

²⁵Ibid.

CHAPTER VI

THE ELECTIONS: 1850, 1861

On November 25, 1850 and again on January 2, 1861, the voters of Georgia went to the polls to select delegates to special conventions called to consider the state's response to sectional crises. This study focuses on two aspects of these elections--the size and nature of the popular majority in each instance and the extent of voter participation. The comparison of the unionist and secessionist popular majorities is secondary to the more significant downward revision of the size of the secessionist majority based on election returns not formerly available. On the other hand, the comparison of the extent of voter participation in 1861 with that in 1850 is in itself a revision of the method usually used in evaluating the size of the vote in the election of 1861. Both contemporaries and historians have compared the vote for delegates to the Convention of 1861 with that cast in two preceding statewide elections, the presidential election of 1860 and the gubernatorial election of 1859. They have concluded that voter participation in 1861 was limited and have attributed this to inclement weather on election day.¹ Although it does not seem likely that the issues at stake in 1861 would generate less voter interest than those involving party factions, this

¹Federal Union, January 8, 1861; Daily Georgia Telegraph, January 3, 1861; Allan Nevins, The Emergence of Lincoln, Vol. II, Prologue to Civil War, 1859-1861 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951), p. 415; William J. Donnelly, "Conspiracy or Popular Movement: The Historiography of Southern Support for Secession," North Carolina Historical Review, XLII (Winter, 1965), p. 74.

study examines this possibility by studying the election of 1861 in terms of the only other election in the state in which similar issues were involved.

Both contemporaries and historians have acknowledged the decided unionist popular majority of 1850; however, contemporary doubt concerning the existence of a popular majority for secession in 1861 apparently developed in certain quarters shortly after the election. These doubts arose in part from the fact that the election returns were not promptly released. The issue of the unpublished returns was raised on the third day of the convention by a co-operationist delegate who introduced a resolution requesting the governor to furnish the convention with a report of "the whole number of votes polled in each county, and the number received by each candidate." Action on this resolution was indefinitely postponed by a vote of 168 to 127.² A group of citizens in Murray County subsequently petitioned Governor Brown to have the election returns published. In compliance with this petition, the executive department belatedly released the official version of the election results on April 25, 1861.³

The Brown report did not give the complete election returns; instead it listed only the candidates receiving the "Highest vote for Secession" and the "Highest vote for Co-operation" in each county. According to this tally, which included every county in the state except one, the secessionist vote was 50,243; the co-operationist total,

²"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 245-246.

³Federal Union, April 30, 1861.

37,123. Pointing to a "clear popular majority" for secession, Brown issued a call for unity in the face of a Northern foe "now making war upon us most unjustly, wickedly and cruelly."⁴

Modern historians have had access only to the totals given in the Brown report, which was accurately quoted, but not documented, by a contemporary historian in 1881. Since this source failed to include a critical analysis of the report or to indicate the form in which it was presented, certain errors which distorted these figures were not apparent.⁵

A number of minor mistakes were made in the official returns, but the basic error lay in the choice of criteria utilized in determining the highest vote for secession and co-operation in each county. The classification of delegates and defeated candidates was obviously based on the vote on the ordinance of secession in the convention. However, on this vote forty-five co-operationists, including Benjamin H. Hill, one of the co-operationist leaders, responded to a plea for unity by voting for the ordinance. It is totally unrealistic to consider the county vote cast for any of these men as an endorsement of secession; yet twenty-three are listed as secessionists in the Brown report, and their vote is included in the secessionist popular majority. Moreover,

⁴Ibid.

⁵Avery, The History of Georgia, p. 149. The report was apparently published in only one newspaper. Moreover, it appeared nearly four months after the election, at a time when attention was centered on the initial stages of the war. These two factors, limited distribution and illogical timing, help to explain why this release was not located by those unaware of the circumstances leading to its preparation and publication.

in addition to these major errors and other inaccuracies resulting from the misinterpretation of the vote on the ordinance of secession, four co-operationists who actually voted against the ordinance are included in the secessionist column, and one secessionist is incorrectly listed as a co-operationist.⁶

Both the popular majority and the total vote were affected by the errors in the Brown report. Because of the abbreviated form in which the returns were presented, the correction of these errors poses certain problems. In twenty-one counties it is not possible to determine the total county vote. In thirteen counties the secessionist vote is unknown, and in four counties the co-operationist vote cannot be determined. While the voter participation study will deal with known quantities only, the popular majority study will take both known and unknown quantities into consideration, with the latter being projected as probabilities based on information derived from the analysis of the former.

As noted above, the extent of voter participation in 1861 is compared with that in 1850. However, population growth and the creation of new counties during the ten years between these two elections invalidate such a comparison in terms of the number of votes cast. Therefore, the vote in each of these elections is expressed as a percentage of the vote in immediately preceding statewide elections. Thus the total vote in each county in 1850 is calculated as a percentage of the vote cast in these counties in the gubernatorial election held in the fall of

⁶Federal Union, April 30, 1861; "Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-260.

1849. Since two general elections were held just prior to the election of 1861, the gubernatorial election of 1859 and the presidential election of 1860, the 1861 vote is expressed as a percentage of the average vote cast in these two elections. The percentages of voter participation in the elections of 1850 and 1861 obtained in this manner are compared on both a state and regional basis.

The 1850 voter participation survey is complete with the exception of six counties. Gordon and Clinch are omitted from the 1849 returns,⁷ and the 1850 returns list no vote in Appling County. Although the vote cast for delegates from three counties, Bryan, Burke and Pulaski, is included in the 1850 returns, these delegations were elected without opposition and split their convention vote. In such cases the county total cannot be determined since there is no indication as to whether the vote was divided between the unionist and resistance candidates or whether most of the electorate voted for both. The delegations from Campbell, Dooly, Irwin, Lowndes and Thomas also split in the Convention of 1850. However, since there were opposition candidates in all five of these counties, the total vote can be determined in each case by adding the vote received by all candidates and dividing by the number of delegates. In the remaining eighty-four counties the total county vote is based on the highest vote cast for a unionist candidate and the highest vote for a resistance candidate. In all cases the vote on the third resolution in the Georgia Platform is utilized as a direct indication of the position of delegates and as an indirect indication

⁷Georgia Journal and Messenger, December 19, 1849.

of the position of defeated candidates.⁸

The 1861 voter participation survey is less complete than that of 1850. The average 1859-1860 vote has been obtained for all counties except Wilcox and Irwin; in these two counties the 1859 vote alone is used.⁹ However, the total vote cast in twenty-two counties in the election of 1861 cannot be determined as a result of limitations and errors in the Brown report. No returns at all are given for McIntosh County, and the co-operationist vote in Montgomery is omitted. Ten of these twenty-two counties had split delegations in the convention. Classification errors were made in listing the vote in five, Morgan, Greene, Lincoln, Monroe and Fannin. However, even if candidates were correctly classified, as is the case in Banks, Catoosa, Forsyth, Gordon and Oglethorpe, the total vote in counties which elected split delegations can be determined only if the vote received by all candidates is known. Finally, although the delegations from the remaining ten counties voted as a unit in the convention, in each instance the Brown report lists co-operationist delegates in both columns. This error can be rectified in part by using the higher of the two co-operationist votes; however,

⁸Federal Union, December 10, 1850; Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5, 23-24; "Debates and Proceedings," Federal Union, December 24, 1850. The use of the complete returns (which give the vote received by all candidates in ninety-four counties) in every county included in this portion of the study would have allowed a more accurate survey of the extent of voter participation in 1850. However, since the 1861 voter participation study is, of necessity, based on the highest vote for secession and for co-operation, a similar procedure is used in the 1850 study in order to facilitate the comparative study.

⁹Federal Union, October 25, 1859, November 20, 1860. The complete returns for both 1859 and 1860 are given in the latter issue, but the Wilcox and Irwin votes are illegible.

the secessionist vote cannot be determined. Counties in this category are Charlton, Clayton, Henry, Irwin, Laurens, Meriwether, Newton, Talbot, Walton and White.¹⁰

The total 1861 vote in 110 counties is known. In three of these counties this could not be determined on the basis of the Brown report but is available from other sources. The report lists the two co-operationists elected in Baldwin as a secessionist and a co-operationist. In this instance the higher co-operationist vote and the secessionist vote reported shortly after the election are used in determining the total vote.¹¹ In Troup County, which sent a split delegation to the convention, a co-operationist is incorrectly listed as a secessionist, and the vote of a defeated candidate is given in the co-operationist column. However, since the vote received by every candidate in this county is available, the total vote is ascertained by adding the vote of all the candidates and dividing by the number of delegates.¹² This is also the method used in determining the total vote in another county whose delegation split in the convention. In Marion County the Brown report correctly lists the elected secessionist but gives the vote cast for a defeated candidate in the co-operationist column. However, the total vote

¹⁰Federal Union, April 30, 1861; "Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-256, 264.

¹¹Federal Union, January 8, April 30, 1861; "Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-256. Although not all of the scattered returns published after the election are accurate, those citing the same vote given in the official returns for the two candidates listed in the latter are considered reliable.

¹²Federal Union, April 30, 1861; "Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-256; Daily Constitutionalist, January 6, 1861.

may be calculated by using the vote cast for all candidates.¹³ In the remaining 107 counties the total vote is based on the figures given in the official returns.¹⁴

The data compiled in the 1850 and 1861 voter participation surveys is given in the table on pages 130-133. As indicated above, the major sources¹⁵ utilized include the returns in the 1849 gubernatorial election;¹⁶ the 1850 convention election returns used in conjunction with the roll of this convention and the test vote on the third resolution of the Georgia Platform;¹⁷ the returns in the 1859 gubernatorial

¹³Federal Union, April 30, 1861; "Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-256; Daily Columbus Enquirer, January 5, 1861.

¹⁴Federal Union, April 30, 1861; "Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-256. Although in twelve of these counties elected co-operationists are incorrectly listed as secessionists in the Brown report, it is assumed that the defeated candidates listed in the co-operationist column represent the correct secessionist vote. In eleven instances this assumption is based on the fact that the county delegations cast unit votes for co-operation in the convention. In the case of Cherokee County, whose delegation split, the figures given in the Brown report are considered an accurate reflection of the total vote because the secessionist delegate from this county was elected as a member of an instructed co-operationist ticket (Columbus Enquirer, December 25, 1860). In the other ninety-five counties where totals are based on the official returns, the delegations cast unit votes and the delegates listed are correctly classified.

¹⁵Exceptions are noted above. The extensive documentation required to show these source exceptions, those relating to the manner in which totals were calculated, and the reasons why totals are not available in certain cases would destroy the effectiveness of the table as a visual aid. For this reason it was necessary to include information which might have been expressed in tabular footnotes in the discussion preceding the table.

¹⁶Georgia Journal and Messenger, December 19, 1849.

¹⁷Federal Union, December 10, 1850; Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5, 23-24; "Debates and Proceedings," Federal Union, December 24, 1850.

election and the 1860 presidential election;¹⁸ and the official returns in the election of 1861 used in conjunction with the convention roll and the test vote on the Johnson resolutions.¹⁹

The percentages of voter participation in 1850 given in Table IV range from a high of 120 percent in Chatham to a low of 30 percent in Lee. The average county vote in this election is 79 percent. The 1861 range is from 111 percent in Towns to 38 percent in Madison; the average is 78 percent. However, these average percentages are somewhat misleading since they include counties where the absence of opposition candidates would tend to reduce voter participation. This is substantiated by the fact that the average percentage of participation in counties where there was no opposition is significantly lower than the overall average in both 1850 and 1861. In 1850 the nine counties where the men elected faced no opposition show an average of 42 percent participation, while the twelve counties without opposition candidates in 1861 had an average 56 percent voter participation. Since the generally lower percentage of voter participation in such counties may be at least partially attributed to the fact that the role of the electorate in the decision-making process was minimized, a more accurate measure of voter interest in the issues involved in these two elections may be obtained if the counties where candidates were unopposed are excluded. When this is done, the 1850 average is 83 percent, and the 1861 average is 80 percent.

¹⁸Federal Union, October 25, 1859, November 20, 1860.

¹⁹Federal Union, April 30, 1861; "Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 254-256, 264.

TABLE IV
Voter Participation: 1850, 1861

County	1849 Gov.	1850 Del.	Per- cent ^a	1859-1860 Average ^b	1861 Del.	Per- cent ^c
Appling	324	----	----	436	424	97
Baker	841	331	39*	346	220	64
Baldwin	666	545	82	827	568	69
Banks				580	----	----
Berrien				520	387	74
Bibb	1368	1257	92	1943	1639	84
Brooks				620	287	46*
Bryan	193	----	----	278	253	91
Bulloch	433	467	108	591	436	74
Burke	744	----	----	917	537	59*
Butts	675	547	81	671	437	65*
Calhoun				367	288	78
Camden	238	152	64*	216	155	72*
Campbell	964	610	63	1209	934	77
Carroll	1319	865	66	1663	1556	94
Cass	2366	1761	74	1959	1863	95
Catoosa				796	----	----
Charlton				196	----	----
Chatham	1452	1737	120	2061	1597	77*
Chatooga	858	317	37*	897	679	76
Chattahoochee				593	437	74
Cherokee	1782	1869	105	1504	1405	93
Clarke	1038	916	88	1117	897	80
Clay				515	296	57
Clayton				636	----	----
Clinch	----	295	----	297	297	100
Cobb	1977	1978	100	1948	1042	53*
Coffee				231	221	96
Colquitt				204	146	72
Columbia	581	384	66	800	414	52
Coweta	1494	1218	82	1422	1140	80
Crawford	841	742	88	610	461	76
Dade	376	269	72	481	388	81
Dawson				568	511	90
Decatur	861	336	39*	1078	979	91
DeKalb	1846	1535	83	1111	914	82
Dooly	816	599	73	719	560	78
Dougherty				598	403	67
Early	601	576	96	434	215	50*
Echols				148	146	99
Effingham	326	232	71	427	352	82

TABLE IV (continued)

County	1849 Gov.	1850 Del.	Per- centa	1859-1860 Average ^b	1861 Del.	Per- centc
Elbert	1190	1041	87	805	406	50
Emanuel	383	323	84	506	411	81
Fannin				757	----	----
Fayette	1146	834	73	842	822	98
Floyd	1518	1003	66	1805	1472	82
Forsyth	1249	1039	83	1055	----	----
Franklin	1363	1163	85	902	707	78
Fulton				2432	1747	72
Gilmer	1122	539	48*	1008	874	87
Glascocock				243	223	92
Glynn	132	133	101	213	162	76
Gordon	----	813	----	1384	----	----
Greene	889	636	72	902	----	----
Gwinnett	1419	1248	88	1688	1525	90
Habersham	1093	881	81	772	583	76
Hall	1237	515	42	1153	935	81
Hancock	756	636	84	680	445	65
Haralson				376	394	104
Harris	1159	1032	89	1137	897	79
Hart				830	645	78
Heard	841	510	61	920	764	83
Henry	1805	1460	81	1257	----	----
Houston	1249	1041	83	1139	867	76
Irwin	378	307	81	225	----	----
Jackson	1290	1013	79	1254	1088	87
Jasper	950	1049	110	819	629	77
Jefferson	537	233	43	787	554	70
Johnson				374	318	85
Jones	830	686	83	472	402	85
Laurens	597	272	46*	526	----	----
Lee	579	175	30*	466	204	44
Liberty	299	238	80	389	408	105
Lincoln	405	320	79	361	----	----
Lowndes	849	542	64	500	465	93
Lumpkin	1396	1110	80	824	675	82
McIntosh	212	211	100	259	----	----
Macon	729	610	84	707	424	60
Madison	699	247	35*	648	248	38*
Marion	1098	1086	99	738	621	84
Meriwether	1577	1268	80	1265	----	----
Miller				262	134	51*
Milton				749	626	84
Mitchell				473	363	77

TABLE IV (continued)

County	1849 Gov.	1850 Del.	Per- cent ^a	1859-1860 Average ^b	1861 Del.	Per- cent ^c
Monroe	1382	1225	89	1190	----	----
Montgomery	284	185	65	375	----	----
Morgan	648	527	81	597	----	----
Murray	1970	1634	83	952	837	88
Muscogee	1896	1927	102	1648	1403	85
Newton	1420	1085	76	1500	----	----
Oglethorpe	806	738	92	818	----	----
Paulding	867	840	97	1039	851	82
Pickens				741	767	104
Pierce				319	266	83
Pike	1614	1429	89	1047	822	79
Polk				703	641	91
Pulaski	645	----	----	680	683	100
Putnam	694	573	83	642	456	71
Quitman				403	215	53
Rabun	351	299	85	486	440	91
Randolph	1546	1434	93	1083	480	44
Richmond	1281	944	74	2155	1972	92
Schley				442	356	81
Screven	477	340	71	543	348	64
Spalding				1057	817	77
Stewart	1472	1578	107	1094	752	69
Sumter	1239	887	72	1182	954	81
Talbot	1582	1311	83	1037	----	----
Taliaferro	397	295	74	405	212	52*
Tatnall	403	334	83	492	346	70*
Taylor				577	584	101
Telfair	392	315	80	286	290	101
Terrell				646	557	86
Thomas	727	571	79	958	583	61
Towns				321	357	111
Troup	1502	909	61	1320	799	61
Twiggs	722	641	89	506	211	42*
Union	958	852	89	722	787	109
Upson	1043	932	89	901	576	64
Walker	1649	1328	81	1403	914	65
Walton	1247	1157	93	1287	----	----
Ware	485	297	61	262	252	96
Warren	1012	379	37*	762	496	65
Washington	1164	976	84	1218	848	70
Wayne	174	203	117	189	135	71
Webster				520	412	79
White				453	----	----

TABLE IV (continued)

County	1849 Gov.	1850 Del.	Per- cent ^a	1859-1860 Average ^b	1861 Del.	Per- cent ^c
Whitfield				1423	1304	92
Wilcox				276	210	76
Wilkes	765	743	97	738	391	53
Wilkinson	893	824	92	974	854	88
Worth				390	303	78

^aThe percentages in this column express the 1850 vote in terms of the 1849 vote. They were obtained by dividing the figures given in column three by those given in column two. Percentages relating to counties where delegations were elected without opposition are indicated by asterisks.

^bThe county totals given in this column were obtained by averaging the vote cast in the gubernatorial election of 1859 with that in the presidential election of 1860. However, it should be noted that the vote given for Irwin and Wilcox represents the 1859 election only.

^cThe percentages in this column express the 1861 vote in terms of the average vote cast in the gubernatorial election of 1859 and the presidential election of 1860. They were obtained by dividing the totals given in column six by those in column five. Percentages relating to counties where delegations were elected without opposition are indicated by asterisks.

Although the average percentage of voter participation in 1850 was slightly higher than that in 1861, these averages seem to indicate a surprising similarity in the extent of voter participation in the special elections of 1850 and 1861. However, if the percentages given in Table IV are considered on a regional basis, the results tend to indicate a lesser degree of similarity in the two elections than that suggested by the averages in the state as a whole.

In two regions the average percentage of participation was greater in 1861 than it had been in 1850. The northern counties show an increase from an average of 81 percent in 1850 to 87 percent in 1861,

while the pine barrens vote rose from an average of 80 percent in 1850 to 85 percent in 1861. Both regional averages were below the state average in 1850 but above that in the state as a whole in 1861. In two other regions, the cotton belt and the coastal counties, regional averages decreased in 1861. The average percentage of participation in the cotton belt was 83 percent in 1850 but only 74 percent in 1861. While the 1850 regional average was the same as the state average, in 1861 the cotton belt average was lower than that in the state as a whole. In the coastal counties the average percentage of participation was much higher than the state average in both elections; however, the regional average decreased from 100 percent in 1850 to 91 percent in 1861.²⁰

Several factors should be noted in regard to the two regions where the average percentages of voter participation show a decrease in voter activity in 1861. First, one of these regions was quite small. Made up of only six counties, the coastal region had relatively little effect on the state average in either election. On the other hand, more than half of the counties in the state were located in the cotton belt; therefore, voter participation in this region would have a significant effect on the state average. This is particularly important in view of the fact that contemporary comments attributing what was considered a light vote to the weather appeared in newspapers published in the heart of the cotton belt.

Information pertaining to the extent of voter participation in

²⁰Appendix A. All averages used in the regional voter participation study are based on the vote in counties where there were opposition candidates.

1861 is vital to the consideration of the outcome of this election. Unfortunately the actual size of the popular majority in 1861 is obscured as a result of the partial returns given in the official report and the errors made in the classification of certain candidates listed in this report. Therefore, regional averages of voter participation must be utilized to project the probable size of the popular majority in this election.

Although the study of the popular majority of 1861 is complicated by the unknown factors, a major portion of this study is based on the known highest vote for a secessionist candidate and/or the known highest vote for a co-operationist candidate in 131 of the 132 counties in Georgia at this time. With only one exception, the final vote on the Johnson resolutions is utilized in the classification of delegates and the indirect classification of defeated candidates. The use of this criteria undoubtedly involves a degree of error in an undetermined number of cases in which secessionist delegates were co-operationist candidates. However, the additional requirement of information regarding the pre-convention position of all secessionist delegates would so limit the popular majority study that it would be virtually meaningless. Therefore, the less accurate classification by convention vote is the only feasible means of studying the popular vote in 1861.

Both the highest vote for a secessionist candidate and the highest vote for a co-operationist candidate can be determined in 116 counties. In 100 counties these votes are utilized as given in the

Brown report.²¹ Both votes given in another twelve counties may be used if classification errors are corrected.²² In two counties only the highest vote for co-operation may be determined from the corrected official returns; however, the secessionist vote is available from other sources.²³ In one county the highest vote for secession is indicated in the Brown report, and the co-operationist vote is obtained from another source.²⁴ Finally, after a classification error involving a

²¹Federal Union, April 30, 1861; "Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-256. Delegations from ninety-five of these counties cast unit votes in the convention, and the delegates listed in the report are correctly classified according to this vote. In the other five counties, Banks, Catoosa, Forsyth, Gordon and Oglethorpe, split delegations were elected. However, in each case both secessionist and co-operationist delegates are listed and properly classified.

²²Ibid. Although unit co-operationist delegations were elected in eleven of these counties, the delegates listed in the Brown report are classified as secessionists. These errors may be corrected by transferring the votes given in each case to the proper column. Counties involved are Columbia, Habersham, Harris, Milton, Schley, Taylor, Warren, Washington, Webster, Whitfield and Wilkinson. The twelfth county, Fannin, elected a split delegation. Although both delegates are named in the official returns, they are listed in the wrong columns. Therefore, these votes must be transferred to the correct columns.

²³Ibid.; Federal Union, January 8, 1861; Daily Constitutional-ist, January 6, 1861. Both members of Baldwin County's co-operationist delegation are listed in the Brown report, one as a secessionist. The higher of these two votes is the correct co-operationist majority; the secessionist minority is given in the earlier issue of the Federal Union. Only one of Troup's three member split delegation is included in the official returns, a co-operationist listed as a secessionist. The vote cast for this delegate is transferred to the proper column; the vote for the secessionist delegate is given in the Daily Constitutional-ist.

²⁴Federal Union, April 30, 1861; "Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-256; Daily Columbus Enquirer, January 5, 1861. The secessionist member of Marion County's split delegation is correctly listed; however, the vote received by a defeated candidate rather than the co-operationist delegate is included in the co-operationist column. Since the vote cast for the co-operationist delegate is the highest vote for co-operation in this county, this is substituted for that of the defeated candidate.

co-operationist delegate is corrected, the official returns for Cherokee County may be considered an accurate reflection of the vote for co-operation and secession even though the vote received by the secessionist member of this county's split delegation is not included. An exception to the general classification of secessionist delegates according to their vote in the convention is made in this case on the basis of evidence indicating that this delegate disregarded specific voting instructions issued by the county nominating meeting.²⁵

While the highest vote cast for either secessionist or co-operationist candidates can be determined in fifteen counties, the highest vote received by an opposition candidate is unknown. However, in a number of instances this unknown may be projected as a probability based on known factors. This is possible in those counties where the known highest vote for a secessionist or co-operationist candidate and the unknown highest vote for an opposition candidate represent the total county vote. In such cases the total county vote, which is also unknown, is projected in terms of the average 1859-1860 vote in the county in question and the average percentage of voter participation in the region in which the county is located. The probable highest unknown

²⁵Federal Union, April 30, 1861; "Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-256; Columbus Enquirer, December 25, 1860. The Brown report lists one of the two co-operationist members of this county's three-man delegation as a secessionist and gives the vote for a defeated candidate in the co-operationist column. This error is corrected by transferring the votes to the proper columns. The exception which allows the vote of the defeated candidate to be considered the highest vote for secession in this county may be justified on the grounds that this is the only known instance in which the conversion of a co-operationist candidate involved the violation of specific voting instructions issued by the nominating body.

secessionist or co-operationist vote is then determined by subtracting the known highest vote in this county from the projected county total.

In twelve counties the highest vote for co-operation may be determined on the basis of the official returns, but the highest secessionist vote is not indicated. In ten of these counties the unknown secessionist vote may be projected.²⁶

The official returns are utilized in determining the highest vote for secession in three counties where the highest vote for co-operation is unknown. The probable co-operationist vote in only one of these counties can be projected.²⁷

²⁶Federal Union, April 30, 1861; "Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-256, 264. In all twelve cases co-operationists are incorrectly classified as secessionists in the Brown report. In eleven both men listed were co-operationist delegates. Although the higher of the two votes given is used as the highest vote for co-operation, the secessionist vote is unknown. The delegations from ten of these eleven counties voted as a unit for co-operation. Therefore the unknown secessionist vote in these counties (Charlton, Clayton, Henry, Irwin, Laurens, Meriwether, Newton, Talbot, Walton and White) is that of a defeated candidate. In such cases the unknown vote and the known vote represent the total county vote; therefore, the unknown secessionist vote in these counties can be projected. On the other hand, in the eleventh county, Monroe, a delegation which split two to one for co-operation was elected. Since the unknown secessionist vote in this county is that for an elected delegate and the known co-operationist vote is also that of an elected delegate, the combined total does not represent the total county vote and no projection can be made. This is also the case in Lincoln County, where a co-operationist delegate is listed as a secessionist and a defeated candidate is included in the co-operationist column. This error may be corrected in part by transferring the co-operationist vote to the proper column. However, the highest vote for secession is represented not by that cast for the defeated candidate listed in the Brown report but rather by the vote for the secessionist member of Lincoln's split delegation, which is unknown and cannot be projected.

²⁷Ibid. In Montgomery County the co-operationist delegate is listed correctly in the Brown report but the vote is omitted. However, since this delegation voted as a unit for co-operation, the vote listed for the defeated secessionist candidate is acceptable. The

Finally, neither vote in McIntosh County is available and no projections can be made.²⁸

The study of the popular majority of 1850 is much less complex than the 1861 study. The highest vote cast for unionist and resistance candidates can be determined without difficulty in all but one of the ninety-five counties in the state in 1850.²⁹

The distribution of the popular vote in 1850 and in 1861 is given in the table on pages 141-144. The highest county vote for the unionist policy of accepting the Compromise of 1850 and the highest vote for resistance were determined by utilizing the 1850 election returns in conjunction with the convention roll and the vote on the third resolution of the Georgia Platform.³⁰ The highest county vote for secessionist and co-operationist candidates is, in most cases, based on the official election returns given in the executive report of April 25, 1861 and the vote on the Johnson resolutions on the fourth day of the convention. In ten instances the secessionist vote cited is

co-operationist vote may be projected since the combined vote for secession and for co-operation represent the total county vote. In Morgan and Greene counties the secessionist delegates named in the Brown report are classified properly, but the co-operationist delegates are not listed. No co-operationist vote at all is given in Greene and that for a defeated candidate is listed in Morgan. Since split delegations were elected in both counties, the highest vote for co-operation is not indicated and cannot be projected.

²⁸Ibid. The official returns include no votes cast in this county, which sent a secessionist delegation to the convention.

²⁹Federal Union, December 10, 1850; Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5, 23-24; "Debates and Proceedings," Federal Union, December 24, 1850. The vote in Appling County is not included in the otherwise complete returns.

³⁰Ibid.

TABLE V (continued)

County	Highest Vote For 1850 Candidates:		Highest Vote For 1861 Candidates: ^a	
	Union	Resistance	Secession	Co-operation
Effingham	149	83	217	135
Elbert	700	341	403	3
Emanuel	221	102	167	244
Fannin			355	394
Fayette	651	183	498	324
Floyd	882	121	833	639
Forsyth	596	443	766	745
Franklin	725	438	223	484
Fulton			1055	692
Gilmer	539	0	285	589
Glascocock			141	82
Glynn	87	46	161	1
Gordon	483	330	819	1021
Greene	513	123	519	----
Gwinnett	783	465	473	1052
Habersham	717	164	263	320
Hall	470	45	410	525
Hancock	468	168	63	382
Haralson			242	152
Harris	761	271	305	592
Hart			499	146
Heard	293	217	321	443
Henry	1050	410	309*	621
Houston	612	429	583	284
Irwin	224	126	57*	134
Jackson	722	291	644	444
Jasper	472	577	176	453
Jefferson	211	22	116	438
Johnson			64	254
Jones	327	359	255	147
Laurens	272	0	106*	283
Lee	175	0	165	39
Liberty	171	67	255	153
Lincoln	197	123	----	168
Lowndes	315	331	312	153
Lumpkin	763	347	137	538
McIntosh	167	44	----	----
Macon	401	209	379	45
Madison	247	0	248	0
Marion	627	459	311	310
Meriwether	668	600	174*	762
Miller			134	0
Milton			218	408

TABLE V (continued)

County	Highest Vote For 1850 Candidates:		Highest Vote For 1861 Candidates: ^a	
	Union	Resistance	Secession	Co-operation
Mitchell			216	147
Monroe	721	504	----	755
Montgomery	102	83	42	277*
Morgan	393	134	296	----
Murray	759	875	187	650
Muscogee	1043	884	944	459
Newton	946	139	335*	775
Oglethorpe	517	221	317	313
Paulding	573	267	507	344
Pickens			273	494
Pierce			160	106
Pike	791	638	500	322
Polk			304	337
Pulaski	218	210	428	255
Putnam	388	185	164	292
Quitman			214	1
Rabun	205	94	142	298
Randolph	806	628	458	22
Richmond	635	309	1268	704
Schley			129	227
Screven	133	207	281	67
Spalding			572	245
Stewart	906	672	583	169
Sumter	690	197	513	441
Talbot	764	547	293*	474
Taliaferro	237	58	0	212
Tatnall	218	116	0	346
Taylor			256	328
Telfair	183	132	139	151
Terrell			250	307
Thomas	294	312	405	178
Towns			139	218
Troup	698	211	726	806
Twiggs	242	399	211	0
Union	551	301	305	482
Upson	674	258	17	559
Walker	963	365	125	789
Walton	803	354	82*	870
Ware	199	98	177	75
Warren	379	0	204	292
Washington	794	182	280	568
Wayne	141	62	85	50
Webster			163	249

TABLE V (continued)

County	Highest Vote For 1850 Candidates:		Highest Vote For 1861 Candidates: ^a	
	Union	Resistance	Secession	Co-operation
White			74*	320
Whitfield			560	744
Wilcox			146	64
Wilkes	399	344	343	48
Wilkinson	437	387	390	464
Worth			183	120

^aProjected votes are indicated by asterisks.

of 1850. On the other hand, answers to questions concerning popular approval of the decision made by the Convention of 1861 are not so clearly indicated. Regional variations in the nature of the popular majority, the number of instances in which the actual vote cannot be determined, and the size of the probable vote are all contributing factors.

The vote given in Table V indicates that there was a slight popular majority for secession in Georgia in 1861. The known secessionist total is 41,857; the known co-operationist vote is 40,521. When the projected co-operationist vote in one county and the projected secessionist vote in ten counties are included, the totals are 43,432 and 40,798 respectively. On the basis of these projected totals, it seems that approximately 52 percent of the popular vote in 1861 was in favor of secession, while about 48 percent was in favor of co-operation.³⁴ Although it should be noted that the totals on which these percentages are based do not include the secessionist vote in two counties,

³⁴As in the 1850 study, these percentages are based on the combined highest vote for candidates favoring the two policies in question rather than on the total vote.

the co-operationist vote in two counties, and both votes in one county, it is unlikely that the number and distribution of the unknown votes in question would alter the percentages to any significant degree.³⁵

When the county votes given in Table V are considered on a regional basis, a secessionist popular majority is evident in three regions. However, in the fourth region a co-operationist majority is indicated. The most pronounced majority for secession in the state was that in the coastal counties, where 91 percent of the known vote was cast for candidates favoring secession.³⁶ Although the secessionist majority in the pine barrens is not comparable to that in the coastal

³⁵Federal Union, April 30, 1861; "Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-256. Although these unknown votes cannot be projected, the maximum size of the unknown can be determined in four instances. In Lincoln and Monroe counties the Brown report gives the vote for a co-operationist delegate as the highest vote for secession. Therefore, it may be assumed that the vote cast for the secessionist delegate in each case was lower than that of the incorrectly classified co-operationist. Based on this assumption and the co-operationist vote incorrectly listed in the secessionist column, the maximum unknown secessionist vote in Lincoln is 167; in Monroe the maximum is 754. The maximum possible size of the unknown co-operationist vote in Morgan and Greene counties may be determined in a similar manner. In both counties elected secessionists are correctly listed. The elected co-operationists, apparently erroneously classified as secessionists, are not included in the report, which lists the vote for defeated candidates as the highest vote for co-operation in Morgan and no co-operationist vote in Greene. It may be assumed that the maximum unknown in the latter is one less than that of the secessionist delegate listed, or 518, and that the unknown co-operationist vote in Morgan was between the 296 votes cast for the secessionist delegate and the 162 votes received by the defeated candidate. No indication as to the probable division of the vote in McIntosh County is available other than the fact that there was a secessionist majority. However, according to the average vote cast in this county in the elections of 1859 and 1860 (see Table IV, page 131), it may be assumed that a maximum of approximately 259 votes was involved.

³⁶Appendix A. This percentage is based on a secessionist total of 2,341 votes and a co-operationist total of 234. No county votes are projected, but the McIntosh returns (probable maximum 259, with a secessionist majority) are not included.

region, the 58 percent majority in this region is higher than that in the state as a whole.³⁷ On the other hand, the majority for secession in the cotton belt is only one percentage point higher than the state majority.³⁸ Finally, in the northern counties 56 percent of the popular vote was in favor of co-operation, while the secessionist minority was 44 percent.³⁹

The northern region is the only region in the state where the comparison of the results of the elections of 1850 and 1861 indicates a continuing conservatism on the part of the electorate. However, even in this region the voters had a stronger tendency to favor the more radical policy in 1861 than had been the case in 1850. In 1850 resistance candidates in the northern counties received only 32 percent of the popular vote; in 1861 the secessionist minority was 44 percent. While similar, although slightly higher radical increases are also apparent in the state as a whole, the cotton belt and the pine barrens, the most marked increase in the radical percentage of the vote occurred in the coastal region. In this area, resistance candidates received

³⁷Ibid. This percentage is based on a known secessionist vote of 4,506 plus a projected secessionist vote of 122 in two counties and a known co-operationist total of 3,100 plus a projected co-operationist vote of 277 in one county.

³⁸Ibid. The secessionist majority in the cotton belt is based on a known co-operationist total of 19,767 and a secessionist total including a known vote of 21,171 as well as a projected vote of 1,379 in seven counties. The co-operationist vote in two counties (combined maximum 813) and the secessionist vote in another two counties (combined maximum 921) is not included.

³⁹Ibid. These percentages are based on a known co-operationist vote of 17,420 and a secessionist total including a known vote of 13,839 and a projected vote of 74 in one county.

45 percent of the popular vote in the election of 1850. Ten years later 91 percent of the vote in the coastal region went to candidates who favored secession.

Additional information regarding the nature and extent of changes in voter attitudes may be obtained by comparing the results of these two elections in those counties where a more exact study of comparable electorates is possible.⁴⁰ The elimination of new and parent counties leaves only fifty-one counties to be considered.⁴¹ Three of these sent split delegations to the Convention of 1850;⁴² another seven were represented by split delegations in the Convention of 1861.⁴³ Since the pre-convention positions of all members of the secessionist delegations from thirteen of the remaining forty-one counties cannot be verified, this portion of the study is limited to twenty-eight counties. Twenty-one of these counties elected co-operationist

⁴⁰See above, pp. 64-66. For reasons already noted, the electorate in counties created between 1850 and 1861, parent counties involved in the formation of new counties, counties whose delegations split in either convention, and counties in which the pre-convention position of secessionist delegations cannot be verified are excluded from this portion of the study. Although the latter two types of counties are included in the popular majority study, this was an expedient adopted only to avoid excessive limitation of an essential general study. However, such an expedient is not justified in this portion of the study, which is designed to produce exact information regarding changes in the attitudes of specific, limited and essentially stable electorates.

⁴¹Blair, Georgia's Official Register, pp. 438-440.

⁴²Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5, 23-24; "Debates and Proceedings," Federal Union, December 24, 1850.

⁴³"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-256.

delegations;⁴⁴ seven elected declared secessionists.⁴⁵

A continuing conservatism on the part of a majority of the electorate is evident in the twenty co-operationist counties which elected unionist delegations in 1850. Only one of those under consideration, Jasper, sent a resistance delegation to this convention.⁴⁶ However, as Table V indicates, a portion of the actual vote in four of these counties (Meriwether, Montgomery, Newton and Walton) is unknown. Therefore, the extent of increase or decrease in the conservative vote can be ascertained in only seventeen.

According to the election statistics given in Table IV and Table V, the conservative vote in 1861 was proportionately larger than

⁴⁴Ibid. Included are Baldwin, Cass, Chatooga, Columbia, Dade, Gwinnett, Hall, Hancock, Harris, Heard, Jasper, Jefferson, Meriwether, Montgomery, Newton, Putnam, Taliaferro, Tatnall, Upson, Walton and Wilkinson. While a unit vote for co-operation is considered a sufficient indication of pre-convention position, additional information relating to the delegations from Baldwin, Columbia, Gwinnett, Hall, Jasper, Jefferson, Taliaferro, Tatnall and Walton is cited in Chapter IV. The co-operation platforms of delegates elected in five other counties are also indicated in published reports of the nominating meetings. These counties are Chatooga (Daily Chronicle and Sentinel, December 11, 1860); Harris (Columbus Enquirer, December 11, 1860); Montgomery (Southern Recorder, January 15, 1861); Putnam (Southern Recorder, January 1, 1861); and Upson (Georgia Journal and Messenger, December 12, 1860).

⁴⁵Ibid. The pre-convention positions of the secessionist delegations from Bibb, Baldwin and Richmond were verified in the preliminary voter attitude study in Chapter IV. Direct verification in the form of the published reports of secessionist nominating meetings is also available in regard to the delegates elected in Glynn (Columbus Enquirer, December 25, 1860); Houston (Columbus Enquirer, December 11, 1860); and Jones (Federal Union, January 1, 1861). Indirect verification is available in the form of reports of the co-operationist platform of the defeated opponents of the Screven delegation (Daily Constitutional, December 16, 1860).

⁴⁶Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5, 23-24; "Debates and Proceedings," Federal Union, December 24, 1850.

that of 1850 in eleven of the co-operationist counties under consideration. Eight of these were located in the cotton belt, two in the northern region and one in the pine barrens.⁴⁷ The conservative increase evident in these counties ranges from 35 percent in Tatnall to 1 percent in Wilkinson and Heard.⁴⁸ The average increase in all eleven counties is 15 percent. The cotton belt counties show a slightly higher average of 16 percent; the northern counties a substantially lower average of only 8 percent. While no average can be obtained in the pine barrens, it should be noted that the conservative increase in the county located in this region is the highest observed.

The votes shown in Tables IV and V indicate that the conservative percentage of the total vote decreased in six of the co-operationist counties included in this study. Half of these counties were located in the cotton belt, the other half in the northern region.⁴⁹ The conservative decrease in these counties ranges from 35 percent in Hall to 4 percent in Putnam. While the average decrease is 17 percent, the averages in the two regions indicate marked regional differences in the extent of change in voter attitudes in this type of county. The average decrease in the cotton belt is only 8 percent as compared to an

⁴⁷Appendix A. Cotton belt counties include Baldwin, Columbia, Hancock, Heard, Jasper, Taliaferro, Upson and Wilkinson; northern counties, Dade and Gwinnett. The one pine barrens county is Tatnall.

⁴⁸Percentages of increase and decrease cited in this portion of the comparative study of voter attitudes represent the difference between the unionist percentage of the total county vote in 1850 and the co-operationist percentage of the total county vote in 1861.

⁴⁹Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5, 23-24; "Debates and Proceedings," Federal Union, December 24, 1850.

average decrease of 25 percent in the northern counties.

In contrast to the co-operationist counties, a change in the attitudes of a majority of the electorate is evident in more than two-thirds of the seven secessionist counties under consideration. These five counties, Bibb, Chatham, Glynn, Houston and Richmond, elected unionist delegations in 1850. A continuing radicalism is evident in Jones and Screven, both of which sent resistance delegations to the first convention.⁵⁰

The radical percentage of the total vote obviously increased in the five unionist counties where secessionists were elected in 1861. The vote given in Table IV and Table V indicates a similar increase in the two resistance counties. One of the resistance counties and three of the unionist counties were located in the cotton belt. The other two unionist counties were in the coastal region; the remaining resistance county was located in the pine barrens.⁵¹ While the overall average radical increase in these seven counties is 32 percent, the extremely high average increase of 60 percent in the coastal region counties tends to make the overall average unrepresentative. The secessionist counties in the cotton belt show an average radical increase of only 21 percent, and a similar increase of 20 percent is evident in

⁵⁰Ibid.

⁵¹Appendix A. Cotton belt counties are Bibb, Houston, Jones and Richmond; coastal counties, Chatham and Glynn. The pine barrens county is Screven.

the one county in the pine barrens.⁵²

Although the study of changes in voter attitudes in the secessionist counties is extremely limited, that relating to the co-operationist counties is fairly representative. Therefore, while the results of the latter study may be considered a reliable indication of voting patterns in co-operationist counties, less weight should be attached to the results of the former.⁵³

However, the secessionist study is representative in one region, the coastal counties. In 1861 all six of the counties in this region elected unit secessionist delegations.⁵⁴ The two coastal counties included in the secessionist study represent 33 percent of these counties. In 1850 four of the counties in this region elected unit unionist delegations; one elected a unit resistance delegation, and one delegation split its convention vote.⁵⁵ The comparison of the regional popular majorities in these two elections shows a marked increase in radicalism among the electorate in the coastal counties, which is confirmed by the secessionist voter attitude study.

⁵²Percentages of radical increase cited represent the difference between the resistance percentage of the total county vote in 1850 and the secessionist percentage of the total county vote in 1861.

⁵³"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-256, 264. Only 9 percent of the sixty-six counties whose delegations cast unit secessionist votes in the convention are included in the study. However, the seventeen co-operationist counties in which the extent of change is studied represent 32 percent of the fifty-three counties whose delegations cast unit votes for co-operation.

⁵⁴Ibid.; Appendix A.

⁵⁵Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5, 23-24; "Debates and Proceedings," Federal Union, December 24, 1850; Appendix A.

In the northern region the results of the co-operationist voter attitude study clarify rather than merely confirm the results of the comparative popular majority study. In 1850 twenty of the twenty-one delegations from this region were unit unionists; one voted as a unit for resistance.⁵⁶ In 1861, twenty-one of the thirty-four northern delegations voted as a unit for co-operation; seven were unit secession delegations, and six split.⁵⁷ While the comparison of the regional popular majorities of 1850 and 1861 shows an increase in the radical percentage of the vote, which is reflected in the convention vote, this could be attributed primarily to the electorate in those counties where secession and split delegations were elected. However, the co-operationist voter attitude study, which includes 24 percent of the co-operationist counties in this region, indicates the probability of a more general distribution of the increased radicalism, or decreased conservatism, evident in the electorate in this region. This study shows that the average percentage of radical increase in at least 14 percent of the twenty-one co-operationist northern counties was as high as 25 percent. Moreover, the smallest average of conservative increase observed in the study was that in the northern region.

On the other hand, the co-operationist voter attitude study indicates a different situation in the cotton belt. In 1850 forty-five of the fifty-three counties in this region elected unionist delegations;

⁵⁶Ibid.

⁵⁷"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-256; Appendix A.

six delegations voted for resistance, and three split.⁵⁸ In 1861 there were twenty-five unit co-operationist delegations, thirty-five unit secessionist delegations and seven split delegations from the cotton belt.⁵⁹ The comparative study of the regional popular majorities of 1850 and 1861 shows a slightly higher percentage of increased radicalism among the voters in this region than that evident in the northern region. However, in this instance, the co-operationist voter attitude study, which includes 44 percent of the co-operationist counties in the cotton belt, indicates that this increase may be attributed primarily to secessionist counties. This study shows that in at least 32 percent of the co-operationist counties in this region there was an average increase of 16 percent in the conservative share of the popular vote. Moreover, the radical increase evident in another 12 percent of these counties was substantially lower than that indicated in the region as a whole. The more limited secessionist study, including only 11 percent of the secessionist counties in the cotton belt, tends to confirm the indication that a major portion of the radical increase in the cotton belt electorate occurred in those counties which sent secessionist delegations to the convention.

The fourth region, the pine barrens, is somewhat of an enigma. In 1850 nine of the fifteen county delegations from this region were

⁵⁸Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5, 23-24; "Debates and Proceedings, Federal Union, December 24, 1850; Appendix A.

⁵⁹"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-256, 264; Appendix A.

unionists; one voted as a unit for resistance, and five split.⁶⁰ In 1861 seven unit co-operationist delegations and eighteen unit secessionist delegations were elected in the pine barrens.⁶¹ The comparison of the popular vote in this region in 1850 and in 1861 indicates an increase in the radical percentage of the vote, but the voter attitude study gives little information concerning the distribution of this increase. While the largest radical decrease, or conservative increase, in the co-operationist study was that in a county in this region, one county cannot be considered an indication of a regional trend.

In the state as a whole the comparative study of the popular majorities of 1850 and 1861 indicates an increase in the radical percentage of the vote which is substantially lower than that suggested by the comparison of the vote in the two conventions. The unionist majority in the Convention of 1850 was 89 percent;⁶² the secessionist majority in the Convention of 1861 was 55 percent.⁶³ Since the unionist popular majority was 64 percent and the projected secessionist popular majority 52 percent, it is evident that the delegate vote in the Convention of 1861 was a much more accurate reflection of the size of the popular majority than was the delegate vote in the Convention of 1850.

⁶⁰Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 3-5, 23-24; "Debates and Proceedings," Federal Union, December 24, 1850; Appendix A.

⁶¹"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218, 252-256; Appendix A.

⁶²Journal of the Convention, 1850, pp. 23-24.

⁶³"Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 252-256.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The comparative study of the Georgia Conventions of 1850 and 1861 indicates differences as well as similarities between these two conventions which provide insight regarding the nature of the state's secession movement and the extent of popular support for this movement. Certain similarities are readily apparent. In each instance sectional issues prompted the governor to request the legislature to authorize a convention of the people of the state to determine what action Georgia should take. In both cases these requests were granted by the legislature; the conventions were subsequently called by the governor; delegates were elected and the decisions made. The contrast in these two decisions is obvious. In 1850 Georgia accepted the Compromise in order to preserve the union; ten years later the Convention of 1861 dissolved Georgia's ties with the union when it passed the ordinance of secession.

There are also significant differences in the periods prior to these two conventions. More than a year before the Convention of 1850, Governor Towns told the legislature that a serious sectional crisis was imminent and asked for authorization to call a state convention. During the lengthy interval between the passage of the convention bill and the convention, Congress managed to work out a compromise acceptable to both sections. On the other hand, in 1861 delegates were elected less than two months after Governor Brown requested the convention. Furthermore, congressional efforts to arrive at a hasty compromise which might have

prevented the secession of some of the Southern states proved futile. While the rapid secession of South Carolina and other states in the lower South was perhaps a factor in this failure, it should be remembered that there seemed little hope for compromise in 1850 only two months after Governor Towns made his convention proposal.

Although both conventions grew out of sectional controversy, there was a marked difference in the manner in which this controversy was viewed in 1850 and in 1861. In 1850 the primary issues were the gradual attrition of Southern rights and the most effective means of preventing this. In 1861 most Georgians tended to agree that the incoming Republican administration constituted a clear and present danger to Southern rights and to disagree only as to whether this threat should be met in or out of the union.

The difference in the viewpoint in 1850 and that in 1861 is perhaps best illustrated by the basic similarities in the policies proposed by those Georgians who advocated resistance to the Compromise of 1850 and those who supported co-operation ten years later. The failure of the Nashville Convention apparently influenced resistance leaders in the Convention of 1850 to exclude any reference to Southern unity in the summation of their proposals. However, the refusal to grant concessions for the sake of compromise, the demands for guarantees of specified Southern rights and the ultimatum of secession presented in the resistance resolutions are comparable to those made in the co-operationist resolutions introduced during the Convention of 1861. Moreover, it should be noted that the co-operationist policy, which included demands for constitutional amendments guaranteeing Southern rights coupled with

the threat of secession, was actually more radical than the resistance proposals.

The comparison of the more radical of the two policies under consideration in 1850 and the more conservative of the two policies under consideration in 1861 tends to indicate a definite change in the attitudes of most Georgians during this ten year period.¹ This is confirmed by both the local leadership and election studies. While those who favored resistance in 1850 and co-operation in 1861 demonstrated relatively little change in attitude, these two studies show that such consistency on the part of individuals as well as county electorates was apparently limited.

Although the nature of Georgia's conservatism changed between 1850 and 1861, the study of the continuing leadership indicates that, as a general rule, former unionist leaders tended to favor co-operation in 1861 while former resistance leaders were more inclined to favor secession. While the extent of continuing leadership cannot be ascertained, it is evident that a large majority of the leaders who were active during both sectional crises were unionists in 1850. Former unionists also dominated the known continuing leadership elected in 1861, which includes delegates to both conventions, candidates defeated in 1850 and ascending intermediate leaders. Fifty-eight percent of the known continuing leaders who were delegates to the Convention of 1861 were secessionists, while 41 percent favored co-operation. Thus the

¹Individuals who favored outright secession in 1850 and those who opposed secession on any grounds in 1861 were apparently insignificant minorities within minority movements in this state. No attempt has been made to include persons in these two categories in this study.

elected continuing leadership was a more radical group than the continuing leadership as a whole, which was inclined toward conservatism.

Changes in the relative size of the conservative popular vote cast in the two elections were much less drastic than the majorities in the conventions would seem to indicate. The 89 percent unionist majority in the Convention of 1850 was considerably larger than the 64 percent unionist popular majority in this election; the 55 percent secessionist majority in the Convention of 1861 was also slightly greater than the probable 52 percent secessionist popular majority. Thus the consideration of delegate votes alone, which is the usual basis on which these two conventions are compared, tends to exaggerate the extent of decreased conservatism, or increased radicalism, indicated by the comparison of the popular vote.

On the other hand, the comparison of the average percentages of voter participation in the two elections confirms the findings in other studies in which the vote in the election of 1861 has been compared to that in the presidential election of 1860. The comparison of the average 83 percent participation in the state as a whole in 1850 with the average 80 percent participation in 1861 seems to indicate a surprising similarity in the extent of voter activity in these two elections. However, the regional analysis shows significant differences. In two regions where the weather is not known to have been a limiting factor the average percentage of participation increased in 1861; in another the average decreased but was still extremely high at 91 percent. The average percentage of participation in 1861 was significantly lower than that in 1850 in only one region, the cotton belt, where it has been

determined that rains prior to the election made transportation difficult and that the election day itself was stormy. In addition to these regional differences, the comparison of average percentages of voter participation in those counties where candidates were not opposed shows that a much larger proportion of the electorate voted in such counties in 1861 than in 1850. These factors indicate that voter interest in the election of 1861 was probably greater than that in 1850 but that the weather prevented the full expression of this interest in at least one large region and thereby lowered the average percentage of participation in the state as a whole.

The probable secessionist popular majority of 52 percent indicates that the election of 1861 was extremely close. In the northern region there was a co-operationist popular majority of 56 percent. In the coastal region the secessionist majority was an overwhelming 91 percent, and the pine barrens counties show a relatively high 58 percent secessionist majority. However, in the cotton belt the popular majority for secession was only 53 percent. Since voter participation in this region was apparently restricted by the weather, the question as to whether this non-political factor has a greater effect on the secessionist or the co-operationist vote is most significant. Unfortunately it cannot be answered; evidence indicating the probable division of the vote represented by the non-participating members of the electorate is not available.

For the most part, this study has been concerned with observable effect rather than with causation. However, the utilization and revision of the official returns in the election of 1861 raises questions as

to why the publication of these returns was delayed and the reason for the misrepresentation of the size of the secessionist majority. While no attempt was made to investigate this aspect of the situation, several factors relating to these questions were brought out in the study of the two conventions and should be noted. The comparative study of the elections of 1850 and 1861 involved the use of returns in five elections. In four instances the complete or virtually complete returns were made available for publication approximately two weeks after the election; yet in 1861 the returns were not released until nearly four months after the election and then failed to include the vote received by all candidates. Furthermore, it is extremely unlikely that Governor Brown was unaware of the significance of the vote on the Johnson resolutions insofar as the classification of delegates was concerned or of the relative insignificance of the vote on the ordinance of secession in this respect. Although no evidence indicating that the governor was actually present during these votes was presented, it is known that he was granted an honorary seat on the convention floor and was allowed to retain this seat during the closed sessions in which these votes were recorded. These factors suggest the possibility that Georgia's secessionist governor, reluctant to acknowledge the size of a substantial co-operationist minority, deliberately misrepresented the size of the secessionist majority.

However, questions regarding Governor Brown's motives are secondary to the more significant fact that the misrepresentation of the secessionist popular majority has distorted the interpretation of the results of the election of 1861 for generations. The revisions

based on these returns as well as the information derived from the comparative study of the two conventions should be regarded as only the first step toward a more general reconsideration of Georgia's secession movement.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY SOURCES

1. Georgia Newspapers

Albany Patriot. Weekly. January-December, 1850; January, 1860-January, 1861.

Columbus Enquirer. Weekly. January-December, 1850; September-December, 1860.

Daily Chronicle and Sentinel. Augusta. January-December, 1850; June-December, 1860.

Daily Columbus Enquirer. January-September, 1860; January-May, 1861.

Daily Constitutionalist. Augusta. January-December, 1850; January, 1860-January, 1861.

Daily Georgia Telegraph. Macon. December, 1860-May, 1861.

Daily Intelligencer. Atlanta. January, 1860-January, 1861.

Federal Union. Milledgeville. Weekly. January-December, 1850; October, 1859-April, 1861.

Georgia Journal and Messenger. Macon. Weekly. December, 1849-December, 1850; January, 1860-May, 1861.

Georgia Telegraph. Macon. Weekly. January-December, 1850; January-December 20, 1860.

Savannah Morning News. Daily. January-December, 1850; January-June, 1860.

Southern Recorder. Milledgeville. Weekly. January-December, 1850; January, 1860-May, 1861.

2. Legislative Proceedings

Congressional Globe, 31st Congress, 1st Sess. (1849-1850), XXI, Pt. 2.

Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, at a Biennial Session of the General Assembly, Begun and Held in Milledgeville, the Seat of Government, in 1849 and '50. Milledgeville: Richard M. Orme, State Printer, 1850.

Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia, at the Annual Session of the General Assembly, Commenced at Milledgeville, November 7, 1860. Milledgeville: Boughton, Nisbet and Barnes, State Printer, 1860.

Journal of the Senate of the State of Georgia, at the Annual Session of the General Assembly, Commenced at Milledgeville, November 7, 1860. Milledgeville: Boughton, Nisbet and Barnes, State Printers, 1860

3. Miscellaneous

Chandler, Allen D. (ed.). The Confederate Records of the State of Georgia. Vol. I. Atlanta: Charles P. Byrd, State Printer, 1909.

Johnson, Herschel V. "From the Autobiography of Herschel V. Johnson, 1856-1867," American Historical Review, XXX (January, 1925), 311-336.

Journal of the State Convention, Held in Milledgeville in December, 1850. Milledgeville: Richard M. Orme, State Printer, 1850.

Journal of the State Convention of South Carolina; together with the Resolutions and Ordinance. Columbia: Johnson and Cavis, Printers to the Convention, 1852.

Phillips, Ulrich B. (ed.). The Correspondence of Robert Toombs, Alexander H. Stephens, and Howell Cobb. Vol. II, Annual Report of the American Historical Society for the Year 1911. Washington: American Historical Assn., 1913.

Stephens, Alexander H. A Constitutional View of the Late War Between the States, its Causes, Character, Conduct and Results, Presented in a Series of Colloquies at Liberty Hall. Vol. II. Philadelphia: National Publishing Company, 1870.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

1. Maps

Bonner, William G. Bonner's Pocket Map of the State of Georgia. Milledgeville: 1849.

2. Published Works

- Auer, J. Jeffery (ed.). Antislavery and Disunion, 1858-1861: Studies in the Rhetoric of Compromise and Conflict. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Avery, Isaac Wheeler. The History of Georgia From 1850 to 1881, Embracing the Three Important Epochs: The Decade Before the War of 1861-5; The War; The Period of Reconstruction, with Portraits of the Leading Public Men of this Era. New York: Brown and Derby, 1881.
- Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1949. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1950.
- Blair, Ruth (ed.). State of Georgia Department of Archives and History: Georgia's Official Register, 1931. Atlanta: Stein Printing Company, State Printers, 1931.
- Bryan, T. Conn. "The Secession of Georgia," Georgia Historical Quarterly, XXXI (June, 1947), 89-111.
- Claiborne, John F. H. Life and Correspondence of John A. Quitman. Vol. II. New York: Harpers, 1860.
- Coulter, E. Merton. Georgia: A Short History. Rev. ed. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1947.
- Craven, Avery O. "Georgia and the South," Georgia Historical Quarterly, XXIII (September, 1939), 230-245.
- Donnelly, William J. "Conspiracy or Popular Movement: The Historiography of Southern Support for Secession," North Carolina Historical Review, XLII (Winter, 1965), 70-84.
- Dumond, Dwight Lowell. The Secession Movement, 1860-1861. New York: Macmillan Company, 1931.
- Eaton, Clement. A History of the Old South. New York: Macmillan Company, 1949.
- Flippin, Percy Scott. Herschel V. Johnson of Georgia, State Rights Unionist. Richmond: Dietz Printing Company, 1931.
- Janes, Thomas P. (ed.). Handbook of the State of Georgia Accompanied by a Geological Map of the State. 2nd. ed. Atlanta: 1876.
- Johnson, Zachary Taylor. The Political Policies of Howell Cobb. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1929.

Nevins, Allan. The Emergence of Lincoln. Vol. I, Prologue to Civil War, 1859-1861. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.

_____. Ordeal of the Union. Vol. I, Fruits of Manifest Destiny, 1847-1852. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1947.

Northern, William J. (ed.). Men of Mark in Georgia. Vol. III. Atlanta: A. B. Caldwell, 1911.

Perkins, Howard C. "A Neglected Phase of the Movement for Southern Unity, 1847-1852," Journal of Southern History, XII (May, 1946), 153-203.

Phillips, Ulrich B. The Course of the South to Secession: An Interpretation, ed. E. Merton Coulter. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1958.

_____. Georgia and States Rights. Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch Press, 1968.

Rawlings, Kenneth W. "Statistics and Cross-sections of the Georgia Press to 1870," Georgia Historical Quarterly, XXIII (January, 1939), 177-187.

Reynolds, Donald E. Editors Make War: Southern Newspapers in the Secession Crisis. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1970.

Shryock, Richard Harrison. Georgia and the Union in 1850. Durham: Duke University Press, 1926.

Stampp, Kenneth M. And the War Came: The North and the Secession Crisis, 1860-1861. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1950.

Wooster, Ralph A. The Secession Conventions of the South. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.

3. Unpublished Works

Irons, George V. "The Secession Movement in Georgia, 1850-61." Unpublished Doctor's dissertation, Duke University, 1936.

APPENDIX A

GEORGIA COUNTIES OF 1861 LISTED ACCORDING TO REGION

<u>Northern Region</u>	<u>Cotton Belt</u>	<u>Pine Barrens</u>	
Banks	Baker	Macon	Appling
Carroll	Baldwin	Madison	Berrien
Cass	Bibb	Marion	Brooks
Catoosa	Burke	Meriwether	Bulloch
Chatooga	Butts	Miller	Charlton
Cherokee	Calhoun	Monroe	Clinch
Cobb	Campbell	Morgan	Coffee
Dade	Chattahoochee	Muscogee	Colquitt
Dawson	Clarke	Newton	Dooly
DeKalb	Clay	Oglethorpe	Echols
Fannin	Clayton	Pike	Effingham
Floyd	Columbia	Putnam	Emanuel
Forsyth	Coweta	Quitman	Irwin
Franklin	Crawford	Randolph	Lowndes
Fulton	Decatur	Richmond	Mitchell
Gilmer	Dougherty	Schley	Montgomery
Gordon	Early	Spalding	Pierce
Gwinnett	Elbert	Stewart	Pulaski
Habersham	Fayette	Sumter	Screven
Hall	Glascok	Talbot	Tatnall
Haralson	Greene	Taliaferro	Telfair
Hart	Hancock	Taylor	Ware
Lumpkin	Harris	Terrell	Wayne
Milton	Heard	Thomas	Wilcox
Murray	Henry	Troup	Worth
Paulding	Houston	Twiggs	
Pickens	Jackson	Upson	
Polk	Jasper	Walton	<u>Coastal Region</u>
Rabun	Jefferson	Warren	Bryan
Towns	Johnson	Washington	Camden
Union	Jones	Webster	Chatham
Walker	Laurens	Wilkes	Glynn
White	Lee	Wilkinson	Liberty
Whitfield	Lincoln		McIntosh

APPENDIX B

COMPOSITE LIST OF CANDIDATES DEFEATED IN 1861

G. W. Adair, Fulton
 F. F. Alexander, Bryan
 J. Allen, Hart
 Amis, Coweta
 John C. Aycock, Cass
 E. Barbour, Worth
 S. L. Barbour, Dougherty
 W. W. Barlow, Sumter
 Nathan Bass, Bibb
 A. Beall, Warren
 J. H. Beall, Columbia
 J. J. Beall, Campbell
 V. Bice, Walker
 N. E. Bird, Hancock
 Thomas Bird, Gordon
 Richard Bradford, Wilkes
 F. M. Brantley, Meriwether
 W. Brock, Haralson
 A. S. Brown, Hancock
 John Burnett, Appling
 Robert Burton, Schley
 D. H. Burts, Chattahoochee
 E. M. Butt, Marion
 J. C. Byrd, Stewart
 James M. Calhoun, Fulton
 C. C. Carr, Schley
 G. H. Cartledge, Franklin
 Stephen Castellow, Houston
 W. W. Clark, Newton
 P. Cook, Macon
 J. D. Cowart, Webster
 John E. Craig, Gwinnett
 C. P. Crawford, Lee
 L. W. Crook, Whitfield
 J. P. Crosby, Mitchell
 J. Culberson, Troup
 E. Cumming, Wilkinson
 W. H. Daniel, Carroll
 Dasher, Effingham
 J. B. S. Davis, Jackson
 Joseph Day, Houston
 M. G. Dobbins, Spalding

Joel Dodson, Marion
 J. O. Dowde, Cherokee
 G. M. Dudley, Sumter
 R. E. Dudley, Washington
 M. S. Durham, Clarke
 Dumas, Jones
 C. A. Ellington, Gilmer
 J. L. Engram, Clay
 W. A. Erwin, Washington
 B. D. Evans, Washington
 A. G. Fambro, Upson
 C. F. Fickling, Taylor
 E. M. Field, Cass
 W. O. Fleming, Decatur
 Mark Fowler, Milton
 Gantt, Putnam
 John Gardner, Pike
 O. H. P. Gardner, Dade
 W. B. Gaulden, Liberty
 F. H. Gay, DeKalb
 George, Chattahoochee
 Thomas Gilbert, Houston
 J. M. Gilstrap, Jasper
 John T. Grant, Walton
 Q. C. Grice, Fayette
 James Griffin, Decatur
 J. L. Griffin, Lincoln
 Mitchell Griffin, Lowndes
 D. L. Grimes, Heard
 Groverstein, Effingham
 George A. Hall, Meriwether
 C. S. Hamilton, Montgomery
 T. J. Hammett, Glascock
 W. B. J. Hardaway, Jackson
 J. P. M. Harper, Gwinnett
 R. L. Haynes, Milton
 J. Y. Hicks, Randolph
 J. K. Hilliard, Coffee
 T. Hilliard, Ware
 Samuel Hillman, Quitman
 John Hinton, Newton
 J. Hockenhull, Dawson

APPENDIX B (continued)

H. B. Hodges, Bulloch
 Hines Holt, Muscogee
 T. S. Hopkins, Wayne
 J. Horne, Dooly
 N. L. Howard, Muscogee
 T. C. Howard, Campbell
 T. P. Huger, Glynn
 J. H. Huggins, Union
 John Huie, Fayette
 Porter Ingram, Muscogee
 C. J. Jenkins, Richmond
 Daniel Johnson, DeKalb
 D. H. Johnson, Spalding
 S. J. Johnson, Floyd
 William Johnson, Columbia
 J. Jones, Chatooga
 S. A. H. Jones, Washington
 Seaborn Jones, Jr., Polk
 C. M. Kelb, Terrell
 J. Kelley, Towns
 J. B. Kendal, Talbot
 G. H. Kennedy, Emanuel
 J. B. King, Richmond
 Joseph Law, Decatur
 D. W. Lewis, Hancock
 S. A. McAfee, Gwinnett
 R. B. McCutchen, Pickens
 Rheese McGregor, Polk
 H. K. McKay, Sumter
 J. C. Martin, Echols
 J. C. Maud, Talbot
 William Mays, Pulaski
 Dr. Mayson, Cass
 Abner Mims, Calhoun
 Robert H. Moore, Floyd
 Thomas Moore, Fulton
 R. E. Morrow, Clayton
 Montgomery, Warren
 G. M. Netherland, Rabun
 B. F. Newsom, Taylor
 Vincent Nichols, Crawford
 J. Nicholson, Putnam
 J. M. Nunn, Glascock
 Odell, White
 W. W. Oliver, Screven
 O'Neil, Murray
 James Parker, Sr., Screven

J. E. Parrott, Gordon
 Isham Peacock, Pierce
 Henry Quigg, Newton
 M. Rawls, Effingham
 G. R. Reed, Wilcox
 Reese, Coweta
 G. L. Ridley, Jones
 William Roberts, Berrien
 W. F. Rogers, Wilkinson
 J. Ross, Crawford
 A. M. Russell, Lumpkin
 H. Shephard, Telfair
 J. Sloan, Gordon
 E. A. Smith, Telfair
 F. Smith, Coweta
 J. E. Smith, Quitman
 J. T. Smith, Elbert
 Mial Smith, Oglethorpe
 Solomon Smith, Bryan
 William B. Spain, Talbot
 McC. H. Spence, Harris
 J. R. Stanford, Habersham
 R. Stanford, Clinch
 J. L. Steward, Thomas
 Lacy Stewart, Habersham
 J. B. Strickland, Pierce
 William A. Stokes, Jefferson
 F. Summerhour, Murray
 J. M. Tapley, Johnson
 Cicero Tharpe, Bibb
 E. L. Thomas, Whitfield
 W. Thomasson, Heard
 C. C. Thompson, Hall
 S. Treadwell, Whitfield
 I. S. Vincent, Clarke
 A. C. Walker, Richmond
 Benjamin Wallace, Wilkes
 J. A. Walton, Columbia
 Israel Waltower, Lowndes
 Lott Warren, Dougherty
 J. H. R. Washington, Bibb
 T. M. Watson, Columbia
 J. H. Weaver, Paulding
 R. White, Jackson
 S. G. White, Baldwin
 Williams, White
 W. D. Williams, Baker

APPENDIX B (continued)

Issac B. Williamson, Pike
O. Wing, Colquitt
A. Wright, Floyd

Sources:

Major sources utilized in compiling this list were the partial listing of candidates published in the Daily Chronicle and Sentinel, December 25, 1860, and the official election returns in the Federal Union, April 30, 1861. Additional names were obtained from reports of county nominating meetings and scattered election returns published in December, 1860, and January, 1861, in the Georgia Journal and Messenger, Daily Intelligencer, Daily Georgia Telegraph, Daily Constitutionalist, Albany Patriot, Federal Union, Columbus Enquirer and Daily Columbus Enquirer. In all cases the roll of the convention ("Journal of the Convention, 1861," pp. 213-218) was used to determine whether candidates were elected or defeated.

Vita was removed during scanning