

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

RECEIVED

APR 04 1988

National Register of Historic Places
Multiple Property Documentation Form

NATIONAL
REGISTER

This form is for use in documenting multiple property groups relating to one or several historic contexts. See instructions in *Guidelines for Completing National Register Forms* (National Register Bulletin 16). Complete each item by marking "x" in the appropriate box or by entering the requested information. For additional space use continuation sheets (Form 10-900-a). Type all entries.

A. Name of Multiple Property Listing

Georgetown County Rice Culture, c. 1750 - c. 1910

B. Associated Historic Contexts

Georgetown County Rice Culture, c. 1750 - c. 1910

C. Geographical Data

The limits of Georgetown County, South Carolina

See continuation sheet

D. Certification

As the designated authority under the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, I hereby certify that this documentation form meets the National Register documentation standards and sets forth requirements for the listing of related properties consistent with the National Register criteria. This submission meets the procedural and professional requirements set forth in 36 CFR Part 60 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Planning and Evaluation.

Mary Watson Edmonds
Signature of certifying official

3/28/88
Date

Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer, South Carolina Department of Archives & History
State or Federal agency and bureau

I, hereby, certify that this multiple property documentation form has been approved by the National Register as a basis for evaluating related properties for listing in the National Register.

Amy Schlager
Signature of the Keeper of the National Register

5/5/88
Date

E. Statement of Historic Contexts

Discuss each historic context listed in Section B.

The introduction and successful cultivation of rice was the most significant development in colonial South Carolina. Although the rise of the upcountry cotton plantation in the first half of the nineteenth century eventually eclipsed it, the lowcountry rice culture continued to have considerable impact on the landscape, the economy, and the society up to the Civil War. When South Carolina led the nation in rice production for almost two hundred years, no other area of the colony, and later, the state, grew rice with more success and in such abundance as did Georgetown County.(1) Many physical evidences of the rice culture in the county have disappeared due to both the passage of time and modern development along the coast. There are still many resources, however, which help to illustrate the growth and development of the rice culture in Georgetown County from c. 1750 to c. 1910. These extant resources include such properties as plantation houses, slave cabins, rice barns, rice mills, and rice mill chimneys. In addition, extant agricultural features associated with rice cultivation include canals, dikes, and trunks, which have generally been retained and maintained since rice production ceased in the area. The most intact of these properties and features are included in this multiple property submission. There is great potential for archaeological evidence of the rice culture, in large part due to the dependence of rice cultivation on slave labor. A typical rice plantation included rows of slave houses, an overseer's house, and other dependencies in addition to the main plantation house, the remains of which may be archaeologically preserved. One archaeological site representative of some of these aspects is included in this multiple property submission.

Additional Information

Rice was introduced to Carolina soon after the initial settlement as a result of agricultural experiments encouraged by the Proprietors. It was first grown in inland swamps fed by freshwater streams and by 1700 had become a major money crop in the lowcountry. South Carolina rice commanded an excellent price in the market and was exported in great quantities by the 1730s. It soon gained a reputation as the best quality rice grown in the colonies if not the world.(2) By the eve of the American Revolution a new method of cultivation, in river swamps fed by tides, was introduced, which became the preferred method soon after the war. With the shift to tidal swamps from inland swamps both the production and quality of Carolina rice increased significantly.(3)

The efficiency of this method of rice production about fifteen years after the Revolution was described by a guest at one of the early plantations in the county. Nearly forty years later he remembered that "during the summer months, Rice crops waved over fields of thousands of acres in extent, and upon a surface so level and unbroken, that in casting one's eye up and down the river, there was not for miles, an intervening object to obstruct the sight."(4) The visitor considered the Santee River delta as "one of the most valuable tracts in the world

APR 1 1988

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number E Page 1

for the cultivation of Rice. . . . The agricultural improvements are found, almost exclusively, upon the rich alluvial river bottoms, or upon the fertile savannahs, when the latter are supplied with sufficient water to form a head for overflowing the rice-fields."(5) A visitor to South Carolina from Scotland observed in 1810, "nothing in Carolina is held in greater estimation than a Rice Plantation."(6)

The Georgetown area was particularly suited for the tidal swamp method of rice planting, with its intricate river system in which the Black, Pee Dee, Sampit, and Waccamaw Rivers fed into the Winyah Bay at Georgetown and the Santee River fed into the Atlantic Ocean south of Georgetown. The tidal swamp rice culture was superior to the inland swamp method of planting in the amount of acreage it utilized and in the better quality rice it produced. It did, however, have disadvantages as well. Only that land which was close enough to the ocean to be within the upper boundary of the tide, yet far enough inland to be outside that area normally flooded with salt water, could be used. Even with this restriction constant care had to be taken to prevent the accidental inundation of rice fields by salt water. An elaborate system of banks, canals, dams, and trunks, built to regulate the flow of water from the rivers on and off the rice fields, was created, some of which is still visible in the extant fields.(7)

Rice planting was an exacting science - some planters considered it almost an art - which required strict attention to details and adaptability to changing conditions on the part of the planter, his overseer, the slave driver, and the field hands. Each step of the planting/growing/harvesting process was crucial to the success or failure of the year's crop. In the spring, most often in March or April, the land was harrowed and plowed in preparation for planting. Rice seed was sown by hand, using a small hoe, around the first of April. The first flooding of the field, the sprout flow, barely covered the seed and only lasted until the grain sprouted. The water was then drained, to keep the delicate sprout from floating away, and the rice was allowed to grow for about three weeks. About the first of May any grass which grew up among the sprouts was weeded by hoes and the field was flooded to just over the tops of the plants for the point flow, which lasted a few days. Any rice which was left over from the previous year's crop and which had sprouted was weeded out as being inferior. Water was gradually drained off the rice until it half-covered the plants, and remained at this level, called the long flow, until the rice became strong enough to stand. More weeding followed and the water was gradually drained completely off the field,

APR 1 1988

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 2

after which the ground was hoed around the plants to encourage the growth and extension of the roots. The field was hoed and weeded again after about three weeks, when the lay-by flow was added around mid-June or the first of July and was gradually increased until the plants were completely submerged. This flow was kept on the field for about two months and was periodically changed by introducing fresh water and running off stagnant water by the tidal flow through the trunks.

Rice planted in the first week of April was usually ripe and ready for harvesting in the first week of September. After the lay-by flow was withdrawn, just before the grain was fully ripe, the rice was cut with large sickles known as rice hooks and laid on the ground on the stubble. After it had dried overnight, the cut rice was tied into sheaves and taken by flatboat to the threshing yard. There were many dangers to the crop in the harvesting season, the most notable of which were floods, hurricanes, and other storms, and the rice birds. The entire year's crop could be destroyed by a storm after the lay-by flow was withdrawn and before it could be cut, or after the rice was cut and before it could be gathered up for threshing. Rice birds which fed on the young grain came to South Carolina in May and in late August or early September. When they came over in May, the crop was generally underwater, but they often returned in the fall just as it was being cut and could quickly destroy a rice field if left alone. Planters posted slaves out in the fields with horns, bells, and shotguns in an effort to drive off most of the birds and kill those which remained. The appearance of the rice birds was not always a grim occurrence, however; they became a delicacy on many plantations.

Threshing the rice was most often done by beating the stalks with flails, although many of the larger plantations used steam threshing machines by the middle of the nineteenth century. The rice was then shipped to the factor, if it was to be sold as rough rice, or was husked and cleaned. This further preparation was primarily by hand in the colonial period. By the early nineteenth century most of the larger plantations operated pounding and/or threshing mills which were run by steam engines. In 1860, for example, there were at least eleven rice mills in Georgetown District, including those at Fairfield on the Waccamaw River, Weehaw and Nightingale Hall on the Black River, and Belle Isle, on Cat Island.(8) After the rice was finished it was packed into barrels or tierces and shipped to the market at Georgetown or Charleston.(9)

The planting, cultivation, harvesting, and preparation of rice

APR 4 1988

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 3

required an immense labor force which could be taught the details of the process. Slavery provided that labor force, and the growth of the rice culture precipitated the dramatic increase in the numbers of slaves owned by South Carolinians before the American Revolution.(10) Over 85 percent of the population of Georgetown District was slave throughout the first half of the eighteenth century.(11) Planters believed that slaves were particularly suited for rice cultivation for two reasons. Rice was grown in some areas of Africa and there was evidence that some slaves were familiar with the methods of cultivation practiced there. It was also thought that slaves, by virtue of their racial characteristics, were physically able to withstand the extreme heat and humidity of the tidal swamps better than whites and therefore would be more productive workers.(12)

Work on an antebellum rice plantation was divided up into tasks. Each field hand was given a task or a fraction of a task, usually nine or ten hours' hard work for one task, to complete each day according to his or her ability. "The ordinary plantation task is easily accomplished," wrote James Ritchie Sparkman, a Pee Dee River planter, in 1858. "Men and women are all engaged together in the planting, cultivation and harvesting of the Crop, but in the preparation of the Rice Land, as ditching, embanking etc. the men alone are engaged with the spade. It is customary (and never objected to) for the more active and industrious hands to assist those who are slower and more tardy in finishing their daily task."(13) One plantation on the Black River, for example, established one task as cutting and carrying from the field a quarter of an acre of rice.(14) In 1859 a plantation on the Pee Dee River had 52 slaves responsible for 47 1/2 tasks; 41 had full tasks and 11 had fractions of tasks to perform.(15)

Most planters and their families virtually evacuated their plantations along the rivers and swamps and moved further inland in the late spring, returning in the fall. Indeed, not all the rice plantations had fine houses; some did not have planters' houses at all. The main house at Arundel, for example, was begun in 1841 and remained unfinished during the antebellum period. Though the house was not completed and occupied until 1897, Arundel was an efficient working plantation with an absentee owner, producing some 270,000 pounds of rice in 1850.(16) It was not necessary, and often not practical, for planters to build houses at each of their plantations.

Many of them moved to large residences in Georgetown or Charleston during the summer months. Almira Coffin, a young girl from Maine

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APP 4 1985

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 4

visiting relatives in South Carolina, visited several plantations along the Waccamaw River in the spring of 1851. She was particularly impressed with Midway, the plantation of Benjamin F. Dunkin. "The only unpleasant thing about living at one of these fine plantations," she observed, "is that they [the planters] are obliged to leave them in May & not return till the first of Nov. on account of sickness, which they would be certain to have if they remained, called country fever. Some of them own houses here [Charleston] & come down to pass their summers, some on the Pedee go to a settlement, in a Pine land, called Plantersville, to be nearer their places & can visit them during the day. Others on the Waccamaw have houses on the islands, near the shore."(17) It was widely believed that the combination of heat, humidity, swamps, and mosquitoes bred malaria and that living on the plantation was dangerous until October or November.

Most planters visited their fields infrequently, if at all, during the growing season, preferring to leave their overseers in charge.(18) Overseers tended to live in houses a short distance inland from the rice fields, usually in the pine forests there, in the belief that they were safer there than on the plantation itself. They were often the only whites on a rice plantation during the growing season and usually spent as little time in the fields as possible. One planter complained of his overseer, "you will rarely meet with him on so large a place, for he is always circulating and no one knows where to find him."(19)

The driver, a slave appointed to superintend the rice fields and the field hands, was most often the day-to-day manager of a rice plantation. His position was the most important one in the slave hierarchy, and in terms of responsibility was the most important position on the rice plantation after the overseer. In some instances the driver was even more important than the overseer. The driver on a rice plantation, by virtue of the complicated process of planting, cultivating, harvesting, and preparing rice, had greater responsibility than any other slave in the antebellum South. Plowden C.J. Weston, owner of Hagley, explained in "Rules on the Rice Estate of P.C. Weston," which were published in DeBow's Review in January 1857: "The Driver is each morning to point out to each hand their task, and each task is never to be increased . . . Drivers are, under the Overseer, to maintain discipline and order on the place. They are to be responsible for the quiet of the negro-houses, for the proper performance of tasks, for bringing out the people early in the morning, and generally for the immediate inspection of such things as the Overseer only generally

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 5

superintends."(20) He was usually promoted by the planter from the field hands on the plantation, or purchased from another plantation, although some overseers were trusted to appoint a driver. A driver's qualifications included a working knowledge of a rice plantation's operations and the ability to make the field hands work. Most drivers were chosen while in their twenties, young and strong enough to work for many more years but mature enough to handle the responsibility. Unless they proved to be incompetent or were insubordinate most of them held their positions until old age or death prevented them from continuing as drivers.(21)

A typical driver on a rice plantation was more often actually in charge of the plantation than the planter or the overseer. Although his major responsibility was to check the field hands' work and to insure that they completed their tasks or portions of tasks each day, that responsibility demanded that a driver supervise everything that happened in the rice fields. The driver set reasonable tasks and determined whether or not individual slaves met their requirements. He was expected to make crucial decisions about when to plant, when to flood or drain the fields, and when to harvest the crop - and to make them correctly. If a bank or dike was broken through during a storm, or a trunk failed to operate properly, it was the driver's job to re-repair the damage and minimize the losses. He was in charge of organizing gangs of field hands to keep the rice birds off the fields in the fall. The success or failure of the year's crop often depended on the driver and his response to such circumstances.(22)

As involved as the driver was in the day-to-day workings of the South Carolina rice plantation, he was periodically, if not daily, superintended and evaluated by the overseer. The typical overseer was usually young and white, although there were a few black overseers. Most did not have the means or the experience to be planters themselves but often saw their position as a way to work within the plantation system. They usually made an annual contract with the planter for their services which outlined their duties.(23) "The Proprietor, in the first place, wishes the Overseer most distinctly to understand that his first object is to be, under all circumstances, the care and well being of the negroes," instructed Plowden C.J. Weston of an overseer in 1856. "The Proprietor is always ready to excuse such errors as may proceed from want of judgment; but he never can or will excuse any cruelty, severity, or want of care towards the negroes. For the well being, however, of the negroes, it is absolutely necessary to maintain obedience, order, and discipline; to see that the tasks are

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 4 1988

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 6

punctually and carefully performed, and to conduct the business steadily and firmly, without weakness on the one hand, or harshness on the other."(24)

An overseer was responsible for insuring the smooth operations of the plantation, much as a driver was, but with the additional burden of managing the driver as well. He served as the most common contact between a planter and his slaves and was given authority to act in the planter's name on the plantation. Although many overseers were fair, working the slaves up to but not beyond certain limits, many others were brutal, freely using their positions to abuse them.(25) In the end, the relationship between the driver and overseer, and the degree of supervision each exercised over the plantation and the field hands, depended on the personalities and abilities of each man as well as the length of time the overseer stayed on the plantation each year.

From the early years of the rice culture South Carolina planters were generally innovative, making many advances in growing and harvesting techniques and sharing much practical information on rice planting. Georgetown rice planters were particularly active in the exchange of new ideas, and this spirit of cooperation and friendly competition became much more pronounced in the 1830s and 1840s. Several prominent planters wrote letters and contributed papers to agricultural journals such as DeBow's Review, Southern Agriculturist, and Farmer and Planter, and delivered addresses on rice cultivation to organizations such as the State Agricultural Society of South Carolina and the Agricultural Association of the Planting States.(26) Robert F.W. Allston, one of the most active writers and speakers as well as one of the most successful of the Georgetown planters, gave the United States Commissioner of Patents a detailed account of his methods in 1847. "To plant this grain is my business," he wrote, "and I am fond of my business."(27) Dr. Edward Thomas Heriot, of Dirleton on the Pee Dee River, won a gold medal for his rice at the 1851 World's Fair in London. "I need not remark," wrote Charles Manigault, a Charleston County rice planter, "that Georgetown & its neighbouring Rivers produce the best Rice in the World. We all look up to them."(28)

Almira Coffin, the visitor from New England, vividly described the Waccamaw River plantations and their houses in the spring of 1851. "The houses of the Planters are situated near the river on high land surrounded by huge live oaks," she noted after sailing up the Waccamaw, "& some of them were very handsome . . . I was not prepared to see such

APR 4 1987

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 7

large ones & was agreeably disappointed, but one cottage greeted my eye the whole distance."(29) She continued, "the W. River is near the ocean, & the land between the two is called W. Neck & is from two to four miles wide only & is owned & cultivated by 18 or 20 planters up as far as 24 miles from the mouth. Each place has a name & many are very pretty. Mr D's is 'Midway' as it is about half way up, the next is 'True Blue,' one 'Laurel Hill,' 'Strawberry Hill,' 'Fairfield' &c&c, some have Indian names which I don't recollect."(30)

In 1850 the average value of a rice plantation in Georgetown County was \$38,000 with an average yield of nearly 300,000 pounds of rice.(31) Such immense holdings as Joshua John Ward's at Brookgreen, Springfield, Longwood, Prospect Hill, Oryzantia, and Alderly - valued at \$527,000 with a yield of nearly four million pounds - were exceptional. Other planters whose fields yielded over one million pounds of rice in 1850 were William Algernon Alston, owner of Clifton, Forlorn Hope, Rose Hill, Marietta, Friendfield, and Strawberry Hill, and John Hyrne Tucker, owner of Litchfield, Willbrook, Bates Hill, Glenmore, and Holly Grove.(32) A much more representative planter of 1850 would have been Dr. Edward T. Heriot, owner of Mount Arena on Sandy Island and Northampton on the Sampit River, whose plantations were valued at \$37,000 with a yield of 300,000 pounds.(33)

Ten years later, on the eve of the Civil War, rice planters in Georgetown County were even more successful, with an average plantation valued at \$49,000 and yielding nearly 500,000 pounds of rice.(34) In addition to William Algernon Alston and the estates of Joshua John Ward and John Hyrne Tucker, other planters whose fields produced over one million pounds of rice in 1860 included Robert F.W. Allston of Chicora Wood, Nightingale Hall, Rosebank, and Exchange; William B.S. Horry of Milldam and Jutland; the estate of Ralph S. Iazard, Jr., of Milton, Weymouth and Hickory Hill; Andrew Johnstone of Annandale and Estherville; Henry A. Middleton of Weehaw and Kensington; John I. Middleton of Crowfield; Francis S. Parker of Mansfield, Greenwich, and Willowbank; William B. Pringle of Richfield, Pleasant Meadow, and Bear Hill; John Harleston Read of Belle Rive; and Plowden C.J. Weston of Hagley, True Blue, Weehawka, and Waterford.(35) A representative planter, reflecting the increase in both wealth and production since 1850, would have been John D. Magill, owner of Richmond Hill on the Waccamaw River, which was valued at \$70,000 with a yield of 450,000 pounds.(36)

APR 4 1988

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 8

As the sectional tensions between the North and South increased in the decade between 1850 and 1860, the secession of South Carolina from a Union in which slavery was threatened was considered by many of her leading citizens to be the best course of action available. Most of the Georgetown District rice planters agreed with the right of secession in theory, even if some of them doubted the expediency of it when it did occur. Some planters, such as former governor Robert F.W. Allston, John I. Middleton, and Plowden C.J. Weston, were among the state's leading radical secessionists. The six Georgetown District delegates to the Secession Convention in December 1860 voted unanimously for secession. All of them were prominent rice planters.(37)

Many of the rice planters entered the Confederate service. The Georgetown Rifle Guards, a volunteer company which boasted many of the leaders of the district, became Company A of the 10th South Carolina Infantry and distinguished itself in the western theater of the war for the next three years.(38) James Heyward Trapier, owner of Keithfield, on the Black River, was a West Point graduate and a veteran of the Mexican War who was promoted to brigadier general in the Confederate States Army in late 1861. Trapier returned to take command of the Georgetown military district in November 1862.(39)

After elements of the United States Navy made their way into Winyah Bay to Georgetown they continued to steam up and down the rivers in the spring and summer of 1862, raiding properties of military value, in some instances confiscating rice, and taking in runaway slaves, whom they called "contrabands". Most of the rice planters in the district left not only their plantations that summer, as was their custom, but left the Georgetown area and moved inland. Some went north to Cheraw, or northwest to Columbia and Camden; others went even farther northwest to Greenville or Spartanburg. Some even left the state.(40) Many of the planters who did remain and attempted to grow rice during the war years moved to Plantersville.

By the time Federal naval and land forces finally captured Georgetown in February 1865, few planters were left to hear Admiral John A. Dahlgren's announcement of the abolition of slavery in the area. Planters and their ex-slaves were advised to stay near their homes. The blacks were told by Federal soldiers and sailors, many of them who were freedmen themselves, that they were free. They not only celebrated joyously but with a vengeance, drinking freely, looting their former plantations, and harassing their former masters.(41) Jane Pringle, from White House on the Pee Dee River, wrote Adele Petigru Allston,

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 4 1964

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 9

widow of Robert F.W. Allston, "Your negroes I hear are perfectly in-subordinate . . . The blacks are masters of the situation, this is a conquered country and for the moment law and order are in abeyance."(42)

In early March a delegation of planters petitioned "To the United States Military Commandant of Georgetown" for protection and for the restoration of law and order in the area. These men were the Reverend Alexander Glennie of All Saints' Episcopal, Waccamaw; Dr. James Ritchie Sparkman; Dr. Charles Alston, Sr.; William Allan Allston; and Francis Weston. They explained that the white population of the area consisted of thirteen families, most of them women and children - there were only seven adult males in the group - and that all of them were noncombatants.(43) A few days later Glennie and Sparkman met with Captain Henry S. Stellwagen of the U.S.S. Pawnee, anchored in Georgetown Harbor, asking that the Federal land and naval forces occupying the district attempt to control the freedmen since the planters could not. Their request was apparently in vain, as it was reported that "Dr. S. and Mr. Glennie left in disgust."(44)

The disruption which emancipation caused all over the South was particularly acute on the rice plantations, where so much depended on experienced and efficient managers and laborers, and where the work in the fields had always been done by gangs of slaves assigned specific tasks. Many freedmen left the plantations, preferring to be away from any associations with slavery; others, having no other place to go, remained but were unwilling to work for their former masters at any price. Still others worked where they had before the war, but for pay or for a portion of the crop. Most of the freedmen believed that the Federal government would take care of them, giving them land to farm for themselves. The planters expected to retain their land, and asked that same Federal government to protect their property rights. As a result, some rice plantations were subdivided while others were left virtually intact, although the production in all instances was drastically short of what it had been.(45)

Progress was difficult, if not impossible, for several years after 1865. The confiscation and subdivision of land doomed the effective cultivation of rice; most freedmen had little acreage, no capital, and could depend only on themselves as laborers in the fields. They preferred growing subsistence crops such as corn and wheat. The total acreage in Georgetown County which was devoted to the cultivation of rice fell dramatically from 1860 to 1870 - from 47,000 acres to 12,000 acres - and the production in pounds fell just as dramatically, from

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 10

fifty-four million pounds to six million pounds.(46) Such plantations as Simons Lucas' Rice Hope, which was valued at \$30,000 and produced some 495,000 pounds in 1860, was worth only \$10,000 and produced only 75,000 pounds in 1870. Waverly, which had been under the stewardship of Robert F.W. Allston until his nephews came of age, was worth \$35,000 and produced some 450,000 pounds of rice in 1860, soon after Joseph Blyth Allston took over. It was worth only \$2000 and produced only 35,000 pounds in 1870. Perhaps the most dramatic loss was at Dirleton, the plantation of Dr. James Ritchie Sparkman. Sparkman's plantation lost \$118,000 of its value and some 885,000 pounds of rice production in the decade.(47) Other plantations' losses were not so striking, particularly those which had not been among the leaders in rice production in Georgetown District before the war. One of them, for example, was Arthur Middleton's Daisy Bank, whose value dropped from \$12,500 to \$4000 and production dropped from 270,000 to 175,000 pounds.(48) All the rice planters, however, lost more than they gained.

There was a slight recovery over the next decade, with 19,000 acres under cultivation and production of nine million pounds by 1880, most of this due to improved technology in the machinery which operated threshing and pounding mills.(49) Several of the prominent rice planters and merchants of Georgetown County formed the Georgetown Rice Milling Company, which was located in Georgetown on Front Street, along the Sampit River. Describing their mill, an 1880 brochure read, "it is the best machinery ever introduced to the public, for pounding and preparing Rice for market."(50) There were only three pounding mills still operating on individual plantations after the war; they were at Keithfield, on the Black River, Weymouth, on the Pee Dee River, and the most successful of all the mills, at Waverly, on the Waccamaw River. The mill complex at Waverly had been established well before the war, with a rice mill there by the 1830s. It operated at its peak from 1871 to 1911.(51)

This recovery was short-lived, however. That technology which contributed to the small success of rice planting in Georgetown County during the 1870s soon outstripped the area's capacity for it. Rice plantations in Louisiana and Texas began to be established and to produce surprising quantities of rice by utilizing new methods and new machines. Instead of planting rice in coastal and tidal marshes, many farmers there flooded upland prairies, which had two major advantages. There was now much more land available for rice planting, and large harvesting machines could be used on this acreage. Prairie fields could be drained and dried thoroughly to support the harvesters.

APR 4 1988

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 11

This was impossible in the ricefields of South Carolina, where the heavy machines would have sunk into the marsh. Increased yields of as much as 25 per cent were possible with the new methods. Louisiana replaced South Carolina as the leading rice producer in the United States by 1890.(52)

Many of the Georgetown area rice planters were reluctant to give up a crop which had provided for them for so many years. The death of the South Carolina rice culture was hastened by the better yields and better quality rice grown in Louisiana and elsewhere, but it was assured by the frequent and violent storms which plagued the coast from 1893 to 1911. Hurricanes devastated crop after crop and took a severe toll on property and lives. Banks, trunks, and dikes were washed away, and mills and barns were damaged. In many instances expensive and often dangerous repairs to the fields were made only to be swept away by another storm. These hurricanes appeared in the fall, most often in September, just as the year's crop was being harvested. In 1893 there were two hurricanes within seven weeks, and the storm of October 13 was the worst in the history of the state. Other storms followed in 1894, 1898, 1906, 1910, and 1911.(53)

Most of the planters still struggling to produce rice gave up after one of these storms. J.P. Hazzard, the owner of Keithfield, stopped growing rice commercially after the 1906 storm, though blacks in the area rented some of his ricefields and sold the rice they produced to merchants in Georgetown.(54) Elizabeth Allston Pringle, daughter of Robert F.W. Allston, attempted to keep up her plantation at White House, on the Black River. After some small successes, but too many storms, she wrote in 1907, "the rice-planting, which for years gave me the exhilaration of making a good income for myself, is a thing of the past now - the banks and trunks have been washed away, and there is no money to replace them."(55) Most of the rice grown in Georgetown County after this period was grown for local consumption, or for the sake of tradition, rather than for profit.

APR 4 1988

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 12

Georgetown Rice Culture Multiple Property Submission

Pee Dee River Rice Planters Historic District

Hasty Point Rice Barn
Exchange Plantation
Rosebank Plantation House
Chicora Wood Plantation (Listed individually in the National
Register 11 April 1973)
Arundel Plantation
Dirleton Plantation House

Belle Isle Rice Mill Chimney, Cat Island
Beneventum Plantation House
Fairfield Rice Mill Chimney
Keithfield Plantation
Milldam Rice Mill and Rice Barn
Nightingale Hall Rice Mill Chimney
Summer Chapel, Prince Frederick's Episcopal Church
Summer Chapel Rectory, Prince Frederick's Episcopal Church
Richmond Hill Plantation Archaeological Sites
Rural Hall Plantation House
Weehaw Rice Mill Chimney

Properties Already Listed in the National Register and Contributing
In Whole or In Part to the Georgetown Rice Culture Multiple
Property Submission

Hopsewee (NHL)	25 January 1971
Prince George Winyah Church (Episcopal) and Cemetery	6 May 1971
City of Georgetown Historic District	14 October 1971
Pawley's Island Historic District	15 November 1972
Chicora Wood Plantation	11 April 1973
Annandale Plantation	25 October 1973
Prince Frederick's Chapel Site	28 August 1974
Mansfield Plantation	6 December 1977
Arcadia Plantation	3 January 1978
Brookgreen Gardens	15 April 1978
Wicklow Hall Plantation	29 August 1978
Murrell's Inlet Historic District	25 November 1980

APR 4 1988

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 13

NOTES

(1) Lewis Cecil Gray, History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860 (Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith, 1958, Reprint of 1932 Edition), Volume I, pp. 277-280; J. Harold Easterby, Editor, The South Carolina Rice Plantation as Revealed in the Papers of Robert F.W. Allston (Chicago: University of Chicago Press for the American Historical Association, 1945), pp. 6-11; George C. Rogers, Jr., The History of Georgetown County, South Carolina (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970), p. 29; Peter H. Wood, Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1974), pp. 35-37, 73-75, 225-26; Charles Joyner, Down by the Riverside: A South Carolina Slave Community (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984), pp. 12-14.

(2) Gray, pp. 277-280; Wood, pp. 13, 108.

(3) Gray, pp. 280-81; Rogers, p. 165.

(4) G.S.S., "Sketches of the South Santee," The American Monthly Magazine VIII:10 (October 1836), 315.

(5) Ibid., 316.

(6) Raymond A. Mohl, Editor, "'The Grand Fabric of Republicanism': A Scotsman Describes South Carolina 1810-1811", South Carolina Historical Magazine 71:3 (July 1970), 177.

(7) Rogers, pp. 6-8, 27-29; Sam B. Hilliard, "Antebellum tidewater rice culture in South Carolina and Georgia," in James R. Gibson, Editor, European Settlement and Development in North America: Essays on geographical change in honour and memory of Andrew Hill Clark (Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1978), pp. 94-101.

(8) Robert F.W. Allston, Memoir of the Introduction and Planting of Rice in South Carolina (Charleston: A.E. Miller, 1843), pp. 10-11; Allston, Essay on Sea Coast Crops ... (Charleston: A.E. Miller, 1854), p. 31; Rogers, pp. 331-32; Hilliard, pp. 105-09.

(9) This description of the rice culture is taken largely from

APR 4 1988

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 14

Allston, Memoir of the Introduction and Planting of Rice in South Carolina, pp. 8-14; Allston, Essay on Sea Coast Crops..., pp. 31-37; David Doar, Rice and Rice Planting in the South Carolina Low Country, Contributions From The Charleston Museum, edited by E. Milby Burton, Director, (Charleston: The Charleston Museum, 1936), pp. 13-17; and Rogers, pp. 331-34.

(10) Rogers, 342-43; Wood, pp. 34-62.

(11) Rogers, p. 343.

(12) Wood, pp. 35-62.

(13) James Ritchie Sparkman to Benjamin Allston, 10 March 1858, quoted in Easterby, p. 346.

(14) "Synopsis of the Culture of Rice - on Black River. From the Southern Agriculturist," The Farmer's Register IX: 3 (31 March 1841), 171.

(15) "1859. Feb. 12th. List of Field Hands on Dirleton," in Plantation Book, 1859-1864, James Ritchie Sparkman Papers, South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston, South Carolina.

(16) Alexander M. Quattlebaum, "Arundel Plantation: 200 Years of Identity," unpublished MS, pp. 9-12, on file, National Register Office South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia, S.C.; Alberta Morel Lachicotte, Georgetown Rice Plantations (Columbia: The State Printing Company, 1955; Fifth Edition, 1970), pp. 109-111.

(17) Almira Coffin to Mrs. J.G. Osgood, 10 May 1851, in J.H. Easterby, Editor, "South Carolina Through New England Eyes: Almira Coffin's Visit to the Low Country in 1851," South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine XLV:3 (July 1944), 133.

(18) Doar, pp. 37-39; Easterby, pp. 9, 23-24; Joyner, pp. 35, 37.

(19) Robert F.W. Allston to Benjamin Allston, 8 June 1858, quoted in Easterby, p. 144.

(20) "Rules on the Rice Estate of P.C. Weston," DeBow's Review XXI (January 1857), quoted in U.B. Phillips, Editor, Plantation and

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 4 1988

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 15

Frontier Documents 1649-1863 (Cleveland, 1910), Volume I, pp. 117, 120.

(21) James Herbert Stone, "Black Leadership in the Old South: The Slave Drivers of the Rice Kingdom," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of History, Florida State University, 1976, pp. 17-38; pp. 56-65; Joyner, pp. 65-68.

(22) Stone, pp. 17-38; Joyner, pp. 65-68.

(23) Easterby, pp. 23-27; Joyner, pp. 68-70.

(24) "Rules on the Rice Estate of P.C. Weston," quoted in Phillips, p. 116.

(25) Joyner, pp. 68-70.

(26) See, for example, Original Communications Made to the Agricultural Society of South Carolina ... (Charleston, 1824); The Southern Agriculturist, and Register of Rural Affairs ... IV:4 (April 1831); "Synopsis of the Culture of Rice - on Black River ...," The Farmer's Register ... IX:3 (31 March 1841); Allston's Memoir of the Introduction and Planting of Rice ...and Essay on Sea Coast Crops ...; Whitemarsh B. Seabrook, An Essay on the Agricultural Capabilities of S Carolina ... (Charleston, 1848); Reports Submitted to the Winyah and All Saints Agricultural Society (Charleston, 1848 and 1850); and "Rules on the Rice Estate of P.C. Weston," DeBow's Review.

(27) Robert F.W. Allston to Edmund Burke, United States Commissioner of Patents, 22 November 1847, Allston Family Papers, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

(28) Rogers, p. 341; Albert V. House, Editor, "Charles Manigault's Essay on the Open Planting of Rice," Agricultural History XVI (1942), 191.

(29) Quoted in Easterby, "South Carolina Through New England Eyes," 133.

(30) Ibid.

APR 4 1988

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 16

(31) Agricultural Schedules, Seventh Census of the United States, (1850), Georgetown District, South Carolina.

(32) Ibid.

(33) Ibid.

(34) Agricultural Schedules, Eighth Census of the United States (1860), Georgetown District, South Carolina.

(35) Ibid.

(36) Ibid. Magill was not a representative planter in terms of his treatment of slaves; he was considered to be one of the least efficient and most cruel masters of all the Georgetown District rice planters. One slave from Richmond Hill, according to an ex-slave's recollection seventy years later, was pulled limb from limb by four horses after trying to escape in 1862. Quoted in Joyner, pp. 26-28, 55. An archaeological site at Richmond Hill is included in this multiple property submission.

(37) Ibid.; Rogers, pp. 382-83. The six planters were John I. Middleton of Crowfield, on the Waccamaw River, which was valued at \$136,500 and produced 1,860,000 pounds of rice in 1860; Benjamin E. Sessions, identified by Rogers as a planter "on the Waccamaw"; both of them representing All Saints' Parish; Judge Benjamin F. Dunkin of Midway, on the Waccamaw River, which was valued at \$38,000 and produced 730,000 pounds; Dr. Alexius M. Forster of Friendfield, on the Sampit River, which was valued at \$50,000 and produced 638,000 pounds; Dr. Francis S. Parker of Mansfield, Greenwich, and Willowbank, on the Black River, which was valued at \$100,000 and produced 1,440,000 pounds; and Samuel T. Atkinson, of Oakton, on Winyah Bay, which had produced 60,000 pounds of rice in 1850.

(38) R. Lockwood Tower, Editor, A Carolinian Goes to War: The Civil War Narrative of Arthur Middleton Manigault, Brigadier General, C.S.A. (Columbia: Published for the Charleston Library Society by the University of South Carolina Press, 1983); Rogers, pp. 391-98.

(39) Rogers, pp. 390, 405.

(40) Rogers, pp. 403-05, 410.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 4 1988

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 17

(41) Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1894-1922), 30 Volumes. Series I, Volume XVI: 273-280; Rogers, pp. 416-19; Joyner, pp. 225-27.

(42) Jane Pringle to Adele Petigru Allston, 1 April 1865, quoted in Easterby, p. 211.

(43) "To the United States Military Commandant of Georgetown, So. Ca. Plantersville, March 6th, 1865," James Ritchie Sparkman Papers, South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

(44) "On Board of the U.S. Ship Pawnee, March 10, 1865," James Ritchie Sparkman Papers, South Caroliniana Library; Jane Pringle to Adele Petigru Allston, 1 April 1865, quoted in Easterby, p. 211.

(45) Rogers, pp. 422-30.

(46) Agricultural Schedules, Eighth Census of the United States (1860), Georgetown District, South Carolina; Agricultural Schedules, Ninth Census of the United States, (1870), Georgetown County, South Carolina.

(47) Ibid.

(48) Ibid.

(49) Agricultural Schedules, Tenth Census of the United States, (1880), Georgetown County, South Carolina.

(50) Georgetown Rice Milling Company, Georgetown, S.C. 1880. (Charleston: Lucas and Richardson, Printers, 1880), p. 3.

(51) Lachicotte, pp. 31, 33-35.

(52) James M. Clifton, "Twilight Comes to the Rice Kingdom: Postbellum Rice Culture on the South Atlantic Coast," Georgia Historical Quarterly LXII:2 (Summer 1978), 150-51.

(53) Duncan Clinch Heyward, Seed From Madagascar (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1937), pp. 239-47; Clifton, 151; Rogers, pp. 488-89.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 4 1988

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number E Page 18

(53) Duncan Clinch Heyward, Seed From Madagascar (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1937), pp. 239-47; Clifton, 151; Rogers, pp. 488-89.

(54) Affidavits of Abraham Pyatt and Joseph Arthur Richardson, 25 June 1970, in the possession of Louis H. Hutto, Jr., Georgetown, South Carolina.

(55) Patience Pennington [Elizabeth Allston Pringle] A Woman Rice Planter (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928), p. 446.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 1

Section F. Associated Property Types

I. Name of Property Type: Agricultural Features Associated With Rice Cultivation

II. Description

Rice cultivation in Georgetown County took place on flood plain land bordering the Sampit, Black, Pee Dee, Waccamaw, and Santee Rivers. All of these rivers were subject to tidal action, making the tidal flow of rice cultivation possible. The tidal method was based on flooding and draining the fertile flood plain. The cultivated land had to be low enough to be flooded at high tide, but high enough to be drained at low tide. Fresh water from these rivers was used to flood the fields. The river water was pushed upstream at high tide and dropped at low tide.

Cultivation of ricefields by this method involved the use of canals, dikes, and trunks. After the land was cleared, it was divided into large fields or approximately six hundred acres, then further subdivided into smaller tracts of approximately fifteen acres which were enclosed by dikes or banks. These dikes were built to a height of five to ten feet and were approximately four feet wide. They were surrounded by canals, dug fifteen to twenty feet inside the banks; dirt from the canal was used to increase the height of the banks. Dividing land into fields enclosed by banks permitted each small field to be flooded independently of the others during the growing season. Rice was planted in early April and harvested at the end of August or first week of September. The fields were plowed and cleared of stubble during the winter months.

Trunks, or small flood gates, were installed at intervals in the banks. A trunk consisted of two facing doors, usually constructed of cypress, a wood which holds up well when exposed to water. The trunk doors worked automatically from the pressure of the water. To flood a field, the outside door was raised and water from the river pushed the inside gate open, thus filling the canals and inundating the field. A field could be flooded only at high tide. Eventually water inside the canals would be at the same level as that of the river outside. When the tide began to fall, the pressure of receding water in the ditch would force the inside door to close, impounding the water for as long as desired. The procedure was reversed to drain the field. On an ebb tide, the inside door would be lifted. Water leaving the field would force open the outer door. When the tide began to rise, the water from the river would press the outside door shut, preventing salt water from getting in the ricefields.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number _____ Page _____

III. Significance

These agricultural features are important resources which provide information about rice culture in Georgetown County. They qualify under item A of the National Register Criteria. This property type should be listed under the AGRICULTURE area of significance.

IV. Registration Requirements

To qualify for listing these agricultural features must have been involved in the cultivation of rice. Most of these features have been retained since rice cultivation ceased c. 1910. The canals, dikes and trunks must still be visible in their original configurations. Because dikes are subject to deterioration from boring by snakes, undermining by muskrats, and damage from floods and hurricanes, they have to be continually maintained. Historically, maintaining dikes and keeping canals free of obstruction was one of the ongoing plantation tasks. The trunks are subject to decay because of their constant exposure to water and have to be replaced periodically. It is impossible to determine the age of individual trunks with any certainty. The design of trunks and the materials of their construction, however, have remained constant.

State and Federal wetland protection measures have encouraged the maintenance of historic rice fields. If the agricultural features of rice fields are allowed to fall into disrepair so that the impounded fields return to marsh, then questions of state vs. private ownership arise. Most owners of historic rice fields have maintained the agricultural features because impounded rice fields attract water fowl. Many of the rice fields are now used by hunting clubs and wild-life refuges, a use which has made survival of these historic features possible.

For purposes of counting the agricultural features associated with rice cultivation in this multiple property submission, each separate system was counted as one structure. For example, the nomination for Keithfield Plantation counts three structures - the canal system, the dike system, and the trunk system. This method was determined by the nature of the agricultural features, which in most cases are inaccessible and for which a count of individual canals, dikes, and trunks would not be possible.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 4 1988

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 3

Section F. Associated Property Types

I. Name of Property Type: Resources Associated With Plantation Community Life

II. Description

The typical rice plantation included a plantation house, dwellings for the slaves, and a number of auxiliary service buildings, such as smokehouses, gate houses, and commissaries. The plantation buildings were components of a self-contained, self-sufficient economic and social unit. One needed to leave the plantation only to attend a nearby church, agricultural or social club, or to visit with other plantation families. A common landscape feature was an avenue of live oak trees lining the drive leading up to the plantation house from the main road. The plantation houses are tangible reflections of the wealth of Georgetown County rice planters and their social group. Nearby church buildings were important adjuncts to the social life of the plantation. While none of the buildings within this group are exactly alike, within the subgroups they share a commonality of size, building materials, spatial arrangement, and physical placement. Taken as a whole, these structures, constructed between c. 1750 and c. 1860, reflect local building traditions.

In addition, the potential for the location and identification of significant archaeological components of the Georgetown County rice culture is evidenced by several recent archaeological investigations at the sites of rice plantations along the Waccamaw River. Coupled with limited historical documentation (records and plats), archaeological surveys have identified numerous archaeological sites representative of planters', overseers', and slaves' houses, plantation outbuildings, agricultural features, cemeteries, and churches. Sites representative of many of these property subtypes and eligible for the National Register have been identified at Turkey Hill, Oatland, Willbrook, True Blue, and Richmond Hill, for example.

III. Significance

These properties are noteworthy because of their association with significant rice plantations. The plantation houses and their associated auxiliary buildings reveal much about the way of life of the planters and of the thousands of slaves who provided manual labor. These buildings qualify under items A, B, C, and D of the National

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 4

Register Criteria. All of these property types should be listed under the ARCHITECTURE, SOCIAL HISTORY, and ARCHAEOLOGY (Historic Non-Aboriginal) areas of significance.

Subtype: Plantation House

Plantation houses were typically constructed of frame with exterior clapboard covering. Most are 1 1/2 or 2 stories in height and rest on brick pier foundations. Most are central plan dwellings, with two rooms located on each side of the hall. These paired rooms are usually serviced by back-to-back hearths. Gabled dormers on the principal facades are common. Single entrance doorways are most common, usually with sidelights and transoms. Most fenestration is by 6/6 or 8/8 light, double hung sash windows. The finish of these houses usually reflects the affluence of their owners. Ornate mantels, wainscoting, crown moldings, and plaster ceiling medallions are common. Plantation houses are generally sited on high ground, facing a river and usually have a one-story porch across the facade that fronts onto the river. Some features, such as raised basements, porches, and center halls were incorporated to provide ventilation and shade in the semi-tropical climate of coastal South Carolina.

Subtype: Plantation Outbuildings

Plantation outbuildings, because of their specific functional use, tend to be small structures. They generally are one-story and of frame construction, usually with clapboard or wood shingle exterior walls. They usually rest on brick pier foundations and have gable roofs, with either standing seam metal or composition shingle roofing material. Generally, these structures are devoid of exterior trim. The interior plan usually consists of one or two rooms. Wood shutters, instead of glass panes, usually protect the rectangular window openings. Chimneys, when used, are usually constructed of brick and placed on an exterior wall. The function of the building determines its placement in relation to the plantation house. A gate house is traditionally located at the main gate leading to the plantation property, at the beginning of a long drive to the plantation house. Thus, it may be a considerable distance from the house. A smokehouse would usually be within one hundred feet of the main house.

APR 4 1988

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 5

Subtype: Slave Cabins

Slaves often did the actual construction of their own dwellings, but were usually working from plans provided by the plantation owner. Slave housing therefore tends to be fairly uniform, simple, and devoid of trim. Slave cabins are traditionally of frame construction, usually with clapboard or wood shingle exterior walls; more rarely, board and batten exterior siding was used. They usually rest on low brick pier foundations and are one-story in height and rectangular in shape. Slave cabins usually are of one of two vernacular types: a single pen with end chimney or a double pen with central interior chimney. The double pen was used for two families, while a single family unit usually occupied the single pen cabin. The interiors were commonly divided into one or two rooms. Occasionally a loft was included. A single entrance door is usually located on the long wall, flanked by simple window openings that have shutter coverings, but no glass. Some early photographs of slave cabins show them with porches, which were probably early twentieth century alterations.

Slave cabins were generally grouped together on a "street," with several cabins facing each other across a lane or road. An overseer's cabin was frequently at one end of the street and a chapel at the other end. Cabins for slaves working in the plantation house would have been placed in fairly close proximity to the house; cabins for slaves working in the fields would have been on high ground near the ricefields. Very few slave "streets" exist today. More often one finds only a single extant cabin.

In addition to the areas of significance mentioned above, the slave cabins should also be listed under the BLACK ETHNIC HERITAGE area of significance.

Subtype: Churches

These structures can vary greatly in scale, building materials, and decorative quality. Most are rectangular in shape. Sometimes this basic rectangular shape is modified by an apse projection at one end or by transept projections. Gable roofs are common on church structures. Construction materials are usually frame, brick, or stone. Entrance doors are usually double and are frequently sheltered by a portico. Decorative elements often include stained glass windows and steeples.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 4 1987

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 6

In addition to the areas of significance mentioned above, churches might also be listed under the RELIGION area of significance.

Subtype: Church Rectories

Church rectories tend to reflect the prevailing architectural fashions and materials of other dwellings of the time of their construction.

IV. Registration Requirements

To qualify for listing, these properties must be intact examples of one of the identified subtypes. Although some minor changes may have occurred over time, the properties should be considered if they are recognizable to their period of significance and retain their original plan, siting, materials, and exterior finishes. Additions to the properties are acceptable provided they occur on the rear elevations and are clearly distinguishable as additions. A side addition to a church building would be acceptable, provided it was near the rear of the building and provided it was clearly distinguishable as an addition.

To qualify for listing, archaeological properties such as houses, churches, cemeteries, agricultural buildings, and agricultural fields should meet a combination of the following significance criteria to meet National Register standards for archaeological sites. These criteria are derived primarily from Glassow (1977).

Integrity: The current state of preservation of a site should be sufficient for the recovery of data from interpretable contexts and proveniences.

Density: Density refers to the quantity of archaeological artifacts and features within the site. A high density of such materials would be expected to yield a sufficient statistically valid sample. A low density of materials indicates the site would be limited in the quality of scientific information it might yield.

Diversity: Diversity of variety refers to the range of temporal and/or functional archaeological remains.

Clarity: Clarity pertains to the lack of mixing of components within a multicomponent site and the potential of the archaeologist to correctly interpret data derived from its context.

APR 4 1986

**United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service**

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 7

Uniqueness is the special quality of a particular site type and its potential to yield significant data in relation to other sites of a similar type. A unique site might be one which is the last remaining example of its kind in a particular environment.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 4 1988

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 8

Section F. Associated Property Types

I. Name of Property Type: Rice Processing Facilities

II. Description

These properties were built to store rice and to process it after it was harvested. They include: rice barns, rice mills, rice chimneys and winnowing houses. These structures were important parts of a rice plantation. The subtypes in this group are distinctly different, each having a recognizable appearance that is dictated to a large part by its specific function.

III. Significance

These properties are significant for their association with the processing of rice grown in Georgetown County. The County's economic base in the period from c. 1700 to c. 1910 was directly tied to the cultivation and processing of rice. These structures qualify under items A and C of the National Register Criteria. Rice barns and winnowing houses should be listed under the AGRICULTURE area of significance; rice mills and chimneys should be listed under the INDUSTRY and ENGINEERING areas of significance.

Subtype: Rice Barn

Rice barns were used for the storage of harvested rice. They are usually rectangular in shape, of frame construction, with exterior walls of cypress shingles. They usually rest on brick pier foundations and are generally two stories in height, with gable roofs. An interior stairway leads to the upper floor. Door and window locations vary, however there is usually an entrance door at the end of one of the long side walls and a loft door. Windows are usually shuttered.

Subtype: Rice Mills and Rice Mill Chimneys

Rice mills are generally rectangular and of frame construction, originally with cypress-shingled exterior walls and a cypress-shingle gable-end roof. They are generally on brick pier foundations and were two- to two-and-one half stories high, with exposed beams and rafters and a minimum of interior subdivisions. Door and window placement varies, though there is usually an entrance door on one of the long side walls and a loft door in the gable, and windows are usually shuttered.(1)

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 4 1981

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 9

A general description of rice mill chimneys, in the absence of documentary evidence, must be based on historic photographs and on examinations of the extant rice mill chimneys and remnants. Rice mill chimneys, which date from c. 1830 to c. 1860, are constructed of brick. These chimneys are generally built on wide brick foundations which extend well below ground level. They are generally six to eight feet square at the base, tapering from the ground or from the top of the base toward a top some thirty to forty feet high. Corbelling is often present at the top of the base and the top of the chimney itself. A firebox with an arched opening is located at the base, generally with an identical or slightly smaller arch on the opposite side of the chimney. Although most rice mill chimneys were square or rectangular, two of the extant chimneys in Georgetown County are unusually shaped. The chimney at Laurel Hill, which is approximately fifty feet high and is remarkably intact, is in the form of an eight-pointed star. The chimney at Fairfield, which is approximately thirty-five feet high and is slightly deteriorated, is octagonal in shape. Chimneys were not directly attached to the mills but were independent structures, connected to them by means of brick viaducts, generally underground but in some instances partially above ground level.(2)

As the production and quality of rice increased in South Carolina the efficiency of its processing increased as well. Rice was threshed from the stalks and the husk was pounded from the grain by hand from the mid-eighteenth century well into the nineteenth century and in some instances even after the emancipation of the slaves. The threshing process was simple but time-consuming, as the stalks were laid on the ground and then beat with flails to separate the heads. The heads were then winnowed to remove the chaff. Some planters built winnowing houses, buildings elevated above the ground in which the grains were dropped through a screen in the floor, allowing the wind to blow the chaff away. Most often, however, the rice was winnowed by fanning the chaff from the rice using large flat baskets. The final step in this process was the pounding of the husk from the grain, a step in which the grain was not pounded at all but gently ground by a wooden mortar and pestle to remove the tough outer husk from the delicate grain.(3)

Threshing and pounding mills were developed to add speed and volume to the processing of rice. By 1790 there were several pounding mills established in the lowcountry, with machinery driven by water power. Most of the water-powered mills were converted to steam power by the 1830s, requiring large brick chimneys for the fires running the steam engines.(4) Robert F.W. Allston described the pounding mills and their

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 10

operation in 1843. "At present," he observed, "almost every planter of four hundred acres and upwards, is provided with a Tide-water or a Steam-pounding mill for preparing his own crops for market. There are also a number of Toll-mills in the State, nearly sufficient for preparing all the rough-rice which is not pounded at the plantations."(5) "Steam threshing mills cost, prior to the Civil War, about \$8,000; and pounding mills some \$20,000," J. Motte Alston recalled in the 1890s.(6)

"Rough rice" was taken up into the top floor of a pounding mill, which was usually two stories high, by tin buckets attached to a conveyor belt run by pulleys. Once there it was passed through a wire rotating screen which sifted out inferior grains and impurities, and then ground between two large millstones to separate the husk from the grain. The rice was then dropped down onto a wind-blown fan on the second floor, which separated the chaff and blew it away. After fanning the rice was then dropped down chutes into large wooden mortars on the ground floor to be pounded. The wooden pestles, which were footed with iron, were driven by a large shaft run by the steam engine. Each mortar held four and a half bushels of ground rice, and a typical mill might have 10, 12, 14, or 24 mortars, depending on the size of its engine. After the rice was pounded for two hours it was conveyed back to the second floor, where the flour, small grains, and broken grains were screened out and the most valuable rice - the large unbroken grains - were sent down to a brushing screen. Any remaining rice flour was removed from the rice by wire brushes operating against a rotating drum. The "clean rice" was then dropped by chutes into barrels.(7)

Threshing mills, also driven at first by water power but later by steam power, were developed later than the pounding mills and made their first successful appearance in the 1830s. Their machinery operated much as early cotton gins did, with rakes to separate the heads of rice from the stalks, fans to winnow the chaff from the grain, and screens to catch the grain.(8)

Many mills were equipped for both pounding and threshing, and run by a single steam engine, on the larger plantations. After the Civil War most mills operated as threshing mills; there were pounding mills at the Georgetown Rice Milling Company, in Georgetown; Waverly, on the Waccamaw River; Keithfield, on the Black River; and Weymouth, on the Pee Dee River. A few of the most productive steam-driven rice mills in antebellum Georgetown County, whether pounding or threshing mills, were at Fairfield, Laurel Hill, Hagley, and Waverly on the Waccamaw River;

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 4 1988

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 11

Mansfield, Weehaw, and Keithfield on the Black River; Chicora Wood, Nightingale Hall, Hasty Point, and Weymouth on the Pee Dee River; and Belle Isle and Cat Island, on Cat Island.(9) Of these mills, Fairfield, Laurel Hill, Mansfield, Weehaw, Chicora Wood, Nightingale Hall, and Belle Isle have extant brick chimneys or remnants. The chimneys or remnants at Laurel Hill, Mansfield, and Chicora Wood have been previously listed in the National Register as components of nominated plantations. Chicora Wood is the only Georgetown County rice plantation with an extant mill building and its chimney.(10) The mill building at Milldam, on the North Santee River, housed a threshing mill which ran by water power and therefore had no mill chimney.(11)

Subtype: Winnowing House

A winnowing house is a frame structure, approximately ten feet square, which is elevated on stilts about fifteen feet from the ground. The exterior walls are usually clapboard. A stairway is usually attached, providing access to a door. These structures usually have hipped roofs. A screen is located in the middle of the floor. Threshed rice was dropped through the screen and the wind separated the chaff from the grain.

IV. Registration Requirements

In order to qualify for listing, rice barns and mills must retain their original plan and their integrity of materials and siting. The original exterior cypress shingle are subject to deterioration. It is acceptable for these shingles to have been replaced, provided replacement is with like materials. Roofing material for these buildings was originally cypress shingles. Replacement with standing seam metalroofing is acceptable.

In order to qualify for listing, rice mill chimneys must retain their integrity of materials and siting. Though brick chimneys are subject to deterioration, at least 75% of the original height must be intact and the arched openings for the firebox must be intact.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 4 1987

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number F Page 12

NOTES

(1) Brookgreen Gardens, Mansfield Plantation, Chicora Wood Plantation; National Register nomination and photograph files, State Historic Preservation Office, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia; Personal observations, National Register staff, State Historic Preservation Office, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, 29-31 July, 24-25 August, 2 September 1987; Interview with R. Kenneth Williams, Manager, Kinloch Plantation, Georgetown, South Carolina, 25 August 1987; Alberta Morel Lachicotte, Georgetown Rice Plantations (Columbia: The State Printing Company, 1955; Fifth Edition, 1970), "Old Rice Mill at Chicora Wood," p. ii; Arney R. Childs, Editor, Rice Planter and Sportsman: The Recollections of J. Motte Alston, 1821-1909 (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1953), "Old Rice Mill at Fairfield Plantation," facing p. 46; Interview with Richard Porcher, Department of Biology, The Citadel, Charleston, South Carolina, 23 June 1987; Interview with Fred Powell, Game Warden, Arcadia Plantation, Georgetown, South Carolina, 2 September 1987.

(2) Ibid.

(3) Robert F.W. Allston, Memoir of the Introduction and Planting of Rice in South Carolina (Charleston: A.E. Miller, 1843), pp. 16-19; Allston, Essay on Sea Coast Crops ... (Charleston: A.E. Miller, 1854), pp. 36-37; David Doar, Rice and Rice Planting in the South Carolina Low Country, Contributions from the Charleston Museum, edited by E. Milby Burton, Director (Charleston: The Charleston Museum, 1936), pp. 16-17; Charles Joyner, Down by the Riverside: A South Carolina Slave Community (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 1984), pp. 48-49.

(4) Allston, Memoir ..., pp. 16-22; Allston, Essay on Sea Coast Crops ..., pp. 36-37; Doar, pp. 15-20; George C. Rogers, Jr., The History of Georgetown County, South Carolina (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970), pp. 334-35.

(5) Allston, Memoir ..., p. 18.

(6) Arney R. Childs, Editor, Rice Planter and Sportsman: The Recollections of J. Motte Alston, 1821-1909 (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1953), p. 45.

APR 4 1987

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

**National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet**

Section number F Page 13

(7) Allston, Memoir ..., pp. 20-22.

(8) Allston, Memoir ..., pp. 16-17.

(9) Doar, pp. 18-22; Rogers, p. 335; Industry Schedules, Eighth Census of the United States (1860), Georgetown County; Industry Schedules, Ninth Census of the United States (1870), Georgetown County; Interview with Richard Porcher, 23 June 1987.

(10) South Carolina Inventory of Historic Places files, State Historic Preservation Office, South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia.

(11) Interview with R. Kenneth Williams, Manager, Kinloch Plantation, Georgetown, South Carolina, 25 August 1987.

G. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

Discuss the methods used in developing the multiple property listing.

See continuation sheet

See continuation sheet

H. Major Bibliographical References

See continuation sheet

See continuation sheet

Primary location of additional documentation:

State historic preservation office
 Other State agency
 Federal agency

Local government
 University
 Other

Specify repository: S.C. Department of Archives and History, Columbia, SC

I. Form Prepared By

name/title J. Tracy Power, National Register Historian; Sherry Piland, Architectural Historian
organization S.C. Department of Archives and History date 15 September 1987
street & number P.O. Box 11669 telephone (803) 734-8608
city or town Columbia state South Carolina zip code 29211

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 1 1987

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number G Page 1

Section G. Summary of Identification and Evaluation Methods

A survey of historic places in the three-county area served by the Waccamaw Regional Planning and Development Council was begun in December 1970 and completed in September 1971. This survey was published as The Waccamaw Survey of Historic Places. The Georgetown County survey was conducted by a committee of county citizens including representatives of Brookgreen Gardens, the Georgetown County Historical Commission, the Georgetown County Historical Society, the Georgetown County Memorial Library, and the Rice Museum. A special section of this survey was devoted to the Georgetown County rice plantations. The emphasis, however, was on the plantation residences.

In 1978 an update of the rice plantation portion of the survey was begun as a basis for a National Register thematic nomination for the Georgetown County rice culture. Work on the update was a joint project involving Kathy Hendrix, Historic Preservation Planner for the Waccamaw Regional Planning and Development Council, and members of the State Historic Preservation Office staff of the South Carolina Department of Archives and History. Using the lists of rice plantations developed by George C. Rogers, Jr. in The History of Georgetown County, South Carolina, each plantation was surveyed for existing physical remains and sites from the rice era including barns, cabins, and other outbuildings. The survey revealed numerous historic resources which required further study before a nomination could be prepared. The SHPO office felt that due to other obligations it would not be feasible for the nomination to be prepared in-house.

In 1982 there was an attempt to work with a local Georgetown County organization to hire a consultant through a survey and planning grant to prepare a nomination. This effort proved unsuccessful.

In 1985 the SHPO identified areas of the state which were experiencing growth and which were likely to experience development pressure. Georgetown County was one of these areas. It was decided that completing the survey of the resources associated with the rice culture and preparing a nomination should be high priorities of the SHPO.

In the spring and summer of 1987, the SHPO National Register staff reviewed past survey information, made additional site visits, and conducted historical research concerning the cultivation of rice in Georgetown County. Staff members involved in the project included Mary W. Edmonds, Division Head, Survey and Registration Division;

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 4 1988

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number G Page 2

Andrew W. Chandler, National Register Manager, Sherry Piland, National Register Architectural Historian, J. Tracy Power, National Register Historian, and Dr. Patricia A. Cridlebaugh, Staff Archaeologist. Interviews were conducted with Jim Fitch, director of the Rice Museum, and with Richard Porcher, a professor at the Citadel who has researched the rice culture era with a special interest in the agricultural resources and in locating rice processing facilities. Extensive tours were taken of Keithfield Plantation (with Ernest Pyatt, caretaker) and of Kinloch Plantation (with R. Kenneth Williams, manager). These tours focused on visiting agricultural resources such as impounded rice fields where canals, dikes, and trunks were visible. Photographs from earlier survey efforts were field-checked for current accuracy and additional photographs were taken as needed.

Historical research revealed a distinct time-frame in which rice was cultivated in Georgetown County. The property type typology grew out of our understanding of the organization of rice plantations and of the cultivation and growth of this important crop.

APR 4 1980

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 1

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- United States Censuses, Georgetown County, South Carolina, 1850-1920:
Population Schedules of the Seventh Census of the United States, 1850: South Carolina: Slave Schedules. Washington: National Archives Microfilm Publications, 1964.
Population Schedules of the Eighth Census of the United States, 1860: South Carolina: Slave Schedules. Washington: National Archives Microfilm Publications, 1967.
South Carolina Department of Archives and History, "Agriculture, Industry, Social Statistics, and Mortality Schedules for South Carolina, 1850-1880." Columbia: Department of Archives and History Microfilms, 1971.
Reports of the Statistics of Agriculture in the United States, Agriculture by Irrigation in the Western Part of the United States, and Statistics of Fisheries in the United States at the Eleventh Census: 1890. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1896.
Census Reports Volume VI: Twelfth Census of the United States, Taken in the Year 1900. Agriculture, Part II: Crops and Irrigation. Washington: U.S. Census Office, 1902.
Thirteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1910. Volume VII: Agriculture 1909 and 1910. Reports by States, with Statistics for Counties. Nebraska-Wyoming, Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1913.
Fourteenth Census of the United States Taken in the Year 1920. Volume VI, Part 2. Agriculture. Reports for States, With Statistics for Counties and a Summary for the United States and the North, South, and West. The Southern States. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1922.

Manuscripts

- Louis H. Hutto, Jr., Georgetown, South Carolina
Affadavits Concerning Keithfield Plantation, 1970
South Carolina Department of Archives and History, Columbia
State Historic Preservation Office
South Carolina Inventory of Historic Places files
National Register of Historic Places files
National Register Office files: Alexander M. Quattlebaum,
"Arundel Plantation: 200 Years of Identity," unpublished
MS.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 2

South Carolina Institute of Archaeology and Anthropology, Columbia
James Michie, "Richmond Hill and Wachesaw: An Archaeological
Study of Two Rice Plantations on Waccamaw River, Georgetown
County, South Carolina. Research Manuscript Series 203, 1987.
South Caroliniana Library, University of South Carolina, Columbia
Allston Family Papers
Robert F.W. Allston Papers
Breslauer-Lachicotte Company Papers
Davison McDowell Papers
James Ritchie Sparkman Papers
South Carolina Historical Society, Charleston
John Sparkman Plantation Book

Other Unpublished Material

Carpenter, James G. "The Rice Plantation Lands of Georgetown
County, South Carolina: A Historical Geographic Study."
Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Department of Geography, University
of South Carolina, 1973.
Eaddy, Mary Ann. "Slave Housing on the Rice Plantations,
Georgetown County, South Carolina." Unpublished M.A.
Thesis, Department of Architectural History, George
Washington University, 1985.

Interviews

Jim Fitch, The Rice Museum, Georgetown, South Carolina, 27 April
1987
Louis H. Hutto, Jr., Keithfield Plantation, Georgetown, South
Carolina, 29 July 1987
Robert Joyner, Tom Yawkey Wildlife Center, South Carolina Wildlife
and Marine Resources Department, Cat Island, South Carolina,
24 August 1987
Fred B. Lee, Beneventum Plantation, Georgetown, South Carolina,
29 July 1987
Jim Lee, Dirleton Plantation, Thomas G. Samworth Game Management
Area, South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Department,
Georgetown, South Carolina, 30 July 1987
Hoyt Martin, Caretaker, Weehaw Plantation, Georgetown, South
Carolina, 2 September 1987
Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Owens, Prince Frederick's Summer Chapel
Rectory, Georgetown, South Carolina, 25 August 1987.
Richard Porcher, Department of Biology, The Citadel, Charleston,
South Carolina, 23 June 1987

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

NPR A 125c

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 3

Fred Powell, Game Warden, Arcadia Plantation, Georgetown, South Carolina, 2 September 1987
Ernest Pyatt, Caretaker, Keithfield Plantation, Georgetown, South Carolina, 30 July 1987
Alberta L. Quattlebaum, Waverly Plantation, Pawley's Island, South Carolina, 31 July 1987
Lucile G. Quattlebaum, Arundel Plantation, Georgetown, South Carolina, 30 July 1987
Mr. and Mrs. William B. Schoolfield, Nightingale Hall Plantation, Georgetown, South Carolina, 29 July 1987
Mr. and Mrs. Alfred P. Seitter, Rural Hall Plantation, Georgetown, South Carolina, 29 July 1987
R. Kenneth Williams, Manager, Kinloch Plantation, Georgetown, South Carolina, 25 August 1987

Published Sources

- Allston, Robert F.W. Essay on Sea Coast Crops... Charleston: A.E. Miller, 1854.
- Allston, Robert F.W. Memoir of the Introduction and Planting of Rice in South Carolina. Charleston: A.E. Miller, 1843.
- Bailey, N. Louise, and Elizabeth Ivey Cooper, Biographical Directory of the South Carolina House of Representatives: Volume III: 1775-1790. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1981.
- Bailey, N. Louise, Mary L. Morgan, and Carolyn R. Taylor, Biographical Directory of the South Carolina Senate 1776-1985. 3 Volumes. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1986.
- Bull, Henry DeSaussure. All Saint's Church, Waccamaw: The Parish, The Place, The People. Columbia: R.L. Bryan, 1949.
- Childs, Arney R., Editor. Rice Planter and Sportsman, The Recollections of J. Motte Alston, 1821-1909. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1953.
- Clifton, James M. "Twilight Comes to the Rice Kingdom: Postbellum Rice Culture on the South Atlantic Coast." Georgia Historical Quarterly LXII:2 (Summer 1978).
- Coffin, Almira. "South Carolina Through New England Eyes: Almira Coffin's Visit to the Low Country in 1851." South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine XLV:3 (July 1944).
- Doar, David. Rice and Rice Planting in the South Carolina Low Country. Contributions From The Charleston Museum, edited by E. Milby Burton, Director. Charleston: The Charleston Museum, 1936.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

APR 4 1981

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 4

- Easterby, J.H., Editor. The South Carolina Rice Plantation As Revealed in the Papers of Robert F.W. Allston. Chicago: University of Chicago Press for the American Historical Association, 1945.
- Edgar, Walter B., and N. Louise Bailey, Biographical Directory of the South Carolina House of Representatives: Volume II: The Commons House of Assembly 1692-1775. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1977.
- Georgetown Rice Milling Company, Georgetown, S.C. 1880. Charleston: Lucas and Richardson, 1880.
- Glassow, Michael S. "Issues in Evaluating the Significance of Archaeological Resources." American Antiquity 42 (1977): 413-420.
- Gray, Lewis Cecil. History of Agriculture in the Southern United States to 1860. Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1958. Reprint of 1932 Edition. Volume I.
- Harwell, Richard B. "The Hot and Hot Fish Club of All Saints Parish." South Carolina Historical Magazine XLVIII: 1 (January 1947).
- Heyward, Duncan Clinch. Seed from Madagascar. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1937.
- Hilliard, Sam B. "Antebellum tidewater rice culture in South Carolina and Georgia." In James R. Gibson, Editor, European Settlement and Development in North America: Essays on geographical change in honour and memory of Andrew Hill Clark. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.
- Joyner, Charles. Down By The Riverside: A South Carolina Slave Community. (Blacks in the New World) Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1984.
- Kovacik, Charles F. "South Carolina Rice Coast Landscape Changes." In Tall Timbers Ecology and Management Conference Proceedings No. 16.
- Lachicotte, Alberta Morel. Georgetown Rice Plantations. Columbia: R.L. Bryan Company, 1955.
- Lawton, William. An Essay on Rice and its Culture... Charleston, 1871.
- Malet, William Wyndham. An Errand to the South in the Summer of 1862. London, 1863.
- Arthur M. Manigault Chapter, United Daughters of the Confederacy, For Love of a Rebel. Charleston: Walker, Evans, & Cogswell, 1964.

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places
Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 5

- Mohl, Raymond A., Editor. "'The Grand Fabric of Republicanism': A Scotsman Describes South Carolina 1810-1811." South Carolina Historical Magazine 71:3 (July 1970).
- Official Records of the Union and Confederate Navies in the War of the Rebellion. 30 Volumes. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1894-1922.
- Original Communications Made to the Agricultural Society of South Carolina... Charleston, 1824.
- Phillips, U.B. Life and Labor in the Old South. New York, 1929.
- Porter, A. Toomer. Led On! Step by Step. New York, 1967.
- Pennington, Patience [Elizabeth Alston Pringle]. A Woman Rice Planter. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928.
- Pringle, Elizabeth Alston. Chronicles of Chicora Wood. New York, 1922.
- Proceedings of the Winyah and All Saints Agricultural Society... Charleston, 1850.
- Register, Jeannie Heyward, Compiler. "Marriage and Death Notices From the City Gazette." South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine XXVII:2 (April 1926).
- Reports Submitted to the Winyah and All Saints Agricultural Society... Charleston, 1848.
- Rice Journal and Gulf Coast Farmer (July 1904; February 1927).
- Rogers, George C., Jr. The History of Georgetown County, South Carolina. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1970.
- "Rules on the Rice Estate of P.C. Weston; South Carolina, 1856." DeBow's Review XXI:1 (January 1857).
- G.S.S., "Sketches of the South Santee." American Monthly Magazine VIII:10 (October 1836).
- Seabrook, Whitemarsh B. An Essay on the Agricultural Capabilities of S Carolina... Charleston, 1848.
- Seward and Kip, Perserverance Rice Mills, Rice, Its Cultivation and Management. Georgetown, 1875.
- Slave Narratives: A Folk History of Slavery in the United States, from Interviews with Former Slaves. South Carolina Narratives. Volume I. Part II. Reprint Edition. St. Clair Shores, MI: Scholarly Press, 1976.
- The Southern Agriculturist, and Register of Rural Affairs; Adapted to the Southern Section of the United States (Charleston) IV:4 (April 1831).

United States Department of the Interior
National Park Service

National Register of Historic Places Continuation Sheet

Section number H Page 6

- "Synopsis of the Culture of Rice - on Black River. From the Southern Agriculturist." The Farmer's Register: A Monthly Publication, Devoted to the Improvement of the Practice, and Support of the Interests, of Agriculture (Richmond) IX:3 (31 March 1841).
- Starnes, Hugh N. "The Rice-Fields of Carolina." Southern Bivouac II:6 (November 1886).
- Thomas, Albert Sidney. A Historical Account of the Protestant Episcopal Church in South Carolina 1820-1957: Being a Continuation of Dalcho's Account 1670-1820. Columbia: R.L. Bryan Company, 1957.
- Tower, R. Lockwood, Editor. A Carolinian Goes to War: The Civil War Narrative of Arthur Middleton Manigault, Brigadier General, C.S.A. Columbia: Published for the Charleston Library Society by the University of South Carolina Press, 1983.
- Warner, Ezra J. Generals in Gray: Lives of the Confederate Commanders. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1959; 1975 Printing.
- Wood, Peter H. Black Majority: Negroes in Colonial South Carolina from 1670 through the Stono Rebellion. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1974.